

EXCERPTS  
INFORMAL REMARKS  
VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY  
PRESIDENT'S CLUB  
DALLAS, TEXAS  
May 21, 1967

I have traveled in a number of states since January, and each week I have sensed an improvement in the political situation. I want to say to you very frankly that both the President and I realized before the November 1966 elections that we would have some serious losses. We also knew that, after the elections, there would be a period in which everybody would be second-guessing. However, we took a look at what we were doing and what we thought we could do. We came to the conclusion that, with hard work, we could reverse this trend.

Every President goes through a difficult period sometime in his Administration.

When I spoke to the American Political Science Association in New York City, two years ago, I read from The New York Times for the year 1915, and they thought I was reading from 1965 issues -- it sounded just like it, they said. I read that the President had lost control of Congress, and that his leadership had faltered, that there was a lack of inspiration, and so on. Of course, it was Woodrow Wilson the Times was writing about.

You can go back into every Administration of every President, without exception, and find a period of disenchantment.

There are problems in the international scene that are so complex the average citizen cannot comprehend them. He is busy with his own work or profession, he cannot read 16 hours a day, and he just doesn't have all the information. Therefore, there is sometimes a lack of understanding of what we are trying to do.

When you are in public life, you have to face up to the fact that there are going to be difficult times. You are going to have to make tough decisions, and people are not always going to understand them.

I wonder how many people remember President Roosevelt's speech at Chicago in 1937, calling for quarantining the aggressor. That speech was followed by heavy losses for the Democrats in 1938. We lost 81 seats in the House of Representatives, 16 governors, and 14 Senators. It was a colossal defeat -- and it came just two years after President Roosevelt had scored a tremendous victory, carrying all but two states.

The same is true of President Truman. I remember it vividly. An organization with which I was associated in the past has recently intimated that it might support a Republican for President in 1968. That reminds me that they decided in 1948 to support General Eisenhower for the Democratic Presidential nomination

but President Truman won re-nomination anyway and went on to win the election.

I have been traveling and talking and seeing people. A few months ago I was in Arizona and addressed a dinner sponsored by Mr. Eugene Pulliam, the publisher. The next morning I met with the Democrats, just as I am doing here. We had about 1600 for breakfast, and they were lined up for two blocks, four abreast -- many couldn't get in.

I went up to Buffalo, New York, to speak at the Buffalo Club. I think I was the first Democrat since Grover Cleveland to be invited there, and I had a wonderful time. It was a marvelous group of men. It was the 160th anniversary of the Club. The next morning the County Democratic Chairman had a breakfast for me, and over 1,000 people came.

I have been in Houston, as you know -- we had a great turnout there. I have been in North Carolina and Georgia, New Hampshire and Vermont, and different places along the Eastern Seaboard and out West.

The outlook is good and getting better. It isn't good enough, but it is picking up. Inch by inch, day by day, person by person, we are building. We are going to build constructively. We can't build on demagoguery, we can't build on false promises, because we are responsible people.

You have read about the so-called "revolution of rising expectations" among the peoples of Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

We have the same thing happening in America.

There are rising expectations today not only in the new nations, but in America itself. Some of us who are well off can't quite understand the discontent of those who aren't. But it is quite natural -- you don't have to have a university education to figure it out. We are going through a period of turbulence here. We are going to get through this, if we make the necessary adjustments -- and we are going to be a better country when we get through it. We are going to have more tolerance. We are going to have more people who are able to take care of themselves. It is not going to diminish any of us; on the contrary, it is going to help all of us.

My father taught me when we were in business that we could be no richer than the customers who came to our drugstore. He said: "I want you to remember, son, that every time a man is well paid or a farmer gets a good price for his crops, we Humphreys are better off. No matter how intelligent you think you are -- no matter how good a manager -- you cannot make money out of paupers."

I lived through the Depression. We stayed in business 63 years, and we're still in business. You have to be pretty good to stay in business 63 years in South Dakota and not go broke. You have to do something yourself, believe me, regardless of what you have going for you.

There is a restlessness in this country, and we are trying to grapple with it. We see it among our youth and on the college campuses. We see it in many places, and there isn't any easy way to get at it -- but we are working at it, and we think we are finding some approaches.

A good deal of it will wear itself out, providing that we give constructive outlets to the energies of people who want to be constructive, and that we give them leadership. We are trying to do just that.

I go to college campuses all over America. What you generally hear about is the pickets. But there may be 25 pickets outside compared with 10,000 interested students inside. I think I have visited as many university campuses as any man in public life. I am a former teacher. I love students. I enjoy their company. They are sharp, they are incisive, they are bright. Of course, they're like other young people. They don't always have good judgment, but you don't always when you are 19 or 20. But they are

good, they are able, they are socially concerned. The problem we have is to get the proper image of these young people projected to the American people, and I don't know how we are going to do that.

I went to Rutgers University a year ago. There were 14,000 people in the audience. There were university presidents and scholars from 42 countries. It was the 300th Anniversary of this University great university. The Chancellor of Oxford/was there, and the President of the University of Utrecht in Holland, and many of the greatest scholars in the world. It was a magnificent spectacle.

There were about 40 people who had told the reporters that they would walk out when the Vice President got up. They were a block and a half away, but they had set the whole stage. The audience filled a great square, and way off in the distance there was this handful of people demonstrating.

What do you think the headlines said next day? "Students Walk Out as Humphrey Speaks." The real purpose and quality of the gathering was never brought to people's attention.

You have read about my journey to Europe. People have come up to me since and said: "We're so glad you're back. It must have been terrible." On the contrary, it was marvelous. We were wonderfully received, far more than we deserved as individuals -- but we didn't go as individuals, we went as representatives of our

country. Everywhere we went we had a heartening reception. You should have been with us in Berlin. There were at least a half million people on the streets, waving flags and cheering us.

You have read about the incident that occurred in Brussels when I was placing a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. A handful of Maoist Communists began pelting the police and bystanders with eggs and tomatoes, but they never got near me. The fact was that there were at least 500 or 600 people out that Sunday morning, and only a small fraction of them were involved in this little demonstration.

When we left there to go to church, people were all along the boulevard -- even hanging out of their apartment windows -- waving flags and cheering us Americans. There were thousands of people at the church, and I was literally mobbed with affection. But what did you read? -- You read about somebody throwing eggs. I think that was a disservice to the people of Belgium, because they love the American people.

In Rome we went to the opera. We were given the Presidential Box, the first time it had been used this season. President Saragat wanted to honor the United States -- and besides, he is an old friend of mine. When I got out of my car at the opera the secretary of the Communist Youth in Milan was there, and he threw a little plastic bag of yellow paint at me. It didn't hit me -- I got a couple of spots

on my shirtsleeve. But it did hit the Director of the Opera squarely on the chest. You should have seen the Vice President and the Director of the Opera parading through the ornate and spacious lobby of the Opera House. He was dripping with yellow paint, but he carried himself with such dignity that you would never have known it. When we entered the Opera, we received a standing ovation -- not because of what had happened outside (they knew nothing about that), but because your country is respected in Italy, as it is throughout the world.

\* \* \*

Now I want to review what is happening in Southeast Asia. Nobody really knows when this struggle will be over, and it would be ridiculous for me to make any predictions. We can, however, look at what has transpired and put it in perspective.

Remember that our country became militarily involved in Southeast Asia a long while ago. At the time of President Kennedy's death, there were some 16,000 members of our armed forces there. President Johnson did not make the military commitment to Vietnam -- if he had, I think he would have been right, but he did not. That military commitment was made a long while ago. The SEATO treaty, with its protocol covering Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, was signed during the Eisenhower Administration and became effective in 1955.

That same year an American Military Assistance Advisory Group took over the training of the South Vietnamese Army. We have been there with military advisers and later with military manpower ever since.

When Vietnam was divided after the Geneva Agreement in 1954, more than 900,000 people moved from North Vietnam to South Vietnam, because they didn't want to live under the Communist regime of Ho Chi Minh. Less than 100,000 people moved the other way. So, when I hear people say how wonderful it is under Ho Chi Minh and how he would win an election if it were held, I remind them that, when the Vietnamese had the chance, most moved the other way. It was like East Germany -- they had to build a wall across Berlin to keep them from going west. Like the Berliners, the Vietnamese voted with their feet. Khrushchev saw that -- so he built a wall, fortified it, and manned it with police and dogs and guns to keep people from moving from East Berlin to West Berlin.

With the Vietnamese that went South there also came trained Communist cadres with the express purpose of organizing in South Vietnam to take the country over. This is documented fact, not fiction. During the succeeding years, they kept infiltrating more people, and placed them in the villages ready to act when the signal

was given. The so-called National Liberation Front was organized by the Communists in 1960. It is neither national nor does it seek to liberate the people. The only honest word in its name is "front." It is a front for Hanoi, controlled by Hanoi, and operated out of Hanoi. If I were to ask this audience to name its chairman, I would bet that not more than five people could tell me his name. He is a lawyer of no great reputation from Saigon, and his name is not widely known even in Vietnam. He is a front man, a Southerner put in front to make it look as if the National Liberation Front were an indigenous movement in South Vietnam. And the object of the Front is to establish a kind of parallel government, seeking to supplant the legitimate government of South Vietnam wherever it can and ultimately over the whole country.

After they had infiltrated thousands of terrorists as individuals, the North Vietnamese began in the fall of 1964 to move regular units of their army into South Vietnam. And that is not the only country they are in. Regular units of the North Vietnamese Army are in Laos today in open violation of the 1962 Geneva agreements concerning that country. There are presently at least seven North Vietnamese divisions (or their equivalent) in South Vietnam. There are no American or South Vietnamese troops in North Vietnam. So, when I hear Americans say that we're guilty of aggression, I say: "How do you figure that out?"

Now, when we started our bombing of North Vietnam in February, 1965, there was already a regular North Vietnamese Army division in South Vietnam.

We started bombing for a simple reason. South Vietnam was in danger of being totally taken over. The National Liberation Front had stepped up its terrorism. Therefore, we started to bomb in 1965 not before the aggression from the North but after it -- and no one can dispute that fact.

We went into South Vietnam at the invitation of a government with which we had a treaty. Had we not begun bombing in February, 1965, there would be no South Vietnam today.

We sent the bombers in. We knew that they wouldn't win the war -- we aren't fools. America had the greatest Air Force ever created in World War II; it did great things, but it didn't win any war. The Nazis had air superiority at the beginning of the war, but they couldn't defeat Great Britain that way. Nevertheless, air power is important. We had the machines and we had the trained pilots, and it seemed to us that this was the least we could do at that time to be helpful.

Already we had urged in vain a UN presence in the area. The United States joined South Vietnam in the UN Security Council during May 1964 in suggesting that a UN-sponsored peace-keeping

or observation group be established on the border between Cambodia and South Vietnam to stabilize the disturbed conditions resulting from Viet Cong operations there. Hanoi, however, condemned even this limited UN involvement in Vietnam.

In August 1964 the United States supported a Security Council invitation to the Hanoi government to discuss the US complaint of North Vietnamese attacks against US naval vessels in international waters as well as the American military response. Hanoi replied that the Vietnamese problem was not within the competence of the Security Council and that it would consider any decisions by the Council as "null and void."

In effect, Hanoi said to the UN - then and since - "Drop dead!" They have never for a moment accepted the jurisdiction of the UN, nor have they accepted any UN observers.

I mention this because there has been a good deal of fictionalizing lately. People have said that, if we didn't bomb, we would get peace. The fact is that there wasn't any peace before we began the bombing.

Since then, the military situation has been reversed. Your government has put almost half a million troops into South Vietnam. When we first came, there was only one harbor -- and a poor harbor, at that. Now there are at least three magnificent harbors that have

been constructed, and they can handle everything we need to bring in. Then there was only one major airfield; now there are at least six major airfields that can handle the largest planes, and a dozen others that can take most of our fighter planes.

When we arrived, the government of Vietnam was in total disarray; this present government has been in power for two years and has been able to sustain itself, which is better than the governments in some other countries have been able to do.

\* \* \*

I think every reasonable person knows that, when President Johnson sent that letter to Ho Chi Minh, he walked the extra mile for peace. Yet people say we ought to be in contact with them. We have no lack of contact with North Vietnam. As Dean Rusk says, we keep ringing the telephone, and we get a connection, but nobody picks up the receiver. They don't talk. We haven't been able to get anybody in Hanoi to talk, nor has anybody else from Kosygin to U Thant to Harold Wilson to Tito to Radhakrishnan, the former President of India. The Pope has tried, they've all tried, but North Vietnam says "No." Yet there are fellow-Americans who say that, if we just search for peace, we will find it.

I've been a man of peace all my life. I'll stack my record in the cause of peace up against any of the critics of this Administration.

I'm the author of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Food for Peace, a co-author of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the author of the Peace Corps, and the Chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee.

(I think the arms race is a terribly costly and dangerous thing, but I don't believe in unilateral disarmament. If we have arms control, it must be across the board for all countries. I think we have to pursue it. But our critics need to understand honestly all that has been done, rather than think with their blood or their glads. They have to think through what your government has got to do.)

Ho Chi Minh rejected the Pope's plea. He rejected Johnson's plea. He rejected U Thant's plea. The most recent proposal of the UN Secretary General asked for what is called a stand-in-place. That means that everybody is to stop shooting and stay where they are -- don't move, and then we'll see if we can get people to talk. It means that you don't lose any of your positions, but held what you have. It means that you stop your movement of men and supplies while you try to find some way to the conference table. We accepted that, without qualification. Ho Chi Minh said no.

There has never been a President who has been willing to walk as far for an honorable peace as President Johnson. We have tried everything. As Dean Rusk has said, there have been 29 separate proposals that other nations have made. We've accepted every one and the other side has accepted none. Yet we have, fellow-Americans, today who say that President Johnson doesn't want peace, and I see placards that call him a murderer and me a murderer. Sometimes I wonder what people are thinking of, if they are thinking at all.

Well, the tide of battle has turned in favor of the allies. There is a tough battle being waged in what is called the I Corps sector -- the northern-most part of South Vietnam just this side of the 17th parallel. The North Vietnamese have sent in two new divisions south of the De-Militarized Zone, and they have two divisions in the Zone itself, and one in reserve behind it. Your Marines have been getting blasted by the North Vietnamese forces in the Zone with heavy artillery and rockets.

Why is Ho Chi Minh engaging in this battle if he can't possible win? I'll tell you what I think. In that area of South Vietnam, we have had considerable success militarily and also in pacification. That is important, because this war cannot be won through military means alone; it will have to be won politically, through pacification.

Our Marines, in cooperation with the Korean 2nd Corps and the South Vietnamese Army, had been cleaning the Viet Cong out of this area.

Ho Chi Minh has been attacking ferociously in that area to do three things. First, to destroy the political development, the pacification, that was taking place there. Second, to inflict a psychological defeat on the American forces in a major conflict-- not too big, but big enough to make it look bad. Third, to try to get his forces positioned so that, if he did go to the conference table later, he would be able to say:

"Look, we'll settle. But we are going to settle on the basis of the positions to which our forces have advanced, just as the Soviet Union did in Europe. They never withdrew their forces. They stayed right where the last Red soldier was -- that was the line. When World War II was over, everything east of that line was Red."

That's exactly what Ho Chi Minh has in mind. So he's conducting what I call "spoiler" attacks on the political development of South Vietnam. He's waging a brutal military struggle against the Marines to score a psychological victory. And he's trying to put himself in position to claim a third or a quarter of the territory of South Vietnam in the first stage of negotiations.

Is he going to succeed? No -- because we too have engaged in "spoiling" tactics. Just this week, as you've noticed, we moved substantial forces into the southern part of the De-militarized Zone. There is a river that runs right through the middle of it. We're south of that river, in the South Vietnamese part of the Zone. We have not landed any forces in North Vietnam. We do not want to be accused of the invasion of North Vietnam.

We have limited objectives in this struggle -- they are to stop this aggression and permit the South Vietnamese to develop their own country. We're being tested now as never before, but my prediction is that by this fall things will look much better. I don't say it will be over-- I don't think it will be. But it will look better, and I'll tell you why -- because of the progressive political developments in South Vietnam.

Last year they held the elections for the Constituent Assembly. What did some people say? What did you read? They said it wouldn't work, the election would be rigged -- remember? Over 85% of the registered voters -- 55% of the voting-age population -- turned out for that election. Four hundred American reporters covered it, and they found fewer irregularities than in some American elections. It was an amazing turn-out, despite terrorism and the threat of death to candidates and voters.

After the Constituent Assembly was elected, it started to write a constitution. Well, they debated it and there was serious argument -- this Assembly was no rubber stamp. Then what did the critics say? They said Prime Minister Ky would never accept it -- but he did. The next thing they said was that the military junta would write the laws for the election of a President. But they didn't. The junta said that the Constituent Assembly, the elected assembly, would write the election laws and set the election date -- and they did. The next thing the critics said was that the Constituent Assembly would never be permitted to function as a parliament. But then the Government of South Vietnam said that the Constituent Assembly would act as the temporary parliament.

Then the critics said -- what about the village and hamlet elections? They said they would never take place, but they did. There have been elections in almost 1000 villages during the month of April. They were free elections held in the face of Communist terrorism -- twelve of the candidates were killed. And now the hamlet elections are taking place.

The North Vietnamese know that, if this political process succeeds, they've had it, because it is political and social development that is going to be the decisive factor. Militarily they can't defeat

us -- and militarily we cannot win what we seek to win, namely, a secure country. You must have political development, and social development has got to go forward at the same time.

So I say to you -- if we stick to it, if we don't try to second-guess all the time, if our people believe that the country really wants an honorable peace -- and that we are really not destroyers, but nation-builders, I think we are going to come out of this pretty well.

# # #



Transcript

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON

June 20, 1967

file

TO : Ted Van Dyk  
FROM : David C. Williams DCW

Apparent errors are numbered in the left-hand margin of the transcript. The most serious is No. 6 on Page 16 of the transcript. This is the second time I have seen his assertion that North Vietnamese regulars are in Thailand. All the authorities I have consulted, including Herb Beckington, say there is nothing in this. One source in the State Department speculates that the Vice President may have heard it from some Thai official. If some reporter picks it up and checks it out, it would be quite embarrassing.

Comments on other errors follow. Where the correct version appears in the edited text, I refer to the same number in the margin of that text.

1. See text.
2. We didn't "go there in '59." The MAAG sent in 1955 was expanded gradually over the ensuing years, but there were still less than a thousand Americans in uniform there when Eisenhower left the White House.
3. See text.
4. See text. Only 4000 of these checked through officially; the rest just went.
5. See text
6. Dealt with in first paragraph of this memo.
7. See text.
8. This ICC finding was made just two months ago, and has not been made public yet. There is tremendous diplomatic pulling-and-hauling about it, and the State Department recommends that it not be mentioned at this time.
9. Our Embassy in Saigon was bombed on March 29, not in Christmas - after, not before our bombing started.
10. This appears more likely to be the Communist objective now than in 1965. It is developed in detail later on in the transcript, in connection with the North Vietnamese build-up and attacks in I Corps. this year.
11. There seem to be no US peace appeals as such in the record of the months up to the beginning of the bombing - understandably, because our bargaining position was very poor. I give the UN angles in the text.
12. See text/ Not 85%. It's 39% GVN, 22% VC, 27% contested, 11% being secured.
13. See text
14. See text.

12A. See Text

General Carl L. Phinney introduces the Vice President of the United States, Mr. Hubert H. Humphrey

---

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a very rare privilege for me to present one of the most distinguished Americans we have ever had visit Dallas. He has been a dynamic personality and a great American and he has a lot of friends in Dallas as was evidenced by that crowd this afternoon down in the Ballroom. He has been a great help to the President. I do not believe in the history of the United States there has been any better relationship than between President Johnson and the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey.

Remarks made By Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the  
United States, May 21, 1967, City Club, Dallas, Texas.

Thank you very much Carl, our good friend, ladies and gentlemen. Just a short while ago Will Davis gave me a flattering introduction in the Ballroom and I have been sort of walking on air ever since those words of fiction and high praise, all of which I accepted as fact from an objective point of view. (laughter). I am very pleased to return to Dallas. I remember a little over a year ago about a year and a half ago, I believe it was, it was my privilege to be here with members of the President's Club. We had a delightful and wonderful luncheon. We didn't have enough ladies though. I think next time that we have a President's Club luncheon that I will insist that the ladies be present, otherwise I won't come. (Applause). I don't know whether I should speak for the President or not but I think he'd sort of join me in it, particularly if I speak to Lady Bird about it and I'm going to tell her. I want those of you here that see your Governor, our friend Governor Connolly, to be sure to give him the greetings of Mrs. Humphrey and myself. Governor Connolly and Nellie are good friends of ours. We've had good times together. Muriel and Nellie, well, when they get together they take both the Governor and the Vice President down to size, sort of level us off a little, the great equalizers, you know, these ladies of ours. If you will express to them my appreciation for the hospitality that was extended to us when we visited Austin and Houston here just a short time ago and also today the hospitality that we received in Dallas. I regret that my Muriel, Mrs. Humphrey, is not with me. I keep telling her that when she misses a trip like this it is very

unfortunate because everybody asks about her. If not everybody a large number of them. In fact, so many of them about about her I'm beginning to wonder just who is running the ship. (Laughter). She happens to be out in Colorado attending some meetings there. I think some of you know she is very active in civic work and she is taking a great interest in mental retardation and mental health, as we have a very personal interest in the matter and she has become an extremely gifted woman in this line of endeavor and people seem to like her. I'm glad they do, I always have, (laughter) and she is doing a wonderful job for our country, and for me, for our family, so I bring you her good wishes and we'll be back here to see you. We traveled in Texas several times. We have been to Wichita Falls and we've been to Waco, and of course, we've been to Houston and we've been to Fort Worth, we've been to Austin and Dallas, and we hope to get into San Antonio, we hope to get out to other places, El Paso and Amarillo and Lubbock (laughter, mispronounced Lubbock) and Abilene -- and a few other places, I must be sure to remember Lubbock because if I don't George won't give us any money. I was delighted that today Graham Purcell and Earle Cabell could be with us. They are very wonderful representatives of yours and are very helpful to the President and they are very helpful to what you people want out of your government. Now, I'm going to -- I asked Carl, General Phinney, my friend Carl Phinney, I said, Carl, what should I -- what are we going to do here? I told him what I said I'd like to do. I said would it be all right if I share some thoughts with, some observations with this group on the international scene and not so much the domestic scene. And he thought that might be well so I'm going to do that. I want you to know first of all, however, that

the President and the Administration take a great interest in this community. This is not to appeal to your parochial pride, but I know that there are people here from many other sections of the state than Dallas. I know that this is a group that represents, in the main, Northeast Texas, but Dallas has shared I think rather well in many of the Federal programs and surely in some of the great Federal projects, your Federal Center, your fine Post Office which you are getting, Post Exchange, and of course, your State is very deeply involved in the space program and a host of other activities. As you should be, you have the talent and the resources here, but don't forget it. About the Governor, I mean that - I told a friend of mine up in Georgia the other day - I said no matter how much you may be critical of President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey you just remember what the Republicans have done for you. (Laughter). I said the last time one came through here he burned Atlanta. (Laughter and applause). And then I had to correct that because I did recall that President Eisenhower used to come down and play golf. I said I think you can do better with us despite all of the problems that you have with us and I suggest that you stick around and be with us and I think you know I have been traveling around the country a great deal, on the weekends primarily, and it's hard work. I'd be less than honest with you if I didn't tell you that. I have a lovely home in Minnesota. I was complaining about the whole situation earlier this morning. I complain in the mornings. But I'm a bad fellow in the mornings, I'll tell you. During the day I warm up. (Laughter). I get better about midnight. (Laughter). I said isn't it something that I have that lovely home in Minnesota. I talk to the caretaker on the telephone. Gosh, I just love to talk to

him about it and I said to my Executive Assistant, Mr. Connell, who was with me I said, after you have scheduled me all through this country can I take a chance on getting 5 or 6 days out there this summer. He said he doubted it. We do have a beautiful place alongside of a lovely lake in our state and our children are there, so we always look forward to getting back to it, and when I travel around the country I see many wonderful places and I sometimes wish that I had time enough to enjoy your hospitality, to really and truly just relish it and breathe it in. You know we are in such a hurry all the time. It seems like my life is a series of speeches or dinners and shaking hands and running away and I'm a different individual than that. At least, I like people, I like to spend time with them. But I guess it's not to be that way. And, as my wife has always said, if you don't like it, you know nobody forced you into this position. (Laughter). You volunteered, in fact, you shouted. (Laughter). So, I keep that in mind. I have traveled to a number of the states since January and each week that we travel we have sensed an improvement. I want to say to you very candidly and very frankly what I think, we, both the President and I, realized before the elections, to be honest about it, that we would have some very serious losses. We also knew after the elections we would go through a period of time in which everybody would be second-guessing and there would be a lot of Monday morning quarterbacking and it would appear that the end was in sight. Worse things, of course, have happened. In fact, we took a look at what we thought we were doing and what we thought we could do and came up with the conclusion that with some hard work and attention to our job that maybe we could reverse this trend. Every President, every

President, goes through a bitter period in his administration. I want to give you a reference - November 22, "Time" magazine, Education Section. Just mark that down. You take a look at what they said about President Kennedy on November 22, 1962. "Time" Magazine, Education Section. You read it. It sounds exactly like what is being said now. Talks about the disenchantment of youth with the President. How he had disappointed them and the rebellion amongst the youth on the campus and that the administration has been compromising and that they are disappointed with President Kennedy's foreign policy and they are disappointed with his domestic policy. There is a lack of leadership. I just read it. I have it on my desk in the Capitol. I was showing it to some Congressmen that came through the other day, Senators, and I said boys, take a look at this. And it's a fact. I spoke to the American Political Science Association in New York two years ago and read from the "New York Times" for the year 1915 and I just read from the paper and they thought I was reading from the "New York Times" for 1965. It sounded exactly like it, they said. The President has lost control of Congress. His leadership has weakened. There is a lack of continuity. There is no inspiration today, ta ta, ta ta, ta ta, ta ta. And they were talking about Woodrow Wilson. (Laughter). It was the month of September, 1915 and you can go back into every single administration without exception. There is a period of disenchantment. And when you have hot problems on the international scene that are so complex that the average citizen will without, well, none of us know the answers frankly, none of us know the answers. But surely, the citizen who is busy with his own work, his own occupation, his own profession, so that

he isn't just devouring this material 16 hours a day, he just doesn't have all of the information and there is sometimes a lack of understanding of what we are trying to do. Not always what we can do, but what we're trying to do. And one has to face up to the fact when you are in public life, you have to face up to the fact that there are going to be difficult times and when you make tough decisions people are not going to understand those decisions. I wonder how many people remember Franklin Roosevelt's great speech at the Bridge in Chicago, what they called the Chicago Bridge Speech, when he talked about quarantining the aggressor. He lost Congress in that speech in 1938. He lost 81 seats in the House of Representatives, 16 governors and 14 United States Senators. A colossal defeat just two years after the greatest political victory since the time of George Washington and James Monroe. There has never been anything like it. He lost only two states and swept the Nation and two years later he lost the Nation and by 1940 he was in serious trouble, but he won again, started to pick up. The same thing is true of President Truman. I remember so vividly. I see an organization that I was associated with in the past has decided now they will support a Republican for president. But I remember when they decided to do that in 1947 and 1948 and Harry Truman went on to win. I have been traveling, I have been talking. I have been seeing people. I have been working day and night. I will be honest with you. Our workday is about 16 to 18 hours. Sixteen hours is a good workday. The Lord has blessed me with good health and lots of vitality and apparently full of ginerale. I don't know what it is. I rest well and I feel good and I watch my health as best I can. A few months ago I was out in Arizona. I

had a community dinner that I addressed and Mr. Pulliam, who is a very conservative editor put on a dinner there and asked if I would be the honored guest. I came. We had a wonderful dinner. The next morning I met with the Democrats, just like I did here. Well, we had about 1600 for breakfast and they were lined up two blocks, four abreast. Couldn't get in. I went up to Buffalo, New York to speak at the Buffalo Club. I guess I am the only Democrat since Grover Cleveland who has ever gotten invited, and I had a great time. It was a wonderful reception - a marvelous group of men. It was about the 160th anniversary, and the next morning I had the County Chairman call a breakfast meeting. We had over 1,000 people. We only gave them 48 hours notice, for I was filling in. President Eisenhower actually was supposed to have made the address and he was stricken ill, and they asked me if I would fill in, and I said yes I would. I have been in Houston, as you know. We had a great turnout there, and North Carolina - just marvelous, Georgia, couldn't have been better, then up in the Eastern Seaboard, New Hampshire and Vermont, and different places along the Eastern Seaboard and the West. It is good! It is better! It isn't good enough, but it is picking up. Inch by inch, day by day, person by person, we are building. We are going to build constructively and we can't build on demagoguery, we can't build on false promises. We are responsible. We can't promise the moon, or maybe we can. We may get there. I guess we used to say we can't promise the moon. We may be able to give you the moon, I'm not too sure. I don't know what good you will find there, but we're willing to give it to you. It is difficult when you are the incumbent, and yet there are, of course,

great advantages. There are two or three things that are causing our troubles. One is the rising expectations in our own country. We always talk about everybody else. You read these articles about the rising expectations of the peoples in Asia, Latin America and Africa. What you are really talking about is that the poor are hoping it's going to be better and when they get their independence in a country like Latin America, Africa or Asia, right away they feel that once the yoke of colonialism is off of them that they will move ahead, and frankly, it doesn't always happen that way, for frequently they are not trained for self government, too often the inability to properly marshall their resources -- and it takes time. They go through a very difficult period of time, but we call it rising expectations, and we always justify everything on the international scene that is turbulent by saying we have to expect it. It's in change, in ferment, and because there is great change it is going to be difficult. You can't expect there will always be an orderly society. Like I tell our youngsters when they come up to Washington and come into my office. I remind them about the American Capitol. I remind them what it was like when Dolly Madison was there, and the wife of the fourth President, what it was like when John Adams was there, when Abigail Adams was hanging her laundry in the East Room of the White House. I remind them that in what is now the beautiful gardens of the White House once they grazed hogs in that area, and that there were no paved streets and there were no hard surface walks. It was all mud. It was a dump, to put it mildly, and that was seven years after our independence. It didn't really amount to much until after Andrew Jackson, and even then they

✓

couldn't agree where they were going to put the Treasury Building and that is why it intersects Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenue and loused up the whole traffic. He got angry one morning as they started off and went on out, and after Congress had debated for a year and a half about where they were going to put the Treasury Building, he said be damned, I'll put the cornerstone right here, and he drove his cane in the ground, and he drove it right in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue. The traffic has been snarled ever since. It hasn't always been, as I tell our young friends that come through, we didn't always have deodorants and detergents and all the nice things. We at one time were like a lot of other people. Rising expectations are not international. They are national. There are rising expectations in America, and it is the same pattern wherever you go. Those of us who are pretty well off and doing well, we can't quite understand the other fellow. You know it is really natural. You don't have to go to the University for an education to figure that out, but there is a period of turbulence. We are going to get through this. That is, if we want to, if we make the necessary adjustments and we are going to be a better country when we are through with that, but I told your people in the Ballroom, and I mean it, from the bottom of my heart, we are going to be a better country, we are going to have more tolerance, we are going to have more people that are able to take care of themselves, more resources, and the fact is, it is not going to diminish any of us; it is going to help. My father taught me when we were in business that we were no richer than the customers who came to our store. He said I want you to remember that, son, and every time that a man is well paid and a farmer gets a good price, the Humphreys are better off. No matter how intelligent you think you are, or how good a manager you are, you cannot make money out of paupers. I lived in the depression and we

stayed in business 63 years, we're still in business, and that is pretty good to be in business in South Dakota 63 years and not go broke. You have got to do something, believe me, regardless of what we had going to us. It's a restlessness in our country. We are trying to grapple with that restlessness. We see it in our youth. We see it in our college campuses. We see it in lots of places and there isn't any easy way to get at it, but we are working at it and we think we are finding some approaches to it, and frankly, a good deal of it will wear itself out, providing that we give outlet, constructive outlets to the energies of people who want to be constructive and providing that we give them leadership, and we are trying to do that. I go to college campuses all over America. Oh, you generally read about the pickets. That is what you generally hear, but my dear friends, there may be 25 pickets outside and there are 10,000 interested students inside and that is a fact. (Applause). I think I have visited as many university campuses as any man in public life. I am a former teacher. I love "them" people. I enjoy their company. They are sharp and incisive. I think they are very brilliant and bright. They are like all other young people. They don't always have judgment, but you don't when you are 19 or 20. But they are good, and they are able and they are socially concerned, and this is a very heartening thing. The problem that we have is to get the proper image of these young people projected to the American people, and I don't know how we are going to do that. I went to Rutgers University here a year ago. There were 14,000 people in an audience, and there were representatives from 42 countries. There were the chancellors, and the scholars, and the great presidents

of universities of these 42 countries. It was the 300th anniversary of this great University, the 300th anniversary, and there were about 40 people who had told the television and radio people that they were going to picket and walk out when the Vice President got up. They were a block and a half away. Believe me they were. They had set the whole stage. The President of the University of Utrecht in Holland, which is one of the great universities, and the Chancellor of Oxford University was there, marvelous setting, magnificent, some of the greatest scholars in the world. Most beautiful pageantry that was in itself. These gowns of almost a medieval design, this flowing audience. All over the great plaza so to speak, this great square, and way off in the distance there were a handful of people that decided that they were going to demonstrate and what do you think the headlines said - it said "Students Walk Out, Humphrey Speaks". You know, the quality of the meeting was never brought to the attention of the people. I think it is something that is going to shake the country - just to get it in perspective, just to get it in perspective. You read about our journey to Europe and I've had people come up to me since and say, "Oh, we're so glad you're back. It must have been terrible!" It was marvelous! It was wonderful! Oh, they did get rid of a few eggs here and there along the way, but it only proved the prosperity of Europe - otherwise, they couldn't have thought of that, but the real truth of it is that we were wonderfully received, far more than we deserved as individuals, but we didn't go as individuals, we went as representatives of your country and every place we went it was a heartening reception. You should have been with us in Berlin There

✓

were at least a half million people on the streets, waiving flags, cheering us. Marvelous reception! The same things, the incident that we saw in Belgium where when we were placing a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and a handful of these Midas Communists - and that's what they are - they're known for what they are - The priests have them all marked - women came there with some fruit and vegetables and eggs in their purses and about the time that I was ready to place the wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, a very serious and sober ceremony, bingo, they starting peling the police and others with some eggs and fruits and tomatoes and so on, but it never got near me. The fact was that there were at least 500 or 600 people out that Sunday morning and there was maybe of that 500 or 600 50 or 60 of them or 75 at a maximum that were involved in this little demonstration. When we left there to go to Church all along the boulevard people were all along there and they were hanging out their apartment windows waiving flags and cheering Americans.

I went to Church and there were thousands of people. I was mobbed, literally, at the Church, with affection. What did you read? You read about somebody throwing eggs. I think that's a disservice to the people of belgium, because the people of Belgium love the American people, and the people of Italy love the American people. You have to have a good sense of humor. We walked into the Opera in Rome - and my Mrs. Humphrey was not feeling well this evening. You know, you get a tipsy tummy once in a while when you are making these long journeys - so I asked the daughter of our Ambassador, Freedy Reinhart, if she would be my date. She was a fifteen year old young lady and she was just tickled

to death we were going to the Opera. We were given the Presidential box. The first time it had been used this season. President Seragot is a friend of mine and besides he wanted to honor the United States and we went and when we got out of our car, ordinarily my instructions are, well, you know, move along - be a moving target at least - don't stand there. But I didn't feel that this was the proper way to do things when you had a delightful young lady so I was being a bit gallant and chivalrous and I stood there and waited and then the Secretary of the Communist Party from Milan - the Communist Youth in Milano was down there and he had a little packet bag of yellow paint and he pitched it on over. It didn't hit me - I got a couple of spots on my shirt sleeve but it hit the Director of the Opera smack bang on the chest and I tell you I wanted to break out laughing, (but I knew I musn't) and you ought to have seen the Director and Vice President parading through the beautiful, spacious, gracious, very lovely, ornate - the lobby of the Opera House at Rome - he was dripping with yellow paint and he was so proper you would never have known that he even had a speck on his suit. But again, may I say when we entered the Opera, we received a standing ovation - they knew nothing of what happened outside - it wasn't in response to that - but a standing ovation - your country is respected around the world. (Applause). Now I did want to sign off and review for you what I think is happening in Southeast Asia. Nobody really knows when this struggle will be over and it would be ridiculous on my part to make any predications. You cannot predict much of anything. You can, however, observe what has transpired and you have to take this now and



put it in prospective - remember that your government became militarily involved in Southeast Asia a long time ago. This is not new. In fact, at the time of the death of President Kennedy there were well over 25,

(1) <sup>16,000</sup> ~~between 25 and 30,000~~ Americans there in the Special Forces in Vietnam. *Military Adm. 9/25/60*

President Johnson did not make the military commitment to Vietnam. Even if he had of, I think he did the right thing, but he did not. That military commitment was made a long time ago. The treaty was signed - the SEATO Treaty was signed under the administration of Dwight Eisenhower. The protocol agreement, that is, the Mutual Defense Agreement - between South Vietnam and the United States was signed in 1955. We had been there with military assistance and later on with military manpower since

(2) about 1958, '59. <sup>We didn't</sup> And why did we go there in '59? Because in 1959 the

so-called National Liberation Front, which is the political arm of the Viet Cong, the Communists, was organized and it was organized systematically. I want you to just keep your mind with me now, at the end of, when Vietnam was divided after the Geneva Agreement in 1954 there

(3) were better than <sup>900,000</sup> ~~three or four million~~ North Vietnamese who moved south.

Most of them were Catholics by faith and some of them not, but they didn't want to live under Ho Chi Minh regime of Communists in the North.

(4) They moved south. Interestingly enough, <sup>100,000</sup> ~~none~~ of the Southerners moved

North. So when I keep hearing people say what a wonderful world this would be under Ho Chi Minh and how he would win an election if it were held - when there was a chance for people to move they moved the other way. It was there much like when East Germany - East Berlin and West Berlin - they had to build a wall to keep them back. So you just keep

1960



that in mind when you hear many people say, well if there were an election Ho Chi Minh would win. Well, the interesting thing is what we used to say about Berlin, that the Berliners are voting with their feet. That's what Kruschev knew when he said we're going to stop that movement, we're going to build a wall and we are going to fortify the wall and we're going to put up a fence and we're going to use police and dogs and guns and we're going to prevent people from moving from East Berlin to West Berlin. So they no longer could vote with their feet. In Vietnam that was not done they did move down by the millions with their feet in South Vietnam. And some of them that moved down also came down as trained Communist cadres with the express purpose of heading up the organization in South Vietnam to take the country over. This is a documented fact. It is not fiction. There isn't a government in the world that doesn't agree to this. That the Communists moved down in the early 1950, in the mid 50's, thousands of people that are now known as the Viet Cong to take over certain administrative structures, build up a sort of extra government, another layer back in the villages to control and at the right time there was supposed to be the uprising and they were to take over. In 1959 and in early 1960 the National Liberation Front was organized. It is either national, nor does it liberate anything, the only honest word about it is a front. It is controlled out of Hanoi, it is operated out of Hanoi, it's command comes from Hanoi. If I were to ask this audience to name me the Chairman of the National Liberation Front I would be willing to bet most of my life from here on out that not five people in this audience could tell you who it is. He's a nondescript lawyer

from Saigon that no one ever heard about. He is a front man and they try to make it look official by having a Southerner and his name isn't known by one American out of 500,000. Nor is it known in Vietnam. This is a political organization that is put together for the purpose of establishing a government within a government, and that is the basis of the Viet Cong. That is the political apparatus of the Viet Cong.

(5) Now in 1960 and '61 from '61 to '64 and into '65, the North Vietnamese started to move regular units of North Vietnamese troops into South Vietnam. And by the way that isn't the only country in which they are in. Today there are three Divisions in Laos in open violation of the 1962 Agreements. No one denies this. The International Control Commission admits it. There are several Battalions and Brigades of North Vietnamese troops in Northeast Thailand in open violation of international frontiers. There are presently five Divisions of North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam and there are no American troops in North Vietnam and there are no South Vietnamese troops in North Vietnam. And when I hear Americans talk about we're guilty of aggression I say how do you figure that out?

(6) Now, when did we start our bombing? There were <sup>ONE</sup> ~~two~~ Divisions of North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam in February of 1965. It is a recorded fact. The International Control Commission identifies those two.

(7) That's the ICC, the Commission set up under the Geneva Agreements to sort of police the operation in Vietnam. We started our bombing in February 1965. Now we started it for a simple reason. South Vietnam was about ready to be totally taken over. The North, the National Liberation Front

✓

had organized its political cadres. The terrorism was being stepped up. You may have forgotten the American Embassy was blown up <sup>March 29, 1965</sup> ~~in Christmas~~ of that year. You may have forgotten that many innocent people were killed that year. And yet, the very same people today that can cry their eyes out about some others being killed have never mentioned that fact that some of your own people right from this City were killed as Secretaries in an Embassy and hotels were blown up and tourists were killed by Viet Cong terrorists. Now we started to bomb in 1965 not before the aggression of the North but after and no one can dispute that. And I know that in any audience there are those that have a different point of view. That is a fact as much as my name is Hubert Humphrey. And we went there at the invitation of a government with which we had a treaty. Oh, I didn't care much about that particular government but there are a lot of governments that I don't care particularly about with which we have obligations. Some people don't care much about our government even in the country. We have some around here that don't care much about it, like to change it too. Had we not have gone in with our bombers in 1965, February, South Vietnam would be nothing today. They intended to use the same tactics to move their control down from the 17th parallel to the 14th and you've read many times about a city called H U E, Hue which is the old, traditional, historical capitol of Vitenam. It is and was the center a year and a half ago of the Buddhist militants. This was to be the line, Hue was to be taken into the new North Vietnam and once they had accomplished that you would have had some kind of a negotiation saying well, we're ready to stop the war. They would have sliced off a piece of it just exactly like Hitler took a piece of Czechoslovakia and then came back and took a piece of Austria and then

✓

wanted a piece of something else. And we said, no, and we sent our bombers in. We knew that the bombers would not win the war. We're not fools. The Americans had the greatest Air Force that men ever put together in World War II and the Air Force did great things but it didn't win any war. The Nazis had the air, complete air superiority for a long period of time. They couldn't defeat Great Britain, but nevertheless air power is important. It's the mission ahead of us that counts. And we had the machines and we had the trained pilots and it seemed to our country that this was the least that we could do at that particular time to be helpful. The reason I make this point is - before we sent the bombers, we had asked for peace in Vietnam. <sup>NO</sup> We'd asked for peace in the United Nations in August of 1964. We went to the United Nations with a resolution on the Gulf of Tonkins when our ships were attacked in the Gulf of Tonkin in interational waters in open violation of international law, and we went to the United Nations and asked the United Nations to help us police the area, we asked the United Nations to engage in peacemaking activities and the North Vietnamese said they wouldn't even come, that the United Nations had no jurisdiction, it was not a member, it had nothing to do with it - to drop dead. And they said so consistently ever since. They never, ever once accepted the jurisdiction of the U.N. Nor would they permit any U. N. observers. I mention these things because people are doing an awful lot of fictionalizing lately. My point is to those that say if you didn't bomb you could get peace. I remind you that there had never been a bomb dropped in North Vietnam until February, 1965 and we had been appealing for peace in South Vietnam, asking for peace, asking for a meeting of the Geneva Conference,

?

J

asking for a meeting of the International Control Commission for two years. And we got a very direct repudiation and a very, well a very rude rebuke. It wasn't the bombing that held up the peace talks. Had that been the case, there was no bombing until February, 1965. Since that time the situation, the military situation has reversed. Your government put almost half a million troops in South Vietnam. When we came there was but one harbor and it was a poor harbor at that. Now there are at least three magnificent harbors that have been constructed that can handle all the commerce that we need to bring in. There was one <sup>major</sup> airfield now there are at least six airfields, major airfields that can handle the largest of the planes and a dozen other that can take most of the fighter planes. When we arrived the government of Vietnam was in total disarray and this present government with all of its limitations has been in power for two years and has been able to sustain itself. Which is a lot better than some other countries have been able to do. Up until January of this year it appeared that we were making the kind of progress that you would have wanted. I think that every reasonable person knows that when President Johnson sent that letter to Ho Chi Minh that he walked the extra mile for peace. You know, you have people say, we ought to be in contact with them. Ladies and gentlemen, we are in contact with North Vietnam everyday. We have no lack of contact. As Dean Rusk says we keep ringing the telephone and we have got a connection but nobody picks up the receiver. And if they do they pick it up and put it on the table. They don't talk. We haven't been able to get anybody to talk nor has anybody else from Mr. Kosygin to U. Thant to Harold Wilson to Tito to Radhakrishnan,

J

the President of India, they've all tried, the Pope has tried, they've all tried and none of them, North Vietnam says no. Yet we have fellow Americans who say well, if we just search for peace. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been a man of peace all my life. I'll stack my record up for the cause of peace with all of the critics of this administration. I'm the author of the Disarmament Agency, one of the co-authors of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the author of the Peace Corps, the Chairman of the Disarmament Committee of the United States Senate for nine years. I used to be called the Peace NIK. (Laughter). I think Graham and the boys know that these charges were leveled at me repeatedly. I never did believe in unilateral disarmament. I believe that the arms race is a terribly dangerous thing. I think its terribly costly and if we have arms control it must be across the board with all countries. And I think we have to pursue it. But be that as it may, our critics need to honestly understand what has been done and not be thinking with their blood or their glands but to be thinking through to what your government has got to do. Ho Chi Minh rejected the Pope's plea. Ho Chi Minh rejected Johnson's plea. Ho Chi Minh rejected U Thant's plea. The most recent proposal of the Secretary-General of the United Nations asked for what we call a stand down. That means that everybody stop shooting and stay in place just as you are. Don't move and we'll see if we can't after that exercise get some people to come and talk. It means you don't lose any positions, it means you hold what you have. It means you stop your movement of men and supplies and you seek to find

✓

some way to get to the conference table. We accept that, without qualification. Ho Chi Minh said no. Three times in one month and the fourth time came with Mr. Kosygin when he was in London. Now I know whereof I speak. I just left Mr. Harold Wilson a month ago. He is an oldtime friend of mine. And I sat at Checkers, his country home and talked to him about Kosygin's visit at length and to be quite candid with you, my dear friends, I sat with your President during those nights when we were on the telephone with London and trying to work out things with Mr. Kosygin. There were only four of us in the Cabinet Room, five of us at one time. And when I hear people say, well, we missed that bet, and if we had cooperated and so on, and I say you don't know what you are talking about. Why do you think that we would lie to the people? Why do you think your President would lie to you? Why do you think that I would lie to you? Why is it that the people don't think that the other guy might be doing a little lying? (Applause). All I can tell you is we made an honest effort and so did Mr. Kosygin. You know your President worked with Mr. Kosygin on the Tashkent matter, between India and Pakistan. I was there. I went to India before Mr. Shastri's funeral. I remember when your President told Ayub Kahn from Pakistan in the White House. I sat there. There were three of us there. The President of Pakistan, the President of the United States and the Vice President. And he said to Ayub Kahn I want you to cooperate with Mr. ——— the policy of our government is for you to cooperate with Kosygin, to try to get an understanding of peace between Pakistan and India. We'll back you, support you. There has never been

✓

a President who has been willing to walk as far for an honorable peace as this one. We have tried everything. As Dean Rusk said, we have had 29 separate proposals that we've accepted that other nations have proposed, 29 and we've accepted every one and the opposition has accepted none and yet we have fellow Americans today say that Johnson doesn't want peace. And I see placards that call the President murderer, the Vice President murderer and you know sometimes I wonder just what people are thinking of, if they're thinking at all. Well, the tide of battle has turned in favor of the allies and now you read of this terrible conflict. And it is terrible. I want to level with you. It's very tough now and the battle is being waged in what we call the I Corps, the first Corps of the northern area in South Vietnam along the demilitarized zone and the North Vietmanese have sent in two new Divisions South of the Demilitarized Zone, have two Divisions in the Demilitarized Zone and one Division in reserve behind the Demilitarized Zone. And your Marines have been getting blasted by those men in that Demilitarized Zone, with heavy artillery and rockets. Why is Ho Chi Minh engaging in this battle if he can't possible win? I'll tell you what I think. It's just my view and I study it and by the way I reach back for cables that thick every day. I have three men that brief me every morning. You know you have to be rather stupid not to learn a little something out of that. Particularly if they keep at you for three years. And we do this every day and all day today I have had men reading me these



cables and replying to me. And they come in every hour of the day or every two hours with a piece of paper saying here is what you ought to know this and it's what we call red tag and that means it's important - you must get it. And if I'm in another part of the city or if I'm here now and something happens I get a call on the closed line to tell me what's going on. So we think we're somewhat posted. In North Vietnam, in that area, we had the success militarily and in pacification. Because this war will not be won militarily alone, it will have to be won politically and through what we call pacification. And our Marines in cooperation with the 2nd Corps of the Koreans and the Army of South Vietnam had been cleaning out this area of Viet Cong. ~~Eight-five per-~~ **39%** cent of the population in that area was pacified. That's a remarkable achievement. And it was right up on the border of North Vietnam. And I'm convinced that Ho Chi Minh said, we can't let that happen. If they can consolidate this - and we were just about ready to consolidate it, it would be the showcase. It would also mean that we can't use the salami tactics of moving down and being able to get a piece of this under pressure of international public opinion for negotiations. And that is what he has been playing for. He has been playing to get you and I to distrust our government and get other governments aroused to put pressure on the United States so that we would negotiate to give them a piece of South Vietnam as a price for peace. He knew he couldn't get that unless he had some forces south of that line, the 17th parallel, forces in being on the ground to say, well, here we are, let's settle here - let's draw a new line.

J

Here is the line, let's go down to here. So he's been attacking with ferocious power in North Vietnam in that area. To do two things, number one to destroy the political development that was taking place there, the pacification, you might say for three reasons - destroy the political development, defeat the - make a psychological defeat on the American forces, the Marines, now they mean so much, to defeat the Marines in a major conflict, not too big, just enough to make it look bad. Psychologically to shake the people's confidence in our forces. And thirdly, and I'm sure this is it - to try to get his forces positioned in such a place that if he did go to the conference table later on he would be able to say, look, we'll settle, but we are going to settle to the advance of our forces just like the Soviet Union did in Europe. They never withdrew their forces. They stayed right where the last Red soldier was, that was the line. And when you made the treaty, the peace, the war was over, World War II, where they were, where the Communist forces were, everything back of that was Red. And that's exactly what Ho Chi Minh has in mind. So he's conducting what I call Spoiler attacks on the political development of South Vietnam. He's conducting psychological war to brutal military struggle on the Marine forces in South Vietnam. And thirdly, he's getting himself in position if he can, if he goes to the conference table to know out about a third of the territory or a fourth of the territory in South Vietnam in stage one for negotiations. That's what he's trying to do. Is he going to succeed? No. And why isn't he going to succeed? Because we too have engaged in a spoiler. And just this week as you noticed,

we moved in substantial forces in the Demilitarized Zone into the southern section of the Demilitarized Zone. There is a river that goes right down through the middle. We're south of that river in the South Vietnamese part of the Demilitarized Zone. We're adhering strictly to what we know to be the international rule. We have no forces in North Vietnam. We have not landed a single party in North Vietnam. We do not want to be accused of invasion of North Vietnam. We have limited objectives in this struggle and those objectives are to stop this aggression. And to permit South Vietnam to develop its own country. We're being tested now as never before. Never before, and what's happening in South Vietnam can be encouraging. And my prediction is that by this Fall it will look much better. I don't say it will be over. I don't think it will be over. But it will look better and I'll tell you why. Because the political development has been progressive. And just think of it, and I leave you with this. Last year they had the elections of the constituent assembly. What did the people say, what did they say? What did you read? It said, it won't work, there will be a rigged election, you remember? That's a year ago September this coming September, when we had our elections in the Fall they had them too. Over 80 percent of the South Vietnamese turned out for that election. Four hundred American reporters covered it and they found more election discrepancies in Peoria than they did out there. (Laughter and applause). Let's say I make it so that it will contain Minneapolis. The four hundred top reporters were out there to cover that election. It was an amazing

*55% of the voting age population  
85% of the registered voters*

NO CANDIDATES  
Assembly killed or  
one delegate  
the constitution

(12A) turn-out despite the threat of death, despite the fact that candidates were killed, despite terrorism, then the constituent assembly was elected and started to write a constitution. Remember your constitution, your constitution that you remember was never written by elected people. They were all appointed. Any by the law, lest you've forgotten, a hundred people were invited to Philadelphia in 1789, 55 came, 39 stayed and 38 signed. So we didn't start out so hot either. Just thought you ought to know that. And your own capital was moved 11 times in 1776 to 1790 - 11 times. So, it wasn't easy for us. Well, they've written a constitution, and they debated it and there was a serious argument and it was no rubber stamp, and then what was said, the critics? Well, Ky will never accept it, that fellow, that military fellow will never accept it. He'll cancel it out because he had the right of veto. But he didn't, he did accept it. And then the next thing after that they said who'll write the election laws for the president - it will be the military junta. But they didn't. The military junta said the constituent assembly, the elected assembly will write the election laws and set the election date. And they did. And then the next thing they said was, what will be the parliament and can they elect a parliament, they'll never let them have a parliament. But they did. The military directed and the citizens directed, the committee of 20, that's the government of Vietnam, said, the constituent assembly will be the temporary parliament, the elected parliament. And then the next thing they said was what about the village and hamlet elections? They'll never take place, but they did. There have been over 1200 village elections take place in the month of April. And some of those villages hadn't had an election for a thousand years. And there was an average of 7 candidates

1.A

(13)

only 12 candidates  
for village offices killed

I don't have  
figures of total killed  
but several hundred  
is away off

(14) for every office. And they were free elections even though several  
hundred of the candidates were killed by the Viet Cong and over 400  
villages were under terrorist attack. And now the hamlet elections  
are taking place. You see, the North Vietnamese know that if this  
political process succeeds they've had it. Because it is the  
political process that is going to be the deciding factor. The  
political process and the social development. Militarily they can't  
defeat us, but militarily alone you can't win what you seek to win,  
namely a secure country. You have got to have the political develop-  
ment and the social development has got to go along all at the same  
time. So, I just say to you that if we'll just stick with it, if  
we won't all the time try to second-guess, if we'll have people that  
believe that this country really wants peace and an honorable peace  
and that we are really not killers, we are nation builders, you know.  
We have built a lot. If you'll just believe that because the facts  
justify it, I think we are going to come out of this pretty well.  
Thank you very much.

only  
12  
killed



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)