

FOR RELEASE: 2/29/67
Wednesday AM's

OPENING STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
STUDENT PANEL -- UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA February 28, 1967

One of the pleasures of leaving Washington is that it puts things back in proper perspective.

For instance, before I left Washington yesterday I had spent several hours discussing anti-ballistic missile systems . . .the arms race . . .the war on hunger . . . the war on poverty . . .the war in Vietnam . . .the crisis in credibility.

As I stepped off the plane today, the first question I was asked was: "Where do you stand on brown-bagging?"

* * * *

Today I hope you'll help me celebrate a birthday. Back in 1958, a Senator from my home state -- a fellow named Hubert Humphrey -- had a favorite idea and offered a bill in the Senate to put the idea into action.

The idea was conceived in the belief that young people in this country are the embodiment of American idealism, and that people overseas ought to have a chance to observe this spirit first hand.

The idea was a system of voluntary service overseas, lending a hand where help was needed -- in the new nations. I kept after my idea and I kept introducing my bill. In 1960 I was able to get a brief reference to the idea attached to the Foreign Aid Bill -- just enough to plant the seed. Then another Senator, who taught me some practical politics in West Virginia a few months later, made that idea a practical reality by becoming President.

Six years ago tomorrow President John F. Kennedy signed an Executive Order creating the Peace Corps. That Executive Order was based on the brief reference to the idea of voluntary overseas service written into the Foreign Aid Act.

Six months later, the Peace Corps legislation was passed.

Tomorrow is the Peace Corps' birthday, and it's a day for which we Americans -- especially younger Americans-- can justly be proud.

Over 206 thousand have volunteered for Peace Corps service. Over 26 thousand of them have made it through the selection and training process and headed overseas -- 117 of them from this university.

I remember vividly -- and I confess, with just a slight touch of vindication -- the awkward days when the Peace Corps was getting under way.

The loudest voices belonged to the doubters.

They called it the Kiddie Korps! The Children's Crusade!

I remember one notable public figure--what was his name?-- who called it a haven for beatniks and draft dodgers. Then the first volunteers reported. And the critics and doubters were proven so wrong.

I remember the first pep talk I gave them: "It will be rough for you. You will be misunderstood, and your motives will be questioned and twisted. But then, after you leave Washington..."

Well, the critics have eaten their words.

Peace Corps Volunteers now are serving in 52 countries. And where they go, they count.

Leaders overseas have discovered the Volunteers do make a difference.

The result is that where 10 were once "too many", now 100 are hardly enough.

Some countries want double and triple the number of Volunteers that the Peace Corps is able to provide. Other countries which have no Volunteers want them.

Because of the example of the Peace Corps and the work of a Peace Corps spin-off--The International Secretariat for Volunteer Services--21 countries now have their own Peace Corps...and 22 countries have organizations like our Job Corps. About 100 thousand volunteers are serving in all of these agencies.

The Peace Corps spark has lit quite a fire.

One of the highest compliments the Peace Corps has ever received came from Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand, who said: "It is striking indeed that this most powerful idea in recent times, of a Peace Corps, should come from the mightiest nation on earth. Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great nation as a wealthy nation, endowed with great material strength. But how many of us know that in the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful? This is the secret of your greatness."

Perhaps some of you listening to me have contracted that awful American disease -- spectator-itis. When the virus of spectator-itis infects a fellow, he sits there, kind of limp, and says: "I don't want to participate. I don't want to rock the boat. I'll sit on the sidelines. Include me out."

Well, being a former pharmacist, let me give you the Humphrey prescription for spectator-itis.

It will be a 100 per cent cure, or you'll get double your money back. Go get a Peace Corps application blank and fill it out!

When you're in a poverty-stricken community in Latin America where half of the children never reach the age of five, and where the inhabitants don't know the first elements of sanitation or community organization, you'll be cured of spectator-itis. I guarantee it.

And you can cure yourself of spectator-itis right here at home -- join VISTA -- our domestic Peace Corps.

Join the War on Poverty.

Thomas Wolfe put it much better than I can.

"If a man has a talent and does not use it, he has failed. If he has a talent and uses only half of it, he has partly failed. If he has a talent and learns somehow to use the whole of it, he has gloriously succeeded and won a satisfaction and a triumph few men ever know."

The Peace Corps has a commercial I like. It says:
"The Peace Corps won't change the world -- but then it won't leave it quite the same either."

Anybody want a piece of the action?

####

Gov Dan Moore
Sam Ervin
Euritt Jordan

OPENING STATEMENT

Basketball
U of N.C. Tarheels
Larry Miller + all
Bob Lewis } am
Duke - + Again
march 4

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

STUDENT PANEL

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA

This fine
consolidated
Univ System

1989- to 1967

FEBRUARY 28, 1967

Research in Child Development
air Pollution
Pharmacology & Toxicology

North Carolina State U
Raleigh -
U of N.C. - Greensboro
U of N.C. Charlotte

President Friday, Vice President Anderson,

Vice President King, Vice President Weaver, Vice

President Shephard ... may we have some applause

for the Vice Presidents please?

This is probably the first time these good men
have been recognized since John Nance Garner spoke here.

* * *

Chancellor Sitterson, Mr. West, fellow members
of the National Student Association, refugees from Stanford.

J. Robinson West
Chr. Carolina Forum!

✓ Frank Graham
✓ Sam Ervin

I'm delighted to be here. I think you should know, before we begin, that four of my staff members are North Carolina girls. And three of them went to colleges in North Carolina.

Mary Margaret Overby, who was graduated here, has told me of the intellectual and athletic glories of U.N.C.

My secretary, Marsha Shepherd, who attended the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, suggested I visit their branch office here.

But Bess Autry, a Duke girl, would only concede that a school which produced both Thomas Wolfe and Robert Welch at least isn't dull.

But Bess, how about a school
I told Bess that any school that could produce Richard Nixon must be dull. *has some explaining to do.*

I might also add that any school represented by such men as my two friends, Frank Graham and Sam Ervin, must be good.

UNC
Larry Miller
Bob Lewis
All American

When I accepted the invitation to come here

a month ago, I noticed the basketball polls had you number two in the nation ... that's where the President has me.

Now I notice they have you slipping. (Duke - man 4th)

Take my advice: Don't worry. It won't do any good.

Be like Avis - *Try harder -

One of the pleasures of leaving Washington is

that it put things back in proper perspective.

For instance, before I left Washington ^{today} yesterday

I had spent several hours discussing anti-ballistic missile systems ... the arms race ... the war on hunger ... the

war on poverty ... the war in Vietnam ... the crisis in China - credibility - I'm all prepared for the big ones

^{then} As I stepped off the plane today ^{day}, the first question

I was asked was: "Where do you stand on brown-bagging?"

* * *

~~##~~

Today I hope you'll help me celebrate a brithday.

Back in 1958, a Senator from my home state -- a fellow named Hubert Humphrey -- had a favorite idea and offered a bill in the Senate to put the idea into action.

< The idea was conceived in the belief that young people in this country are the embodiment of American idealism, and that people overseas ought to have a chance to observe this spirit first hand.

< The idea was a system of voluntary service overseas, lending a hand where help was needed -- in the new nations! *Practical reality* I kept after my idea and I kept introducing my bill. In 1960 I was able to get a brief reference to the idea attached to the Foreign Aid Bill -- just enough to plant the seed. Then another Senator, who taught me some practical politics in West Virginia a few months later, made that idea a practical reality by becoming President.

↳ Six years ago tomorrow President John F. Kennedy signed an Executive Order creating the Peace Corps. That Executive Order was based on the brief reference to the idea of voluntary overseas service written into the Foreign Aid Act.

↳ Six months later, the Peace Corps legislation was passed. *↓ introduced it*

↳ Tomorrow is the Peace Corps' birthday, and it's a day for which we Americans -- especially younger Americans -- can justly be proud.

↳ Over 206 thousand have volunteered for Peace Corps service. ↳ Over 26 thousand of them have made it through the selection and training process and headed overseas -- *and* 117 of them from this university.

↳ I remember vividly -- and I confess, with just a slight touch of vindication -- the awkward days when the Peace Corps was getting under way.

The loudest voices belonged to the doubters.

They called it the Kiddie Korps! The Children's
Crusade!

↳ I remember one notable public figure -- what was his name? -- who called it a haven for beatniks and draft dodgers. Then the first volunteers reported. And the critics and doubters were proven so wrong.

I remember the first pep talk I gave them:

"It will be rough for you. You will be misunderstood, and your motives will be questioned and twisted. But then, after you leave Washington ..."

↳ Well, the critics have eaten their words.

Peace Corps Volunteers now are servicing in 52 countries. And where they go, they count.

Leaders overseas have discovered the Volunteers do make a difference.

The result is that where 10 were once "too many", now 100 are hardly enough.

Some countries want double and triple the number of Volunteers that the Peace Corps is able to provide. Other countries which have no Volunteers want them.

Because of the example of the Peace Corps and the work of a Peace Corps spin-off -- The International Secretariat for Volunteer Services -- 21 countries now have their own Peace Corps ... 18 countries have domestic Peace Corps ... and 22 countries have organizations like our Job Corps. About 100 thousand volunteers are serving in all of these agencies.

↳ The Peace Corps spark has lit quite a fire.

One of the highest compliments the Peace Corps has ever received came from Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand, who said: "It is striking indeed that this most powerful idea in recent times, of a Peace Corps, should come from the mightiest nation on earth. Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great nation as a wealthy nation, endowed with great material strength. But how many of us know that in the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful? This is the secret of your greatness."

Perhaps some of you listening to me have contracted that awful American disease -- spectator-itis.

When the virus of spectator-itis infects a fellow, he sits there, kind of limp, and says: "I don't want to participate.

I don't want to rock the boat. I'll sit on the sidelines.

Include me out."

Stop the world - I want to sit off!

Well, being a former pharmacist, let me give you the Humphrey prescription for spectator-itis.

It will be a 100 per cent cure, or you'll get double your money back.

Go get a Peace Corps application blank and fill it out!

When you're in a poverty-stricken community in Latin America where half of the children never reach the age of five, and where the inhabitants don't know the first elements of sanitation or community organization, you'll be cured of spectator-itis. I guarantee it.

∟ And you can cure yourself of spectator-itis
right here at home -- join VISTA, our domestic Peace Corps.

∟ Join the War on Poverty.

Thomas Wolfe put it much better than I can.

"If a man has a talent and does not use it, he has failed. If he has a talent and uses only half of it, he has partly failed. If he has a talent and learns somehow to use the whole of it, he has gloriously succeeded, and won a satisfaction and a triumph few men ever know."

The Peace Corps has a commercial I like. It says: "The Peace Corps won't change the world -- but then it won't leave it quite the same either."

Anybody want a piece of the action? !

#

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY'S SPEECH--28 February, 1967

WUNC Intro.

From Memorial Hall on the campus of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Carolina Forum presents a brief address and panel discussion by the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey. The panel, consisting of faculty members and students, will question the Vice President. The Carolina Forum in cooperation with other organizations brings to the campus speakers of national and international reputation in various areas of public interest. Robin West, Chairman of the Carolina Forum, will introduce the Vice President and members of the panel.

Robin West

I am delighted that we have the Chairman of the University's Board of Trustees, Governor Moore, the State's Senior Senator, Senator Erwin, here with us this afternoon. They have been generous friends of the University and of the Forum. (APPLAUSE)

Ladies and Gentlemen, good afternoon, and welcome to this, I think, very special program of the Carolina Forum. The format for this afternoon will include some opening remarks by our distinguished guest, and then questions from the panel. Now would be a good time to introduce the panel. The first is Dr. David Lapkin, Professor of Economics. (APPLAUSE) The next is Robert Powell, President of the Student Body. (APPLAUSE) Then Dr. Samuel Wells, Assistant Professor of American History, (APPLAUSE) and, finally, Gary Byrne, a Political Science graduate student. (APPLAUSE) This panel, we feel, reflects the interest and concerns of the University community as a whole.

Our guest this afternoon is Hubert Humphrey, the thirty-eighth Vice President of the United States. In his extraordinary career as a college professor, the Mayor of Minneapolis, and later as United States Senator,

he has dedicated himself to the individual in our society. He has been a champion to the causes of civil rights, civil liberties and protection of small businesses. He is a great man. I have the honor to present the Vice President of the United States. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

* * * * *

The Vice President

Thank you very much, Mr. West, and the members of the panel, the members of the student body and faculty, friends of this great academic community. I must say that it is nice to get such a good, warm welcome from such a fine, wonderful place as this. I hope that it can last throughout the afternoon. (Laughter) I will do my best to contribute to that. First, may I once again publicly express my appreciation to Governor Moore and to the two distinguished senators, Senator Erwin and Senator Jordan for their cordial reception, and for the two senators in particular and members of the Congressional delegation joining me on this journey. I was particularly pleased to meet two of your outstanding athletes who tell me that greater things are yet to come for the University of North Carolina. (APPLAUSE) I am speaking of Larry Miller and Bob Lewis. I thought you ought to know that I had to give protection and defensive cover to a young man who has been down here helping me out by the name of George Autry, who is a graduate of Duke, (Laughter) /but he looked very placid and somewhat uncertain at the time so I think it bodes well for March 4th for all of you here.

I want to get right to the purpose of this gathering. My first experience on this campus was when a very great American, and a very dear personal friend of mine, was President of this University, and I, of course, refer to Dr. Frank Graham, one of the truly great men of our country. (APPLAUSE) / This University in a large measure is a living memorial to him

and a living testimonial. But, today may I greet your present President, President Friday. And then I want to take time out just to greet some vice presidents--we don't pay enough attention in this country to vice presidents. (Laughter) Of course, I think you will note that it takes many more vice presidents to run a university than it does the United States. There's Vice President Anderson, and Vice President King, and Vice President Weaver, and Vice President Shepard, and then there's Vice President Humphrey. I kind of thought we ought to just give applause to all vice presidents, that it would be a good idea. (APPLAUSE) I doubt that anybody has paid that much attention to vice presidents since John Nance Garner spoke here some years past.

Chancellor Sitterson, Mr. West, and my fellow members of the National Student Association, and refugees from Stanford and CIA, (Laughter and applause) I generally start these talks by saying I am delighted to be here and then when I correct the copy when I get home, it determines whether I was delighted to be here or not. I think I should, however, more or less get myself in position for this campus. You ought to know that four members of my staff, who do most of the work, are North Carolina girls, and three of them went to colleges right here in North Carolina. Mary Margaret Overby, who was graduated here, has told me of the intellectual and athletic glories of the University of North Carolina. She married a chap from another part of the country. We haven't quite forgiven her for that, but she said that he overcame all of the other obstacles. And my secretary, Miss Marsha Shephard, who attended the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, suggested that I visit their branch office over here at Chapel Hill. (Laughter) / And Bess Autry, wife of George, is a Duke girl. Don't hold that against her--everybody can't have all the privileges in the world, you know that. (Laughter) / She would only concede that a school that could produce both Thomas Wolfe and Robert Welch isn't so dull. (Laughter) You really do stretch the spectrum of political ideology around

(Laughter)
here. / But I said to Bess, "How about a school that produced Richard Nixon?" (Laughter + applause)
I haven't had any answer from her yet.

When I accepted this invitation to come here a month ago, I noticed, as I indicated a little earlier, that the basketball polls had this school numbered No. 2 in the nation and anybody that is No. 2 I have a special affinity for. (Laughter) That's where the President has me and I kinda hope he'll keep me there. (Laughter) Somebody told me that there was some danger that you might slip a little here and I said, "Well, take my advice - don't worry, it won't do any good. Just be like Avis--try harder." (Laughter) / I guess the boys are going to do that from what I hear.

One of the pleasures of leaving the nation's capital is that it puts things, I believe, in proper perspective when you get out to see the rest of the country. For instance, before I left Washington today I had spent the morning hours and much of last evening discussing the anti-ballistic missile, the respective systems that are being deployed in the Soviet Union and the ones being talked about here, the arms race, the war on hunger, the war on poverty, the war in Vietnam, the crisis in China--so, I thought I would get all tuned up for the big ones when I came down here in case there were any questions. The minute I stepped off the plane today, however, the first question that I was asked by one of your energetic reporters was, "Where do you stand on brown-bagging?" (Laughter + applause) Then, somebody handed me an editorial from your local newspaper--the University newspaper--and asked where did I stand on another matter, and I said (Laughter) I couldn't answer that question because I am a pharmacist and it would be a conflict of interests. (Laughter) I guess all of you get the message. (Laughter) This is a go-go crowd if I've ever seen one.

Now, I want you to join me in a serious note in celebrating a birthday. And let me just give you a little of the background. Back in 1958, there was a senator from my home state--a fellow named Hubert Humphrey--who had a favorite idea and like most of his ideas, he talked a lot about them and he offered a bill in the Senate to put that idea in action. That idea was conceived in the belief that young people in this country are the embodiment of American idealism, and that people overseas and in far-away places ought to have a chance to observe this spirit first-hand. The idea that I had was a system of voluntary service overseas, lending a helping hand where help was needed, particularly in the new nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I kept after that new idea of mine and I kept introducing my bill without too much success. In 1960 I was able to get a brief reference to this idea written into the Foreign Aid Act--just enough to plant the seed. It was one of those late night amendments that my colleagues know about--you can get anything almost in a bill after 10 o'clock in the senate if you are there.

Then another senator, who, by the way, taught me some very practical politics in the hills of West Virginia a few months later in 1960, made that idea a practical reality by becoming President of the United States. Six years ago tomorrow President John F. Kennedy signed an executive order creating the Peace Corps. That executive order was based on that amendment that we offered that late night to the Foreign Aid Bill. Just a brief, almost confused, reference to voluntary overseas service. Six months later, after President Kennedy's inaugural, the Peace Corps legislation was passed. I remember it because he called me to the White House one day and asked me if I would be willing to introduce my old bill with some adaptations and some improvements and to hold the hearings. I said, "I would be honored,

Mr. President." And, it was my privilege to introduce the Peace Corps legislation, to hold hearings, to manage the bill on the floor, and to see it become law.

Tomorrow is the Peace Corps' birthday, and it's a day for which we Americans--especially younger Americans--can be justly proud. Over 206,000 young Americans have volunteered for the Peace Corps. Over 26,000 have made it through the processes of selection and training and headed overseas, and 117 of them came right from this University. Now, I remember vividly and with just a slight touch of vindication, the awkward days when the Peace Corps was just getting under way and I remember what some folks said about it. The loudest voices belonged to the doubters, and that is generally the case. If you want to get a headline, just be against something - no problem at all - I can get a big one today if I just take on the President for just about one minute. I don't intend to, I want you to know right off the bat. ^(Laughter) Put your pencils down right now.

I remember, for example, one notable public figure--he did get around the country a bit in 1964--who called it a haven for beatniks and draft dodgers. Then the first Peace Corps volunteers reported for duty, and the critics and the doubters have been proven wrong. I remember, too, my first meeting with that first group of volunteers. I gave them a sort of pep talk-- I reminded them that it will be rough, that the assignment is not easy, you will be misunderstood, and your motives will be questioned and twisted. "And, then after you leave Washington", I said, "people will begin to appreciate what you believe and what you are doing."

Well, the critics have eaten their words, and the Peace Corps volunteers are now serving in 52 countries and where they go, my fellow

Americans, they count. Leaders overseas have discovered the Peace Corps volunteers do make a difference. In fact, I think it is our best foreign aid program. The result is that where 10 were once called "Too many", now 100 are hardly enough. Some countries want to double and triple the number of volunteers that the Peace Corps is able to provide. Other countries which have no volunteers are asking for them--begging for them.

Now, because of the example of the Peace Corps and the work of the Peace Corps spin-off--such as, the International Secretariat for Volunteer Services--21 countries now have their own peace corps, 18 countries have organized domestic peace corps, and 22 countries have organizations like our Job Corps, and about 100,000 volunteers are serving in all of these agencies in a host of countries around this world. The Peace Corps, of which this generation that I address is a very active part, that Peace Corps spark lit quite a fire on the international scene and it is a fire that burns very brightly for a better world. And one of the highest compliments that the Peace Corps ever received came from the Foreign Minister of Thailand, Mr. Thanat Khoman. I had the privilege of serving with Mr. Khoman in the United Nations as a ^{fellow} delegate in 1956. And here's what he had to say: "It is striking indeed," said Mr. Khoman, "that the most powerful idea in recent times of a Peace Corps should come from the mightiest nation on the earth. Many of us who did not know about the United States thought of this great nation as a wealthy nation, endowed with a great material strength. But how many of us know that **in** the United States ideas and ideals are also powerful? This is the secret of your greatness," said Mr. Thanat Khoman, and this man, I think, has grown to appreciate what this fabulous organization--the Peace Corps--can do.

Now, perhaps some of you listening to me--and I'll take just another moment--have contracted that awful American disease called SPECTATOR-ITIS. I remember when I--by the way, I am a refugee from the classroom; I always mention that in the presence particularly of the administrative officials of any great university--elective politics is rather uncertain, the tenure is uncertain, it's a precarious business, and I like to renew my credentials ^(Laugh+rr) whenever I get a chance to a sort of captive audience. But, one time when I was teaching a class at the University of Minnesota, I said to this group of young people who were rather cynical about politics--most of them said politics was corrupt, politicians are corrupt, it's no good, etc.--I said, "Listen, if you think it is so corrupt, why don't you get you a bar of political ivory soap and go clean it up! Quit sitting on the sidelines jeering at the players on the field. Either get in and play, or get out and shut up!" It was a simple lesson that day, and I'm saying right now the same things. Spectator-itis is one of the more pleasant diseases that this country is afflicted with and when that spectator-itis virus hits you, you just sort of sit around, kind of limp, slightly cynical, always a bit critical, but never an activist. And, generally you say: "I don't want to participate, I don't want to rock the boat, I just like to sit around and look at things, include me out, stop the world, I want to get off." Well, I've got a prescription for you--I said I was a former pharmacist--and it's a prescription with a money back guarantee--a hundred percent cure--go get yourself a Peace Corps application and sign up. Fill it out, it'll sure finish that spectator-itis virus in a hurry!

Or, when you're in a poverty-stricken community in Latin America where half of the children will never reach the age of five, or where the inhabitants don't know the first elements of sanitation or community

organization--you go there, you'll be cured of spectator-itis. It's instant cure. And you can cure yourself, too, right here at home--join VISTA, our domestic Peace Corps. We need you desperately, because the way you build a better world is in your town. The way you build a world of peace and order is where you live. And the same enthusiasm that goes into saving a world needs to go into helping to save an individual that may need a helping hand. So, join the war on poverty--in cities or rural America. Thomas Wolfe put it much better and he's your graduate.

He said: "If a man has a talent and does not use it, he has failed. If he has a talent and only uses half of it, he has partly failed. If he has a talent and learns somehow to use the whole of it, he has gloriously succeeded, and won a satisfaction and a triumph that few men ever know."

I think Thomas Wolfe has given us the answer. The Peace Corps has a commercial that I like. It's on radio and TV--you can get it on the late show, along with some other things. It says: "The Peace Corps won't change the world--but then it won't leave it quite the same, either."

And, with that may I say to the panel and the student body: "Anybody want a piece of the action?" Let's go. (APPLAUSE)

* * * * *

West: Our first question will be from Dr. Lapkin.

Dr. Lapkin: Mr. Vice President, to the extent that it diverts resources from the Great Society program, is it not fair to say that America's poor are bearing a disproportionate share of the cost of the war in Vietnam? And, in terms of the rising expectation generated by the Great Society, doesn't this diversion bode ill for the future of domestic tranquility?

The Vice President:

There is no doubt that when you have great international developments and involvements, that resources are taken and required. This has been true throughout our history. You could actually say that all the money you spend in foreign aid is diverted from the poor in this country. I happen to think that it is money well spent, because I believe that the struggle for a better world is rather world-wide. You could say that our military assistance programs to our NATO allies through the years was a diversion of funds from this country and the needs of its people. But we do not live as an island unto ourselves--we are a part of the main, a part of the whole as the great poet has put it. And, we need to consider ourselves as a member of the great international community. Now, let's speak specifically of what is happening with reference to the commitment of resources in Southeast Asia. First of all, the percentage of our gross national product to the defense structure of this country, including the war in South East Asia, is no greater today than it was in 1955. That's Number 1--that is an economic fact. Secondly, I was in the Congress after Korea. We spent about 14% of our GNP during Korea--we spend now about 10% in the present situation, and when the war in Korea was over, there were still slums in America, there were poor in North Carolina, there were people in Minnesota who were poor, there were the needy and the sick, but I did not see the Congress appropriate money for that purpose. The question isn't how you use those resources during the war years--the question is whether or not you have the public opinion in a representative body that is willing to dedicate those same resources to different purposes in the peace years. And, yet, we went through the 1950's with a growing economy, with an expanding economy, despite its recession, and there was no real effort made in

federal aid to education, no war on poverty to cure the ills of our slums and our poor people, no medicare, no great breakthroughs, may I say, in community development. What's the situation now. Let's just take a look at what we have done. Now, we have to have priorities--you can't do everything. I want to say that when I was a very young married man, I couldn't have nearly as good a house as I have now. I wanted one and I needed one worse then when we had the kids--the world is kind of upside down most of the time. Now, I have a fine home, two cars, don't get a chance to drive and no children around any more. When I had no car and four children and poor home--that's when I had the family and little income, I might add, too. Things were kind of upside down.

In 1961 this country spent--total^{ly} for all of its poor; that included social security benefits, unemployment compensation, old age assistance, farmers (home administration loans for poor farmers)--everything for the category of people called the poor--less than \$9 billion. That included everything that the government spent. In fiscal 1968 we'll be spending over \$25 billion--Vietnam or no Vietnam! In 1963 we spent in this nation a little over a billion dollars in federal aid to education. This year we will spend four and one-half billion dollars in all federal aid to education. It isn't as if we have drained dry all the resources that we need for our people--as a matter of fact, more is being expended today, and sometimes under very severe criticism from our opponents; more is being expended today for community development--slum clearance, for example, in our cities. In 1961, less than 2½ billion dollars for our cities. In the fiscal budget of 1968, 9 billion. We haven't sacrificed

trying to improve the American society. As a matter of fact, we have made great strides in improving the American society. Right while we struggle in this war--let's take a quick look--One million, two hundred and fifty thousand children in Head Start last year--two years ago, none. One million young people from needy families in job training--five years ago, not a single one. The income growth of the American family on the average is 25% for the worker--the industrial worker--25% in real wages, including the adjustment for the cost of living since 1961. Our investments in education and health are three-to-one over what they were five years ago. Thirty-five thousand young people, lifted out of the ^{rural and} city slums into Project Upward Bound to universities that never before saw the inside of a university. Six million young people in colleges such as I see here in ^{one} universities and / million of them are there under federal grants, scholarships, and loans the last two years. We've made the most amazing record of social progress that this nation ever dreamed of. Oh I know you can do more and I'm a restless man--I want to do more. But let me say this, that to do more here and not to do our duty abroad--whatever may be your views on that situation abroad--I think would be to put the whole world out of balance. We had to contribute billions of dollars to Western Europe at the very time we needed it in America. And we didn't do it just because we loved Western Europe--we did it because we thought it was essential for a balanced and a free world. And we're making our contribution today in Southeast Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa, in Latin America, in Western Europe, because we think this is important for the maintenance of the kind of society that permits us to have this prosperity. So my answer to you is, we've done more than anybody dreamed possible, more than our opposition wants us to do, there's more yet to be done, and we

have a task force at work now planning for the day that peace can come to us so that we can divert these resources if the Congress will give us the authority to do it into the many programs and projects that are needed to help make America an even more just and decent and prosperous nation. We haven't done all we could or should. We've just done more ^{ever} than anybody/believed was possible--and I think that's a pretty good record. (APPLAUSE.)

Mr. West: The next question is from Bob Powell.

Mr. Powell: Mr. Vice-President, my question concerns the subject that has been much discussed on our campus recently, and that is the war in Viet-Nam. In the State of the Union message the President told the nation that the war might last another 15 years. We have recently heard a number of pronouncements by our Government that we are trying every avenue possible to bring about a conclusion to the conflict. I think everyone here, including yourself, would agree that that is the best way to end the conflict--and that is to have an honorable negotiation of peace. The question I have centers around what type of negotiation is possible and feasible in the situation we are in now in Viet-Nam. Because I think if we are sincere in bringing about negotiations the question that must be faced is what realistically we can hope from a negotiated settlement. The Government has continually talked of the middle course we are following in Viet-Nam, but I wonder--and my question is centered around this question-- why in the course of our pursuing negotiations have we continually put the burden of negotiation on the other side, and why have we used military means to achieve what are essentially diplomatic ends, that is, a negotiated settlement? It seems to me that the other side has made very clear what it will take to bring them to a negotiating table that is, an unconditional halt of bombing. Our Government seems to be unwilling to agree to this condition, that is, an unconditional halt to bombing. So I wonder why it is we do put this

burden on the other side if we are very sincere in bringing about a negotiated settlement?

Vice President: Let's take a look at what are the facts and not what are the guesses. (APPLAUSE) In 1963 - now, I don't mean that to Mr. Powell. I have a high regard for this young man and I know his sincerity. One of the joys of coming to this campus is that I sense here that you believe in an open society--you have an open mind, you have an open heart, you believe in dialogue and communication, and may I compliment the student body of this campus for the finest quality of good manners that I have seen on any campus. I want to congratulate you. (APPLAUSE)

Now, let's just go at your question a little bit. In 1963 North Vietnam started to infiltrate men and material across the demilitarized zone and down the Ho Chi Minh Trail, as well as into Laos.

The International Control Commission has verified that statement. Your government did not intervene in terms of any bombing of the North/ until February of 1965. We did so after there was an identified presence of several regiments of North Vietnamese regulars in South Vietnam. They have no more business being in South Vietnam than we have of forcing troops today into East Germany or the Soviet Union and to do so would be considered an act of aggression. We entered upon our bombing program then because we needed to stem the tide of the flow of materials to a nation that had asked us for help. But the myth prevails in this country that if you just stop the bombing, somehow or other North Vietnam will come to the conference table. But people pleaded with North Vietnam to come to the conference table from 1963 to '65. There was no bombing of the North; not one bomb was dropped, not one single bomb, and they kept coming across the lines. Then the story was, give us a pause, so we gave them a pause. I am a/ ^{member of} the National Security Council and I sit with your President, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, and may I say that I have not been known as a militarist. I am the author of the Disarmament Agency, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, one of its sponsors. I was once called in the Congress one of those "peaceniks," you know, and I do not like to call people names. I thought I was doing what was right.

In 1965, first, your government in May of that year had a bombing pause of five days because we were told by an Eastern

European communist country that a brief pause would give them an opportunity to bring North Vietnam to negotiations. Nothing happened. We then paused, at the request of other countries, for 14 days, they said, give us 14 days, this was in 1966. We paused not only for 14 days, the request came and said give us 20 days, so we went to 20. Then the request came and said things are beginning to move, give us 27; we gave them 27. We gave them 37 and why then at the end of 37 did we cease to pause? Because the same source that said they thought they could bring North Vietnam to a conference table said, it's fruitless.

The Vice President of the United States was in New Delhi, India, a year ago this month. I met with Mr. Kosygin. I talked with him for 4 hours. Mr. Kosygin told the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of State that Mr. Schelepin of the Soviet Union had gone to Hanoi in an effort to use the good offices of the Soviet Union to encourage negotiations, and he had gotten nowhere. That is his statement. I think the evidence proves he was right. The President of India, Mr. Radhakrishnan, to whom I went as an emissary of your government, asking for the good offices of India, told me categorically that India had no influence in Hanoi and that he saw no prospects of Hanoi being interested in negotiation. It's an interesting thing to me that the people that seem to know the most about North Vietnam's desire to negotiate are the people who have never been

there and who seem to have no connection with the man that can do negotiating. We are not talking about some 32nd degree contact. If we are going to negotiate, we are going to have to negotiate with representatives of an established government.

Now let's see what happened recently. Mr. Wilson, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Chairman Kosygin of the Soviet Union two weeks ago, this weekend, were in London. Your Vice President sat with your President on Sunday, Saturday and Monday, while we were cabling back and forth between London and the United States. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Kosygin made an approach to your government. They asked us to make certain concessions; we did. We answered that request. They said that if we were willing to do that, which they asked, which I cannot speak of in terms of detail, if we were willing to meet their request that they would forward the request to Hanoi and they would seek to open contact with Hanoi to bring Hanoi to the conference table. You may recall that Mr. Kosygin stayed in London several hours longer. You may recall that we did not renew our bombing / ^{during} this period of time, that there was a cessation. You may also recall a communique signed by Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Wilson. They said they received no response from Hanoi. Mr. Kosygin went home with no response from Hanoi. The interesting part was that this was the first time Mr. Kosygin personally tried to do something to bring about negotiations.

Now my fellow Americans, it puzzles me why people insist that the United States is the one that is dragging its feet on negotiations when your government has agreed to every single proposal that is a responsible proposal to bring North Vietnam to a conference table. Arthur Goldberg only yesterday said that we are prepared, and he speaks for your President, we are prepared to enter a conference of the Geneva type conference once again to settle the situation in Southeast Asia. North Vietnam says they will only come if we get an unconditional promise and commitment that we will under no circumstances renew the bombing. They don't say that they will stop shooting one minute. They say you stop the bombing and we'll think about it. Now what would you think if your President said to Hanoi, if you would stop the shooting in South Vietnam while we're continuing to bomb in the North and while we're continuing to shoot in the South, then we'll come to the conference table. You'd say, why the President of the United States is irresponsible. This is ridiculous. And yet, you are asking your government to cease the bombing in the North without a single commitment from the North Vietnamese except that they might talk. Now we went through that talk, Mr. Powell, you were rather young. We went through it in 1951, '52, and into '53. Two-and-one-half years of talk in Korea and Panmunjom, two-and-one-half years and most of the Americans that were killed in Korea were killed during

the talks while the enemy continued to pour in, while the talks continued on, and when the struggle was brought to an end, it should be noted, that one of the reasons it was brought to an end is because the former President of the United States who not only said he would go to Korea, but he also told through the diplomatic channels that he would brook no more nonsense, there would be no sanctuary, and he would use whatever power the United States had and needed to use to bring this conflict to an end, and that message went from the chancellories of India to Peking into North Korea, and the talks had a satisfactory conclusion. And today there is at least a free South Korea, a Korea which was close to being destroyed. I can only say this for your government, and I speak now for your government, your government is prepared to negotiate in any responsible international forum; we are prepared to accept the good offices of the 17 non-aligned nations; we are prepared to accept the good offices of Chairman Kosygin and Prime Minister Wilson as we did two weeks ago. We are prepared to accept the good offices of his holiness, The Pope; we are prepared to accept the good offices of the United Nations and the Secretary General; we are prepared to go anywhere, to meet with the North Vietnamese and their representatives, and that does not forbid the representation of the Viet Cong in the North Vietnamese delegation. We are prepared to go wherever it is possible, if we can get some assurance from the

North Vietnamese that it's going to be more than a stall, a lot of talk which disarms our people, which leaves our soldiers the victim of constant infiltration of personnel and material. I don't think a mother or a father or a son or a daughter of the United States of America can ask your government to do more than that. We have close to a half-million men in ^{South} Viet Nam and to leave them there the victims of massive infiltration as happened during the ^{recent} Tet truce when the movement of supplies increased as much as 20 times down the coastal waterways and across the demilitarized zone, I don't think you can ask those men to be there and be the subject of unlimited infiltration from North Viet Nam of men and material. If you are going to do that, you ought to pull them out and not leave them there as sacrificial people. (Applause.) This is the basic question in the American ^{public} arena today and it deserved this kind of attention. A group of clergymen came to visit the Secretary of State on this very same matter with an open letter to the President. And the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, who has given much of his life in peace and war, who has served three Presidents of the United States, the Secretary of State looked over this request to stop the bombing in the North, and he said, it's a legitimate request, we're prepared to do that, we're prepared to stop the bombing in the North if you will include in your letter that the North Vietnamese should at least de-escalate or make one act of

a military discipline that would retard their military efforts, such as a cease fire or the stopping of the infiltration of men and materials from the North -- one single act, he asked, one single act of de-escalation of the military efforts from the North. What do you think was the response? The response was, well, Mr. Secretary, the reason we did not put that in the letter was we know they won't do it. We know they won't do it. But we do think we have the right to ask you to stop the bombing. And now, my dear friends, the bombing hasn't stopped the infiltration; it never claimed to stop it. The bombing will never win the war. No bombing ever did. The purpose of the bombing is not to stop the infiltration because it is literally tactical and strategically impossible to do it, but it does make the cost of infiltration go up, it does slow it down, and it requires from three to four hundred thousand North Vietnamese to repair railroads and bridges and roads and ports because of the bombing/^{and} their military targets, and if those three to four hundred thousand men were released they would be in the armed forces of North Vietnam and they would infiltrate. They're in the demilitarized zone right now,^{and} nobody denies it. The demilitarized zone under the Geneva protocols is a neutral area, demilitarized, and yet this very moment that I talk to you two divisions of North Vietnamese troops are there killing Americans. And we're asked to stop it; we're asked to stop defending ourselves and

defending a country that was attacked aggressively by its neighbor to the North. South Vietnam has not invaded North Vietnam. There are no South Vietnamese troops in North Vietnam, but there are North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam, and the United States of America will get closer to that peace table which is our hope, our prayer and our objective. We'll get closer to that peace table if the North Vietnamese understand that this country is united. I think that Ho Chi-Minh has come to the conclusion that he can't win this war in Vietnam; he hopes to win this war in American public opinion and in Washington, but he's not going to be able to do it; we're not going to let him do it. (Applause)

Dr. Wells. Mr. Vice President, in the general range of economic problems facing the administration, I would like to know if you assign a high priority to the anti-ballistic missile negotiations with the Soviet Union, and if so, are these talks of sufficient importance to affect our conduct in the war in Vietnam.

The Vice President

We assign a very high priority to the discussions underway with the Soviet Union on the deployment of the anti-ballistic missile. The Soviet Union has already deployed what is known as its Moscow system, as well as a secondary system. The Moscow system is a highly sophisticated anti-ballistic missile system. We feel that rather than to enter a new dimension of the arms race which will be dangerous and costly, which will not add to the

security of either the Soviet Union or ourselves, even though it may add to our respective powers, we think that to forestall that arms race is of the highest priority. We think to enter it is dangerous, and therefore your President has directed the Ambassador of the United States, Mr. Llewellyn Thompson, with letter to Chairman Kosygin to meet with the appropriate representatives of the Soviet Union in Moscow, just as Mr. Dobrynin, Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. meets here in our country with our representatives in the hope that we can forestall this deployment, and not only forestall the deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system, but to start to literally de-escalate the whole missile program. It is a fact, my fellow Americans, that the technicians and the specialists that have advised your President since the time of Mr. Truman, through Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Kennedy and now President Johnson, that all of the science advisers, everyone of them without exception, feel that the anti-ballistic missile defense system cannot be very effective against a sophisticated offensive system.

And we have ways and means of being able to deploy an offensive missile system that can penetrate any known anti-ballistic missile defense system, and it is to be presumed that the Soviet Union would have some of that technology. Never underestimate the enemy - never underestimate their capacity at sophisticated weapons systems. So, we place high priority on this, just as we do on nuclear poliferation, may I add, and that, by the way, is moving along fairly well despite some of the worries of our non-nuclear friends and neighbors.

Now, you ask if this should be a matter that weighs in / our judgments and decisions concerning Vietnam. Yes, it should be a matter of concern, but it also should be a matter of concern for the Soviet Union. And, I think it is important for this audience to remember that peace is not a one way street, nor is an agreement a one-way street. It takes two or more to make an understanding or an agreement. You know, many people today say that we are close to a detente or we are on the fine edge of a detente with the Soviet Union, and I doubt that that is quite the case. At least it is fair to say that the Soviet Union in her relationships with the United States and Western Europe, and other countries is a much more cautious and prudent power than she was, let's say, twenty years ago. And I believe there is a reason for that and it might be well if we take about three minutes to cite the reasons. In late 1945 Joseph Stalin said to Mr. Truman: "I am going to keep our forces in Northern Iran--the provinces of Northern Iran. We need these provinces for our national security." Mr. Truman was a plain spoken man (laughter). Mr. Truman said: "You keep 'em out of there, and if you don't get them out of there (and I'll give you so many days)," in just that plain language, "you get them out of there according to previous agreement, or I'm directing the

American Air Forces in Europe to attack!" Mr. Stalin thought about it about 24 hours and the order went out to withdraw the 400,000 Soviet troops that were there. That's No. 1.

A little bit later the Soviet Union decided they wanted the Northern provinces of Turkey. You know, half of the population of America was not alive at the time of World War II. Over one-half of the population of the United States does not recall the events that led up to World War II, and about 40% of the population of America wasn't alive in 1948. So, much of what happened in those critical years is a matter of reading, not experience. When Mr. Stalin asked for the Provinces of North Turkey--the Northern Provinces of Turkey--he said he demanded them, as a matter of right--that they were historic Russian territories. He demanded them for security purposes. Then Mr. Truman said: "Get out. You're not getting them." And the Truman Doctrine became a fact. They also, of course, wanted Greece. They not only wanted Greece, they would liked to have had Austria. They already had taken everything as far as the Red army had moved, including Berlin. We didn't get where we are today with the Soviet Union, my dear friends, by just saying, "Take it. What else would you like. (LAUGHTER) You want Iran? Fine, how about Turkey--some of that? Yes. (LAUGHTER) How about Greece?" (APPLAUSE) No, we didn't get it that way. Listen, we offered the Marshall Plan to all of Europe, including the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia had agreed to enter the Marshall Plan and the Soviet Union said: "Get out". And we said: All right, the Marshall Plan will be for Western Europe. We stood by our friends in Greece. Fortunately, we didn't have to get in combat even though we had 20,000 men there and General VanFleet, and the only reason we didn't was because Mr. Tito and Mr. Stalin broke off relations. Mr. Tito got tired of being bossed around, too, and he closed the border

between Greece and Yugoslavia. And, when Mr. Stalin found out how disagreeable it was to work with Mr. Tito and saw some of the spunkiness of Mr. Truman, he decided that maybe it would be better not to try it. Now, we were probed three times in Berlin. In 1961 John Kennedy called up 250,000 reservists in this country. We sent 50,000 additional troops to France. We put additional divisions in Germany. We increased the appropriation for defense in one afternoon by six billion dollars, and I didn't hear one person say, "What is this going to do for the war on poverty?" - not one person. It is an amazing thing in this country that you can get everybody all steamed up to defend half of Berlin, but you can't get very many people steamed up to defend half of the world's population, which happens to be in Asia. Not all in Berlin. Now, don't misunderstand me - I think our commitment in Berlin is vital because the American commitment and its integrity is the one thing today that stands between peace and war. We didn't get where we are with the Soviet Union by telling them to take Korea. We almost got in trouble by saying that Korea was beyond the perimeter of our defense, and my colleagues here from the Congress and our historians remember when Mr. Acheson, and I think regretably, said that we did not consider at that time Korea as being in our perimeter of Pacific defense. Three months later North Korea attacked, said "Well, that's open for occupancy, let's take that", and they attacked and we went in to stop them. And we didn't get where we are today with the Soviet Union by saying: "Well, go right ahead. Mr. Castro needs missiles, he ought to have some of these modern weapons down there with nuclear tipped warheads. We wouldn't want a fellow like that who went through all of that trouble and causing all of that commotion not to have all the most modern and dangerous weapons". John Kennedy said to Mr. Khrushchev "Get them out." I sat in the White House with John Kennedy when that decision was made. We were within 10 hours of world war, maybe 10 minutes. We were waiting for a message while

our troops were on the move, while our planes were on alert, while our ships were coming through the Panama Canal, gentlemen, we were within one day of nuclear war. The fact we didn't get it was because we stood firm, as we said eyeball-to-eyeball, and Mr. Khrushchev ~~wixxin~~ withdrew his missile. Now, the Soviet Union has learned how to live in this trouble world - not because we gave them what they wanted - not because they could run pell mell over everybody they wanted - not because aggression went unchecked - but because we had the guts and courage to check aggression, because we stood up to them and we lost 200,000 men as casualties since World War II without ever taking one inch of territory, without asking one single government to become our colony. I think it is about time that the American people understood the commitment that this nation has made. Our business has been organizing peace. And organizing the peace does not come by letting new Hitlers decide that they can have a Czechoslovakia. Mr. Chamberlain said, and I'll never forget his words, "It is a far away place and a strange and different people--Czechoslovakia", and within one and a half years England was on her knees with Dunkirk. We didn't get with the Soviet Union and with any of these countries where they are today by backing up. And may I give you a side dividend - there is trouble in China today. It could well be that China's troubles are in a large measure due to her adventures in international troubled waters. Two years ago professors, statesmen, senators, executives, were saying: "China's on the move in Latin America and Africa". Today the Chinese embassies are closed up in six African countries. For all practical purposes they are ^{totally} ineffective in Latin America. Two years ago - less than two years ago Indonesia, with three million members of the Communist party, twenty-five million members in Communist fronts, was a Chinese-Communist satellite, totally controlled by the Communist apparatus, and Adam Malik,

foreign minister of Indonesia, a man that I have known for better than 20 years - Adam Malik came to this country and told the American people that Indonesia today was able to rejoin the United Nations and the family of nations and to become once again a free nation because her people had the courage to take on the Communists because we were in Southeast Asia in Vietnam. We were there. A hundred million people have cast off the shackles of Communist power, and 450,000 of these Communists were killed. And yet I haven't heard some of the same voices that say there is such terror in Vietnam worried about the 450,000 that were killed in Indonesia, many of whom maybe were not Communists. But when a nation purges itself, as the French did in their revolution, as the Indonesians have done in their revolution, innocent people are hurt. Prime Minister Li of Singapore, no friend of the United States, said within the last two months that ^{presence of the} the/United States in Vietnam permits free Asia to buy time. Harold Holt, Prime Minister of Australia - now, it's supposed to be very unpopular, this business in Vietnam - it depends on how far you are away from it. In Australia, a country that never had conscription in World War I or World War II - Prime Minister Holt ran on the platform of tripling his forces in Vietnam, a country of just a few million people, with 4500 active combatants, with thousands of non-combatants and civilians - Prime Minister ran on the platform of conscription and support of United States policy in Vietnam and won the greatest victory that any prime minister has ever won in Austrailia. Holyoke of New Zealand, under severe attack by his Labor Party opposition - and I was in this country and know the leader of the Labor Party - Holyoke ran against his opposition on the principle and the platform of support of New Zealand's commitments for Vietnam and support of United States policy in Vietnam and he won the greatest victory that he's ever won. Prime Minister Sato of Japan, beset by corruption in his own

administration, many people saying that they might suffer defeat, accused by his opposition of being a lackey of United States policy in Southeast Asia, wins a great smashing victory. It's my view that those who are closest to the source of trouble seem to understand the meaning of the issue and that is why these men have done quite well.

Next.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Humphrey, the Democratic Party in the 1964 presidential campaign utilized the commercial showing a little girl eating an ice cream cone, symbolizing the Democratic Party was a party of peace in contrast to the Republican Party. It is difficult now to see, really, a distinction between that course followed by the present administration and that course advocated by the Republicans in that campaign. Do you think that the present administration has honestly pursued the foreign policy objectives opted for by the great majority of the American voters in 1964?

Mr. Humphrey: I hope so. I think so. I think there is a considerable difference between the policies being pursued by President Johnson and those that have been advocated in the past week by the standard bearers of the Republican Party of 1964. A great difference. If I recall the headlines of Mr. Barry Goldwater's most recent utterances on one of the great national networks, he wasn't exactly laudatory of the President of the United States and what he considered to be this moderate, halfway, lukewarm, timid action course that we are following in Vietnam. And it is a fact that your administration, your government, is following what we consider to be a course of action for limited objectives with severe limitations upon the use of American power. It takes no particular statesmanship to get this world of ours into world war. The President or any other leader of a great nation can do that overnight. What does take statesmanship and judgment is to

keep these conflicts from escalating into a major struggle or a world war, and that is our constant concern. But, may I say with equal candor that the responsibility of a great nation such as ours who has treaty commitments and has other commitments, is to keep those commitments. If lessons of history have taught us anything, it is that aggression unchecked is aggression unleashed. If the lessons of history have taught us anything, sir, it is that an aggressor has an insatiable appetite, that to permit aggression to go on does not in any way give you the cause of peace--it's the greatest threat to peace. Now, we went to war in the 1940's for peace. That was our purpose. We went to war for peace. We were not the aggressor and we are not the aggressor in Vietnam. We were attacked, and we also had commitments with some of our allies. We held back on those commitments as long or even longer than some people thought we should and we came out of that war convinced of one thing, which is embodied in the United Nations Charter, and the United Nations Charter is a solemn treaty entered into. It is the supreme law of this land. And that charter calls on us to engage in collective security, to resist aggression--period. To promote self determination--period. And to engage in humanitarian enterprises for the benefit of mankind--period. We've kept the faith. We've done it. We've stayed with it. (LAUGHTER) My name is not Adam. (LAUGHTER) (APPLAUSE)

You know I think we could turn this around. I think we might ask ourselves, "Do you think it would have contributed to the peace of the world if we had let North Korea have Korea? Do you think that would have made possible a peaceful democratic Japan? Do you think it would contribute to the peace of the world if the next time the Russians want Berlin to say O.K., it isn't much, go ahead and have it, or the next time they threaten Norway as they have to say, "Well, I guess it is a small country; it is pretty cold up there most of the time. Why don't we let them have it?" No! The fact that we haven't had to go to war sometimes is by the grace of God and good luck. But I remind you that this country has been prepared on several occasions since World War II armed, alerted, troops sent to the field ready to fight. And that has stopped the aggression! It may well be asked whether or not had action been taken sooner in Southeast Asia things might have been different, but you can't relive those days. I am of the opinion that if we pursue our course as we are doing which is a four-front struggle; military, political, economic, and diplomatic; pursue it resolutely, calmly, perseveringly, without too much concern as to what our image may be each day, without taking popularity polls every other week because popularity polls in international affairs and politics are like a woman's fancy and a child's fever - they do fluctuate. What I think are much more important are purpose and principle, and I think if we stick with it, and don't give the enemy the belief that somehow or other we are going to waiver, that somehow or other we are going to change course, that somehow or other that it is going to be different, I think that if we stick with it we are going to have peace and we will get it a lot sooner. I am convinced in my own mind that the voices of indecision have contributed to the confidence of the enemy. The enemy is being led to believe that if he just keeps it up this country is going

to be divided, that the President of the United States and Congress would have to change course. They thought so even after the last election until they heard from the new Republican congressmen and senators. They found out that most Americans do not enter into partisan politics on matters of national security and that most of those that were elected were for a stronger course of action than the present administration pursues. Finally that message has gotten through. Now we are willing, and I repeat again, if you can take your message of peace to Hanoi - that's the problem you know. This problem of peace is not in Washington. We've got so many peacemakers in Washington they haven't got a room big enough to hold them. If we can get the message of peace to where it is needed, we could have peace, because all that we are asking for in this struggle is not one inch of North Vietnam. We are not asking - in fact your President has said we will extend the foreign aid to North Vietnam in his Baltimore speech of two years ago. The Asian Development Bank is committed to offering economic assistance to North Vietnam and we have said and we repeat it, that whatever the Vietnamese people want to do once they have freedom of choice, it is their right. Your President has said that six months after the cessation of hostilities, after a truce has been arrived at, six months later American forces will be out of Vietnam. Your President has said that every military installation would be turned over for civilian purposes. We want no bases.

We seek no territory. We ask for no allies. We are prepared to stand by the results of a free election, but we are not prepared to leave 14 million South Vietnamese the victims of naked aggression and communist power, and it's about time I think that the whole world knew that this country is big enough, strong enough and decent enough not to sacrifice the lives of millions of people to a regime that would do nothing but take those lives or control them with a tyrannical rule. We are not about to do it. We are going to promote political democracy in that country if we can and we are busily engaged at it. Elections are being

held. Elections were held for a constituent assembly, and I might add, 400 of my friends from the newspapers of America went over and covered that election. They thought they were going to get a real scoop because generally the elections in these far away places always have a little juice to them - something there that kinda looks good. They found more election flaws in San Francisco, Minneapolis, and New York than they did in Vietnam and over 80 percent of the people went to that election box and voted for a constituent assembly. That constituent assembly is writing a constitution. This month of March, district and hamlet elections take place, free elections. In the summer a national election takes place, and as I have said from other platforms, when that representative government is elected which is a commitment on the part of this government and the government presently in power in Saigon, when that nationally elected representative government is in power, I think you are going to see the turning point in this war, because on that day, you will see defections from the Viet Cong and on that day representative government will be in charge in Saigon and on that day I think we will be able to say to people throughout the world that one of the objectives of this struggle has been realized - self determination. (Applause) I have a little more time. Go ahead. (More applause)

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Humphrey, in a speech last Saturday evening Mr. James Farley, Former Chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Postmaster General of the United States, attacked J. William Fulbright, and Robert F. Kennedy for the criticism of the present administration's foreign policy. Mr. Farley accused Mr. Fulbright and Mr. Kennedy of undermining American foreign policy and giving aid and comfort to the enemy, which is of course the same as calling them traitors. What role does dissent play in a democracy like ours during a period of semi-crisis? and how far should American citizens be able to go in their criticism of the administration foreign policy without being labeled as traitors by people such as former cabinet members?

The Vice President: Mr. Farley is a man of great distinction in our country and I think he can speak for himself. He has never asked me to be his attorney nor have I power of attorney. I have a high regard for him as I have for the two men he spoke of and I am not going to get involved in that argument. I'll say this - the right of dissent in this country is one of the reasons that we struggle - freedom of choice - that's what it is all about. The right to be heard - the right not only to be heard but the right to be taken seriously - the right to protest. And you ask how far should this right go. Well, I think it should go as far as you can without openly destroying the public order. I mean I think that there is a time when you don't have a right to just go around break up people

and break up meetings and not engage or no longer engage in what you call constructive criticism or constructive analysis. In other words, when dissent and protest approaches the point of public disorder, riot, violence, then it is beyond what I consider to be a legitimate dissent and the forces of law and order must try to establish peace and tranquility in the community; but the campus, for example, should always be open, as I said here earlier, to the right of the protester of dissent. But by the same token those who are the dissenters and want to be respected for their right of dissent must be willing to respect the advocates too. You see dissent is just one-half of the coin and I have been engaged in it a long time in my life. There is another part of the coin - I have been dissenting with a certain political party in this country a long time and I am going to continue to dissent and continue to argue with them when I think they are wrong. But they are entitled to be heard too. They are entitled to their period of time and as we say in radio and television - equal time. So I don't think we ought to brand people who disagree with us as disloyal. I don't want to do that to any of them. I think you know, for example, my own senior colleague in the United States Senate does not agree with my position. My next door neighbor, Senator McGovern, whom I hold in the highest esteem, and hope for his reelection, I will do all I can every way I can for his reelection, doesn't happen to agree with me on this particular issue. It isn't a total disagreement - he has a disagreement of some details. I think that that is a healthy disagreement. I think it is a healthy disagreement. I would only add this that I don't think it helps to constantly believe or try to make people believe that your government is deceiving you. Now your government may not be doing what you think is right but I can tell you that the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States are just as interested in peace as anybody that carries a placard --

anybody! We have the terrible responsibility of making decisions, and it is one thing to debate and to discuss, but there comes a moment when you must decide and the four d's of democracy--dissent, debate, discuss, and decision. Some people don't want to have to make that decision and when you make it, it is a difficult one. You never are quite sure that you are right. You hope that you are right. Your judgment is no better than your information. Your prayer is not to do what is right but to KNOW what's right. It isn't difficult to do what's right - what's difficult is to weigh all of the evidence that you can get and try to make the right decision and sometimes people disagree - they don't think we make the right decision. I think that we have made the right decision,

and I am delighted to have the opportunity to come to this platform in the presence of this good man/who is (Mr. West) (LAUGHTER) - by the way, who is of the opposite political persuasion - I've been working on him privately and quietly - to come here and speak to you today. (APPLAUSE) Thank you. (APPLAUSE)



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