

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

CIVIC MEETING

HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA

MAY 22, 1967

✓ Mr Carl Jones
~~Mayor Heams~~
Dr Rose
- Dr VanBuren
- Cong Jones
- Sen Ziebart
- Ziebart
- Ziebart

Fourth Annual
Banquet
The Arts Council Inc

I have tried many times to be here with you,
and -- finally -- I made it -- ✓ Redstone Arsenal
Gen. Marshall
Space center

I am especially pleased to be in Huntsville
because it brings me together this evening with two good
and old friends, President Frank Rose of the University of
Alabama -- who has done so much for higher education in
the South and throughout this nation -- and Congressman
Bob Jones -- Mr. TVA.

I also want to pay tribute to another old friend not
here this evening -- John Sparkman -- who has been such a
force for good for so many years in the United States Senate.

and Sen. Hill
Health
Care

I think you should know that many of his colleagues
in the Senate call Huntsville "the Town That John Built."

↳ If we were to single out any city in America as
one which is on the move, growing, and providing a better
life for its citizens ... which looks to the future and not
to the past, I think we might well choose Huntsville. *Alabama.*

↳ And, in this appropriate place, I would like
tonight to mark an observance which I believe will grow
in importance in the perspective of future years.

↳ It was exactly three years ago today that President
Lyndon Johnson gave his Great Society address at the University
of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

↳ I think each of us would benefit by rereading that
address today. ~~think~~ each of us would benefit by matching
our progress of the past three years against the goals set forth
in that address.

In that message, the President set forth the challenge that still faces us as a nation. And I hope you will permit me to quote from that speech.

"The purpose of protecting the life of our nation and preserving the liberty of our citizens," the President said, "is to pursue the happiness of our people."

I underscore that: To pursue the happiness of our people.

"Our success in that pursuit," he went on, "is the test of our success as a nation. For a century we labored to settle and to subdue a continent. For half a century, we called upon unbounded invention and untiring industry to create an order of plenty for all of our people. The challenge of the next half-century is whether we have the wisdom to use that wealth to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization."

Then -- speaking to the students of that university but also to the rest of us -- the President put today's challenge to Americans in clear terms:

"Your imagination, your initiative and your indignation will determine whether we build a society where progress is the servant of our needs, or a society where old values and new visions are buried under unbridled growth. For we have the opportunity to move not only

toward the rich society and the powerful society, but upward to the Great Society. The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice, to which we are totally committed in our time.

But that is just the beginning. The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause of boredom and restlessness. It is a place where the city of man serves not only

the needs of the body and the demands of commerce,
but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community.^{NA}

*Arts & Humanities
by Rose*

↳ And then, among other things, he defined the Great Society as "a place where men are more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods."

↳ I will not tonight attempt to recite all the progress -- progress toward that kind of society -- which I believe we have made in these three years. Nor will I attempt to credit that progress solely to the efforts of the President or the Vice President, or of the Congress, or of any sector or group in America.

↳ What I do wish to do is to underline the importance of the fact that we did set out on such a course. And I believe that, in the future, that occasion three years ago may well be marked as the time and place where we set out in earnest ~~to~~

Pursue the happiness of our people.

*("Arts & Humanities"
Science + Education
U.S.A. -*

↳ You in Huntsville know very well the scope of our material and technological progress. You have contributed to it; you have shared in it.

↳ I know, too, that you are just as deeply committed to building the kind of community where man may live by more than bread alone -- the kind of community where education continues even after diplomas are passed ... where the arts and music and individual expression have their place ... where young people and old people have a real role and purpose in life ... where neighbors are really neighbors and care about each other.

↳ But we would be foolish to overlook that which yet remains to be done.

↳ There are all too many places in America where the vision of a Great Society is all too dim ... where even the concept of a more human community is still alien.

↳ There are neighborhoods in our own country where adults have never been to a doctor or dentist ... where unemployment and illiteracy are passed from generation to generation ... where crime and violence are as common on the street as the daily milk delivery is in many of our well-scrubbed suburban enclaves.

↳ There is a high shortage of country clubs in these neighborhoods. *yes even shortage of swimming pools!*
yet, These are the places where our goals will or will not be achieved. These are the places where we shall either prove equal to the task of building a better America, or where we shall fail.

For it is true that none of us is any stronger than the weakest among us. *Jefferson - you cannot be both free and ignorant!*

↳ Three years ago our President asked us to join together in seeking a Great Society. Today I'm often asked:

Why isn't it built yet? - *Why hasn't it been achieved,*

And I reply: It won't be built for a long time ahead. It won't be ~~built~~ *achieved* during this President's term of office, nor for many terms of office thereafter,

But I believe it can be built if the good people all over America -- good people such as those in this room -- make it their business to stay with it over the long pull.

L This is no political speech, I'm not talking about support for any one piece of legislation ... or for any man or any party. I am talking about support for the larger goals, and the ideals, that have helped make our country equal to whatever task it had to face.

L For there are those who say we shouldn't have too much of a good thing ... that now is the time to slow down ... *the promise of* that America is built and everything is just fine.

has been achieved

↳ I was raised at the knee of my father, by the word of Woodrow Wilson. And I have never forgotten Wilson's words in another speech which gained size in history's perspective. They were spoken in a time when this nation had just completed a burst of material progress, but in which all too many of our citizens found themselves strangers in a prosperous land.

↳ But, he said, "we had not forgotten our morals. We remembered well enough that we had set up a policy which was meant to serve the humblest as well as the most powerful, with an eye single to the standards of justice and fair play, and remembered it with pride."

Then, he went on: "We have made up our minds to square every process of our national life again with the standards we so proudly set up at the beginning and have always carried at our hearts."

This, my fellow citizens, is what we do today --
no more and no less. And I think we have no choice but
to continue.

Now, after these remarks, I'd like to hear from
some of you in the audience.

#

[Transcript]

HEADQUARTERS
U. S. ARMY MISSILE COMMAND
REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALABAMA 35809

IN REPLY
REFER TO **AMSMI-G**

25 May 1967

Mr. Martin McNamara
Office of the Vice President
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. McNamara:

I am inclosing two copies of ^[*] the complete transcript of the Vice President's address to the Arts Council of Huntsville, Alabama, on 22 May 1967, and the question and answer period which followed.

This is in accordance with the verbal instructions of D. Bruce Shine. It is my understanding that Charles Grainger and James Record of Huntsville have assumed responsibility for obtaining and forwarding to you a transcript of the Vice President's remarks to the meeting of municipal and county officials held in the Redstone Arsenal Officers Open Mess on the morning of 23 May 1967.

We have available tape recordings of the Vice President's news briefings on the morning of the 23rd as well as his remarks upon arrival and departure should you have some further need for them.

His explanation of the American commitment in Vietnam during the Arts Council dinner has become an instant best seller here. You no doubt have been told in detail of the success of the visit. I can't resist passing along one bit of political intelligence. One of our leading Democratic women said to me yesterday: "Oh if we could just get him to run for governor of Alabama." I hope you understand that's the ultimate tribute as far as some of these people are concerned.

Sincerely,

DC Harris
DAVID G. HARRIS
Information Officer

1 Incl
2 cy transcript

*Only 1 copy in Files when
Pages were Processed Mar. 1977*

THE U. S. ARMY MISSILE COMMAND
ARSENAL SUPPORT OPERATIONS DIRECTORATE
PICTORIAL DIVISION
REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALABAMA

A Transcription of Remarks Addressed To
The Membership of the Arts Council
Huntsville, Alabama, 22 May 1967, by...

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
Vice President of the United States

Prepared For
The U. S. Army Missile Command
Information Office

Technical Advisor: Fred Eiland
Telephone No: 876-4163

Production Specialist: H. Gates
Telephone No: 876-0688

Project No: M67-3758/RCA 7-708

Contract No: DA-01-021-AMC-590 (Z)

24 May 1967

Remarks Addressed by the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey,
Vice President of the United States,
to the Membership of the Arts Council, Huntsville, Alabama
22 May 1967

Thank you, thank you very much. Thank you very much, Congressman Jones. It seems like the Jones boys are running things here tonight. Mr. Carl Jones and our illustrious and distinguished fellow American, Dr. Frank Rose of the University of Alabama, my hosts for the afternoon over at the George Marshall Space Center and Redstone Arsenal, Dr. Von Braun and General Zierdt. I'm so happy that I've had this privilege of visiting Huntsville and being given this unusual opportunity of being here at the fourth annual banquet of the Arts Council. Your Mayor welcomed me this afternoon with typical southern generosity and hospitality for which I am most grateful, and I might share with you just one observation, I've had a wonderfully, wonderfully warm expression of friendship from your children and your people here in this community that has gladdened my heart beyond any words that I can find to properly express my appreciation. It's been a great day for me.

What is much in my mind tonight, and I gather that you're going to pick it a little later, and I'm pleased that that's the case, because I hope that we can have a, as they say in University circles these days, the dialogue and not just the monologue

which you're apt to get if you turn me loose too long. I want to talk to you a little bit about some matters of mutual concern and ... to fit into the pattern that has been set in the conversation this evening by your own University President, Dr. Rose. You know I've tried many many times to be here with you in Huntsville. Every time I've made a plan, something interfered. It was either the President or Nature or the Congress, and finally I made it and I'm sure glad that I finally got down here. I had hoped, however, that you wouldn't have so much Minnesota weather. I was trying to escape that, but you've insisted on making me feel very very much at home. And I'm especially pleased to be in Huntsville because it brings me together tonight once again with two very good friends, one of whom I referred to in some detail, your University President, Frank Rose, who has done so much for higher education in Alabama and all throughout the Nation. I'm sure you know that we consider him one of America's outstanding educators, not just Alabama's outstanding educator. And I feel very privileged to share in the precious gift of his friendship, and then he gives me a chance to come here when I come to Huntsville to be associated on home ground with this wonderful congressman, Bob Jones. We call him Mr. TDA up in Washington. I know you have a great

Chamber of Commerce here, but I might add that you have one in Washington too. He almost sounds a Texan the way he does brag on this part of America. No, I mentioned a moment ago that the Jones boys seem to be in charge here. I'll have to tell you about my visit to Dallas today. Every time I'd go and sit down, there'd be a man longside of me by the name of Johnson. And that's a fact. I said, "I guess there's just no escaping it," and I don't want to, I want you to know that.

Now I want to pay my respects and tribute to another fine friend and a very great public servant and fine American. And do you know of whom I speak? John Sparkman, your Senator. He's been a force for good so many many years in the United States Senate, and I can only say that Alabama has endeared itself to the Nation by men of this quality. And I think that you should know that many of his colleagues up in the Senate call Huntsville the town that John built. I don't know if that's the case or not, and I said John and Bob. I put them together. And then, to add to the laurels of this state, you have Senator Lister Hill, one of the great...I don't know what people are going to do for Senator Hill in the years ahead except to keep both the Senator Hill and Senator Sparkman in the Senate, and I hope and pray that you do, and I hope that my reference won't hurt them. But I've served with these men in important committees in the Senate for sixteen years and everyone in this room that feels a little healthier

tonight than you thought you had any right to be, you can attribute much of that to Senator Lister Hill. If there's any man that has contributed to the health of the American people by his statesmanship, it's Senator Lister Hill. And don't forget it. You're a better and a happier people because of it.

Now, singling out other aspects of this great part of America, if I were to single out any city in the United States, and I work with cities all the time as the President's liaison with the local officials, any city that I know to be on the move or growing and providing a better life for its citizens, which looks to the future and not to the past, I think that we might well give the national honors to Huntsville, Alabama. And since I want to be sure that you maintain that standard and that honor, just examine how you can do even better than you've done because you have the resources to do it. And you know one of the reasons that this is a great city, because here has been brought together a great university. The activities of the Federal Government in the fields of science and technology, the military establishment, and fine industry all pull together so that you have this great partnership of government of the university of the scientific and technological community, of management and finance, and indeed,

of skilled labor. And you've put this together to make what I call a modern city, worthy of mankind. And this is the combination that it takes. This is why you have an Arts Council and indeed, the Arts Council adds to the meaning of everything that I have said as you shall see in my remarks in a moment.

And in this appropriate place I would like tonight to mark an observance which I believe will grow in importance, in the perspective of future years. It was exactly three years ago today that President Lyndon Johnson gave his Great Society address at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan. That was a landmark public statement for this nation. And I think that each of us would benefit by re-reading that address, hopefully tonight, tomorrow, or sometime in the near future. And each of us would benefit by matching our progress individually and on a community basis, of the past three years against the goals set forth by the President in that remarkable address.

In that message, the President set forth the challenge; it still faces us as a people and a nation. And I hope that tonight you will permit me to quote a little bit from that speech: "The purpose of protecting the life of our nation and preserving the liberty of our citizens," the President said, "is to pursue the

happiness of our people." I underscore that phrase "to pursue the happiness of our people". "Our success in that pursuit," the President went on to say, "is the test of our success as a nation. For a century we labored to settle and to subdue a continent. For half a century we called upon unbounded invention and untiring industry to create an order of plenty for all of our people. The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use that wealth, to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization." And isn't this the appropriate place for such a statement...in the Arts Council in its fourth Annual Banquet, where the enrichment of life is the very purpose of your pursuit.

Then speaking to the students of that University, but also to the rest of us, the President put today's challenge to Americans in clear and unmistakable terms: "Your imagination, your initiative, your indignation, will determine whether we build a society where progress is the servant of our needs or a society where old values and new visions are buried under unbridled growth. For we have the opportunity to move not only towards the rich society and the powerful society, but upward to the great society. The great society rests on abundance and liberty for all.

It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice to which we are totally committed in our time. But that is just the beginning. The great society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause of boredom and restlessness. It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community." And then among other things, he defined the great society as, "a place where men are more concerned with the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods". End of the President's quote in that great society message.

I think that this is a standard to which all good people can repair. Now I will not attempt tonight to recite all the progress, progress towards that kind of society which I believe we have made in these three years. I can say, however, that we have made substantial progress. The fact that you are doing what you are doing, is adequate testimony to me for the progress that we have seen. Nor will I attempt to credit that progress solely to the efforts of the President, or the Vice President, or the Congress, or any sector, or any group in America. What I do wish to do, however, is to underline the importance of the fact that we did set out on such a course, that we proclaimed our mission, and I

believe that in the future that occasion of three years ago may well be marked as the time and the place where we set out in earnest as a nation and as a people to pursue the happiness of our people. And to this we know the arts and humanities has given so much. Science and technology has added so much.

You know, as I listened to Dr. Rose, my mind went back for a few years to some experiences I had in Congress. I started to introduce legislation for the establishment of the Arts Council, a National Arts Council, in 1956. I waited until the year 1964 to see it become law. It takes a lot of time. And I was privileged to be the author of the first act for the establishment of a National Arts Council to set this government on the course of at least saying that we were interested in public policy in the development of the arts. Two years later, as you know, or a year and a half later, we amended that act, expanded it to make it the arts and humanities. Establishing the arts council foundation for the financing of at least in part of some of the creativity in the field, in the broad spectrum of the arts and the humanities. We have made progress. We are making progress.

You in Huntsville, you know very well the scope of our material and technological progress. You've tested it. You witness it

and you've contributed to it. You've shared in it. And I know too, that you're just as deeply committed to building the kind of a community where man may live by more than bread alone. The kind of a community where education continues even after diplomas are passed out. Where the arts and music and individual expression have their appropriate and richly deserved place. And where young people and old people have a real role and purpose in live. And where neighbors are not just folks that live next door to one another, but are neighbors that care about each other. This is what we mean by the pursuit of happiness. But we would be very foolish tonight to rest on our laurels, to say that our goals have been achieved, or to overlook the fact that much remains to be done. But having said that, let us not be discouraged because the interesting thing about democracy is not the endings, but the beginnings. The first step, indeed, is the longest journey. But it's the first step that sets us on the path to achievement.

Now there are all too many places in America where the vision of the Great Society is all too dim. Where even the concept of a more human community is still alien. Where bitterness and hatred and prejudice permeate the very atmosphere. Too many places. And my fellow Americans, the United States of America

was not conceived in the spirit of hostility or animosity or prejudice. It was conceived in the spirit of brotherhood, of tranquillity, of social justice, and opportunity. And good Americans worthy of the high honor of being citizens of this country understand that all of those bench marks and characteristics belong to all Americans, not just some. Now there are neighborhoods in our country where adults have never been to a doctor or to a dentist. There are even neighborhoods in our country where some people will not even help other people get to a doctor or a dentist. Where unemployment and illiteracy are passed on from generation to generation, even as we pay tribute to education and honor the educators. Where crime and violence are as common on the street as the daily milk delivery is in many of our well scrubbed suburban enclaves. I need not tell you this. You know that it is characteristic in many places, thank goodness, not a majority, but regrettably in far too many places all across this land of ours. There is a high shortage of country clubs in these neighborhoods that I speak of. Yes, there's even a shortage of swimming pools without country clubs... of just playgrounds without neatly mowed lawns. Yet these are the places where we shall either prove equal to the task of building a better America, a more socially just America, or we shall fail. We're not going to be tested as a nation by the fact

that those who already have too much get more, but rather we shall be judged as a nation as whether or not those who have too little begin to attain enough to sustain themselves in dignity and to be accepted as effective and equal partners in this great adventure of American citizenship. For it is true I believe, now, as it was in the days of Benjamin Franklin, that none of us is any stronger than the weakest amongst us. You know, Thomas Jefferson has been an inspiration for all of us. And we are always quoting from him, but I think one of his most important quotes was when he said you cannot be both free and ignorant. You have to make a choice. And when you make that choice, we mean freedom for all and not just for some. And we mean that ignorance and illiteracy must be obliterated as a scourge and as a plague and a disease from the land, if freedom is to be what it was intended to be.

Three years ago, our President asked us to join together in seeking a great society. A noble goal, it should and I know it has, elevated us to new heights and new standards. And yet we have people that say to us every day, "Why isn't it built yet, why hasn't it been achieved?" And I can only reply in all honesty that this is the work of generations and not of current events. It won't be built for a long time ahead. It won't be

achieved during this President's term of office, nor many terms of office thereafter. But I think what is important is this: to believe that it can be built and to muster and mobilize the material and the human resources to accomplish that goal. To believe it can be built if the good people, the concerned people, the dedicated people, all over America such as those in this room, make it their business to stay with it, to adhere to the standards, and to pull together for the long pull.

Now this is not intended to be a political speech. I speak rather, in terms of philosophy and what I hope is a common denominator amongst us that are socially concerned individuals. I'm not talking about support for any one piece of legislation or for any man or for any party. I am, however, talking about support for these larger goals. And the ideals that have helped make our country equal to whatever test it had to face.

There are those who say we shouldn't have too much of a good thing. They say it breaks down our spirit. There are those that say now is the time to slow down, and my goodness, we surely do have these people that want the pause that they think will refresh them.

There are those that say that the promise of America has been achieved already and that everything is just fine. Well, I can't agree with that. I was raised by an idealistic and yet a very practical father, who taught me the philosophy of a man like Woodrow Wilson. And I have never forgotten some of Woodrow Wilson's admonitions to America; the words in a speech which gain size in history's perspective. They were spoken at a time when this nation had just completed a burst of material progress, but in which all too many of our citizens found themselves strangers in a prosperous land. And Wilson said this...trying to reassure the American people as to their commitments and as to their achievements. He said, "We had not forgotten our morals. We remembered well enough that we had set up a policy which was meant to serve the humblest as well as the most powerful. With an eye singly to the standards of justice and fair play, and we remembered it with pride." And then he went on and said, "We have made up our minds to square every process of our national life again with the standards we so proudly set up at the beginning and have always carried in our hearts." This, my fellow Americans, is what we do today. No more, no less. We have established our goals. We cannot retreat from them and be worthy of the greatness that we claim for ourselves. I think we have no choice but to continue.

To continue to strive to achieve something that no other people has ever known...an equality of opportunity for everyone in our midst. An adventure and opportunity unparalleled in all of human history. A dream of an America that becomes a reality for its humblest citizens. Because, remember this, that America is not only a promise and a hope; it is also a fact and a reality. And we want to make sure that the fact and the reality of America is one of inalienable rights...of life and of liberty and of the pursuit of happiness. Not just for you or for me, but for everyone. The promise of America that your children have recited, that you say you believe in, that I say I believe in. And I think the most succinct and the most profound statement of national purpose ever uttered by a people and our children repeat it in every school room throughout America. But I think they ought to go home and repeat it to their parents too, when we say, "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all". There is no way you can dilute that and still say that you're American. There is no way you can diminish it and still say that you're a patriot. There is no way that you can ignore it and still be worthy of the highest honor that can be paid to any man on this earth...namely to be a citizen of this Republic.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I'm ready for your questions.

The first question here by William S. Bryant is, "Do you have any specific suggestions as to how we as individuals can contribute to better politics or government?"

Yes, I sure do. Enroll - get in the fight. Most of the people who talk about good government are unwilling to participate. They like to sit out in the bleachers while the battle goes on in the field. Then they like to have the privilege of sitting around on Monday morning and analysing all the mistakes...I happen to believe that if you think politics is corrupt...If you don't like the way it is...If you think it's dirty ... and many people do ... why don't you get yourself a bar of political ivory soap, and get in and clean it up. The next question.

Sir, with your permission, I'm going to read two. They seem to be on just exactly the opposite ends of the pole. The first question is Bonny L. Luccas ... by her ... "Why don't we pull out of Vietnam?" The next question by Harry Rhett, Jr., "Why not bring North Vietnam to a quick surrender by more concentrated and heavier bombing and thus end the war?"

Well, those are on the opposite ends of the pole, and I think both of them can be answered, at least in my mind, with a certain degree

of, I hope, of objectivity and persuasiveness. First of all, you will not bomb anyone into submission. Bombing alone ... not even our friends of the Air Force say that this is the answer. Bombing is a part of a military strategy, or of a military complex. We have never said ... and if anyone ever did say ... they misinformed you ... that by bombing alone, you bring anyone to their knees and to the peace table. Bombing justification, as we see it, is a part of an effort of attrition, part of an effort of compelling the enemy to divert resources to the repair of bomb damage, part of an effort on our part to slow down the rate of infiltration of men and material. It is not a matter of whether we should, or shouldn't bomb. The question is, what is its effectiveness and how best can it be used or not used? Does it tend to achieve or help achieve our goals? ... and our goals in this struggle in Vietnam are rather limited. They're goals that most Americans, I think would agree to, even though they may not all agree to how we achieve them. The first goal is to prevent the success of aggression ... and this leads me to the second question, why don't we get out of Vietnam? We happen to believe that aggression, if it becomes an acceptable form of international conduct for the achievement of political objectives, means that the rule of law in the world is gone; that the rule of brute force applies. We are in Vietnam

not only for what we consider to be the needs of the Vietnamese people ... of South Vietnam ... but also our own needs. Let me take just a few moments to talk to you about this. South Vietnam has as much a right to live as a free nation as North Vietnam. Some of our fellow Americans seem to have forgotten that. South Vietnam did not commit an aggressive act against North Vietnam. There has never been a battalion, a company, or a patrol of South Vietnamese forces that has crossed the demilitarized zone into North Vietnam. The United States of America did not intervene in South Vietnam under the SEATO Treaty Commitment, and under the Protocol Arrangement and the Mutual Assistance Pact, which are agreements that we signed, and they were not signed by President Lyndon Johnson, they were signed by another administration, but nevertheless, rightly signed, honorably signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States with only two dissenting votes. And at the time the ratification took place, we knew what we were talking about, because those who presented that treaty said that this treaty might necessitate - might necessitate, the use of American manpower in Asia. So, when I hear people say that they didn't know what they were getting into, I know what I was getting into, I was one of those who voted for it, and there were 87 other Senators that voted for it, and I don't think they were all

oblivious to what we're doing. I think that we - I think that we knew what we were doing. So we find ourselves today committed to South Vietnam by treaty, by obligation and national self-interest.

Now let's talk about national self-interest for a moment. What is our self-interest? Well, one-half of the people of the world live in Asia. And Asia today is the target of a form of militant aggressive Communism that once was the pattern in Europe but has since learned considerably more caution and restraint. That Asian militant Communism attacked China ... attacked India twice in five years ... without provocation. If there ever was a country that ever tried to adjust its foreign policy to the needs of another country, it was India under the late Prime Minister Nehru and the then Defense Minister, (Radhakrishnan ?) (Vengalil Krishnan Krishna Menon ?), who did everything that he could to align India's policies with that of Communist China and despite that, twice, in five years, unprovoked aggression. That we know. So Militant Asian Communism is at least a menace to free societies, or independent societies, or national nation states in Asia. I know some of my good liberal friends say, "Well, they're not very Democratic". That isn't the point. The point is that they are at least independent nation states, and they are entitled to work out their way of life, and their self-determination, just as much as anybody else. And we happen to be in Vietnam now

to prevent the success of aggression, because aggression in the kind of a world in which we live, and aggression that can become a pattern of conduct in the nuclear age and the space age, is too dangerous to become an acceptable mode of international conduct. We are there because we signed the charter of the United Nations which lays down three requirements for all of its members ... and the fact that some of its members do not live up to it, is no excuse for the rest of us. There are people every day in your community that do not live up to their obligations, but it doesn't relieve you of it, and particularly if you're a leader. If you have the rank of leader, then you are expected to do a little better than other people. Now what are those three obligations under the charter of the United Nations which is a treaty that is a supreme law of this land just as much as an article in the Constitution? The first is to prevent the success of aggression. "To resist aggression," says the charter. Either collectively, or regionally or by individual nation states. That's No. 1. Number 2, "to promote self-determination." That's the second purpose of the United Nations. Number 3, "to mobilize resources for economic and social development." Now, ladies and gentlemen, I submit that your country has kept faith with the charter of the United Nations. We

have resisted aggression, not only in Southeast Asia, we resisted it in Korea, we resisted it's potential in Berlin, we've resisted it across the map of the world. We have promoted self-determination, we have joined together in common efforts, or in the mobilization of resources for economic and social development, as no other nation on the face of the earth. We've been generous as no other nation has ever exhibited generosity. We had unlimited power at the end of World War II ... the sole possessor of nuclear power and nuclear weapons ... but we didn't use it for aggrandizement, we didn't use it for imperialistic purposes against anyone. We offered, and some Americans have forgotten it, the Buruch Plan and the United Nations, to do away with our weapons, to internationalize Atomic Energy ... and the Soviet Union said, "No," because it was in the process of developing its own nuclear weapon, and it wanted no internationalization of nuclear power as we sought to rid ourself of this incredibly destructive force. And I might ask my fellow Americans, what kind of a world do you think you'd be living in today if you hand't of had a President like Harry Truman after World War II that had the courage - that had the courage ... to take a stand. Oh, I know that some of you are going to say, "Well, Yes, but most of the time he didn't have to fight." That doesn't make any difference. I hope you're not

saying that its good to take a stand as long as its a bluff. My dear friends, the peace of the world has depended for better than a generation, upon the intergrity of the American committment to other nations. We have been the sole protector for Western Europe for many years. We've been the sole protector against militant aggressive forces in Asia for many years. There wouldn't have been any Turkey as an independent nation state if Harry Truman hand't of had what he called the Greek-Turkish Aid Program and the Truman Doctrine. And when Joseph Stalin had his troops in the northern provinces of Iran and intended to keep them there despite his committments, Harry Truman gave him exactly five days to make a committment to get 'em out; and he said it in unmistakable language that everybody understood. And I would remind this audience that while these programs all sound good now ... that when Harry Truman was making these committments ... and when he was fulfilling these obligations, he was unpopular. So unpopular, that the Democratic party itself wanted to get rid of him, and don't forget it. I haven't forgotten it a bit. Harry Truman was not a popular man when he proposed the Marshall Plan. He wasn't a popular man when he proposed the Truman Doctrine. He wasn't a popular man when he stood his ground, oh no, and when he decided

to meet the challenge at Berlin with the Berlin Air Lift, most of his cabinet was against him, most of the "informed" quote, and quote, "columnists," were against him. Oh yes, they were against him, they said it was ridiculous. Why run the chance of confrontation with the Soviet Union over Berlin? And what did Mr. Truman say? "Because," he said, "We have committed ourselves ... under treaty and agreement we have committed our word ... our sacred honor ... and we will stand, and Berlin will not fall." And for three times in the last twenty years we have had to pit American manpower against Soviet intentions ... in manpower for Berlin. I was there in Congress in 1961 when John Kennedy called up 250,000 reserves. In case you forgot, in the summer of 1961, we sent 50,000 more troops to fortify our garrisons in Germany, and added new troops in Berlin, and sent the Vice-President of the United States there as a symbol of the American commitment ... and it could have been war. And, have you ever thought about the kind of a Europe it would have been if Mr. Truman and Mr. Kennedy hadn't done those things? Have you ever thought the kind of a Middle East it would have been had Mr. Eisenhower not taken a stand - a stand in Lebanon - in the 1950's? The fact that we didn't have a war, we should prayerfully thank God Almighty, it could have been. Have you ever thought the kind of a Caribbean

it would have been had Mr. Khrushchev got by with his missiles - in Cuba? And I sat with John Kennedy on the night that the decision was made to tell Mr. Khrushchev to get them out. I was Majority Whip of the United States Senate summoned back to the White House. I sat with the President when he broadcasted to you, my fellow Americans, over television, and said what we were going to do, and we were within minutes of nuclear war until the Soviet ships turned back, until Mr. Khrushchev said that the missiles would come out. We'd moved our fleet, we'd positioned our planes, we had everything set as every officer of the Armed Forces here knows tonight, and we stood our ground, we were firm and resolute, without being belligerent and bellicose. What kind of an Asia do you think there would have been if we hadn't defended Korea? South Korea was not the aggressor any more than South Vietnam ... and the forces of Militant Asian Communism poured over that parallel in Korea, and we were almost driven from the land. And was Mr. Truman popular? I'll say he wasn't. I was in Congress in those days. I was one of his few supporters, I'm proud to say. And I remember the columns, and I remember the speeches, and I remember what they said about Mr. Truman, and I remember how he was pilloried, but I'll tell you right now my fellow Americans, if you ...

walk out on any street in America today, and ask to name five great Americans ... to name five Americans who had what we call courage ... and there's another word for it ... Five great Americans that knew what it was to really stand up like a man and be worthy of the high office of Presidency, one of those five, as surely as my name is Hubert Humphrey, will be Harry Truman, and I'll tell you why - I'll tell you why, because he did what he had to do. Popularity and the insatiable desire for popularity in public service, is the tocsin and the poison of statesmanship. If you're trying to be popular every day you ought never to try to be President, because you'll sacrifice your country for your own personal ambitions. A President of the United States has no further place to go except to eternity. He's had the highest office that's in the gift of the people of the United States, and indeed of the world; and that's why men who are Presidents generally measure up to that high office. So we have taken our stand in Vietnam for one simple reason ... that we do not believe that aggression can be tolerated. Because we believe that people have a right to determine their future ... and that stand has paid off. Tonight, Indonesia is free of Communist Control ... a nation of over a hundred million people ... and the

leaders of Indonesia would tell this audience as they've told me, that they never would have been able to have cleansed themselves of Communism ... and they did it at the cost of 450,000 dead, and many more thousands wounded in a brutal Civil War in their country ... They never would have been able to do it, had not the United States of America been present with its forces and its power in Southeast Asia ... they never would of had a chance. Their own Ministers of Government have told your Government and the American people that. Tonight, Indonesia's a member of the United Nations. It's beginning to pay its debts. It's beginning to get its economy rolling again. Tonight, Indonesia and Malaysia have no war ... and just because Americans weren't being killed in that war doesn't mean there wasn't a war. Hundreds and thousands of lives were lost in that war. It didn't make our headlines because boys from Minnesota and Alabama weren't there, but there were 60,000 British troops in Malaysia. There was eight years of Gorilla warfare fought in Malaysia against the Communist Gorillas by the British and the Malaysians ... eight years of it.

Tonight, Korea represents the greatest single economic breakthrough in Asia outside of Japan. Ten years ago the newspapers of America, the journalists, the political scientists, the politicians, ... we were all guilty with few exceptions, ... were saying that Korea

is a hopeless mess. Why did we ever get caught up in it? 50,000 dead, 168,000 casualties, American blood, ... but tonight, Korea stands free and independent, and tonight, Japan, which would have been swept as surely as the winds sweep the fields. Tonight, India or Japan stands as a free nation, a friend of the West. These are some of the dividends of resisting aggression and we're in Vietnam and we're going to stay there ... and we're going to stay there, I tell you, until we can get an honorable peace. And that honorable peace is not going to come through military measures alone. Militarily, we are strong. Militarily, we will not be defeated. But the struggle in Vietnam is military, political, economic, and diplomatic.

Now, my fellow Americans, ... and I say this particularly to my friends in the academic community ... of which I've been a part ... no nation has ever pleaded for peace in this part of the world more than America. And when I hear people say that the peace will come if only we stop the bombing, I remind you that we never dropped a bomb in Vietnam until February, 1965, and the plea for peace started in 1963. For two years or better, plea after plea was made. We went to the United Nations, to the Security Council, and the General Assembly, on the resolution of the Gulf of Tonkin. And what did North Vietnam say? It has no jurisdiction. It would

not respond. It would not recognize ... get out.

The roadblock to peace is not in Washington, my dear friends. The roadblock to peace is not in the White House. I can tell you tonight, as your Vice-President, that if anybody can induce an authentic Representative of the Government of North Vietnam, and any of their associates, to come to a conference table, I will have, as your Representative in Government, on the express orders of the President of the United States, high officials of this government from the Secretary of State on down to meet with them to discuss peace. But we get no calls, we get no response. There's no lack of communication between the United States and Hanoi. We can ring the telephone anytime ... but nobody picks up the receiver on the other end ... and if they do, they give us an insulting remark.

Remember, Hanoi has rejected the Pope. Hanoi has rejected U Thant. Hanoi has rejected Koseygin. Hanoi has rejected Prime Minister Wilson, the seventeen non-committed nations, rejected India, Burma, the United Arab Republic, and so on down the line. Twenty-nine time we have sought peace. Twenty-nine times we have said, "Yes, we will come to the conference table". Twenty-nine times North Vietnam has said, "No". And yet some of my fellow Americans parade around this country and condemn us as if we had ...

as if we were the Imperialists - as if we were the aggressors - as if we wanted the war. Oh, we can get peace in Vietnam if we're willing to give them half of South Vietnam. I hope we've learned that lesson. There were those that did that in Europe.

In the 1930's, Hitler's appetite was not settled or not satisfied with the Sudeten land. Hitler's appetite was not settled or satisfied with Austria. It wasn't even satisfied with Poland. It wanted it all.

Aggression unleashed is aggression unchecked. And once you become as major a power as we ... without design or purpose ... we have the responsibility of leadership. We don't want to be the world's Policeman - we want to be the world's Teacher. We're not interested in destruction. We're interested in construction. We want to be Nation Builders, not Nation Destroyers. And we pray for, we yearn for, we beg for, we ask for, ... the chance to help the nations of the world live a better life. But you can't have freedom with bandits roaming the streets. And you cannot have freedom with aggression unleashed and unchecked - security and freedom go together. And we're going to have to stay with it. And my fellow Americans, if we'll buckle down to the task and have just a little less carping criticism, some more honest dialogue over the differences that we have, with respect

for one another, I think we can shorten this struggle - I think we can bring it to a successful conclusion. It won't be easy - it will not come quickly - but it will come. What we need above all, is faith in our cause and faith in our purpose, and to recognize that what's happening in Asia today is a replay of what's happened in other parts of the world. I believe this with all of my heart, and I don't believe it just because the President believes it. I believe it out of my own judgement, out of my own conviction, and I've been known all of my political life as a Liberal, but I don't consider a Liberal one who thinks that it's right to die in Europe for a white man, but not willing to take a stand in Asia for a little people of a different color who also have a right to be free, and who want to be free. Freedom is indivisible, and leadership should know no region, and should know no boundary. Leadership must be for people, not just for some people.

That's a big question. So this one is in a little different light here. This is from Mrs. Vivian Donovan. "Don't you think the voting age should be the same age as the service age of 18?"

Well, I'm in the peculiar position of not being able to always give private opinions. But let me tell you how I want to answer that one. I was a United States Senator - I introduced Constitutional Amendment to set the voting age at age 18. I must caution you that there's a lot of difference between being a United States Senator and being a Vice-President. I'm a member now of a team ... of an administration ... and my individual judgement is put into the mix, and then finally we evaluate them all, and the President makes his decision. There has been no administration position taken on that, but a number of States have already amended their State Laws and State Constitutions for voting age, age 18, and I think that it's beginning to seem a much more receptive and responsible proposal than some people thought it some years back. Did I straddle that well enough?

(Laughter)

I believe here comes this sense of humor that I mentioned a moment ago. This is by Ben Lyle. This is, "Will LBJ run again?"

He will if I have anything to say about it. I think he will. Of course, the President hasn't made any firm decision on that matter, and I don't think one should expect him to do so at this stage. I know the President pretty well - I know of

his deep dedication to what he's trying to do, and if he feels that his candidacy will help promote what the objectives are that we've laid down, and that he's laid down, I think he will. And I keep saying we, now I must tell you that ... tell you a little bit about that.

Ordinarily, you don't speak that way, but, one day in the Senate when I was presiding, my friend, Everett Dirksen, the Minority Leader of the Senate, who is a delightful man, only politically misguided, otherwise (laughter) ... extraordinarily a fine man. He's a really truly great American. And he got up there to make a speech and he was just taking the hide off the President, and the Johnson Administration. And all at once, he cast his eyes up and he saw that I was presiding, and he said, "Ohhh" with that melodious voice, you know, that he has. He said, "I wouldn't want to put all of these burdens and responsibilities of defeat on the President of the United States. Already he is overburdened - there is no need of me cat... uh, castigating him and chastising him for all of the errors of his administration. I want to lay some of it at the feet of the Vice-President, Hubert Humphrey." And then he started to talk about the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. So I've accepted the dubious honor.

This next question is by Joe C. Mocquin. "Do you feel the Nike-X system is necessary as a deterrent to war?"

I think this will greatly depend upon what the ... the discussions with the Soviet Union will, uh, result in. If the discussions with the Soviet Union on the Anti-Ballistic Missile System are unproductive - if the Soviet Union is insistent upon engaging in another dimension of the arms race ... which I think would be very foolish on their part ... and not at all productive in terms of their ultimate defense - then indeed, we will be compelled to make some adjustment in our defenses. And what the nature of the deployment of an Anti-Ballistic Missile System will be is not for me to say from a public platform. This is a highly sensitive matter of national security. I can only tell you this - that your government has taken all of the steps in research and development so that if we have to, we are ready to ... at a moment's notice ... to start the deployment of an effective Anti-Ballistic Missile System along the line of the Nike-X system, which has been presented here in this question. We hope that we won't have to go through that expenditure. At a minimum it will be four to five billion dollars for what we call a thin system, and believe me, that's mighty thin ... and if we have to have an effective system which I believe, if you're going to have one,

you ought to have it effective ... you don't want to just protect some cities. You know, somebody said, "Well, we'll have it for twenty-five cities". I'd like to be in Congress on the day that they didn't take care of my city. Can you imagine Bob Jones not having to take care of Huntsville? But if you have an effective, or what you hope to be an effective Anti-Ballistic Missile System, it will cost from forty to fifty billions of dollars at current estimates, and that's just an estimate, and you know what an estimate means - that's just a wild guess that has little or no reality. So let us hope that we don't have to go down that path. But if we do, we are prepared to do it. And I think you ought to be reassured on this. I think you ought to know that we have put the money into the budget over the last two or three years fearing and worrying lest the day would come when we would be compelled to deploy such a system. And such a system as, uh, well known by the distinguished officers here of our United States Army, of our Air Force, of our other branches of the service so that, uh, we'll have adequate defense if we need it. But my dear friends, that will not give you real defense, because the power of the offensive weapon is so far superior to the power of the defensive weapon that what it means is, you just elevate the weapon structure. You move into a new plateau. It's like moving up - and I used to live

in Denver, from the 6,000 feet or 5,500 from Denver up into the mountains where you hit 10,000 feet and you're just up a little higher - it just means you draw your breath a little shorter - you're just a little bit more weary - and that's the way it'll be in the arms race. We hope and pray to cut back the arms race. But unilateral disarmament, my dear friends, is not a service to the cause of peace. Balanced disarmament on a multi-lateral basis - a multi-national basis ... where the balance is, the ratios are kept in balance ... is a contribution to peace. But for those who think that just to, just by speaking about disarmament, you promote the cause of peace, you only invite the aggressor. And let us never get into that position.

So the next question is from Robert P. Schwenn.

"Do you feel ex-Governor Wallace's Presidential Candidacy would help or hurt the Democratic ticket in the South in 1968?"

That's a dilly!

Well as I was saying to Bob Jones; there are a few questions that you ought to answer, Bob. Let me answer the question this way. Whoever runs for President in 1968 on any other ticket is not going to be President. I think Lyndon Johnson would be running for President in 1968 and I intend to do everything I can to help him get elected whether I'm on the ticket or not. And I think he'll be the next President of the United States and think the rest of them are just getting exercise. Thank you much.

I believe we have time for one more question. This is by Beirne Spragins and this question is:

"What is your opinion of the proposed merger of the National Guard and Reserved Forces?"

Oh man! I don't know. I really don't know. I...when I was in the Congress of the United States, I was a strong National Guardsman.

I want you to know that. But I'm just not sufficiently competent in the structure of our military forces to give you an informed and definitive answer. And I don't think that I'll contribute to the responsible discussion of this issue by getting up here and guessing at it. I do think, however, that this is a matter which is not strictly within the prerogatives of the Executive Branch. Our friends in the Congress are going to have a lot to say about this, and don't ever underestimate the collective intelligence of the Congress of the United States. I have only been away from it a few years, but much of that which is good for this country has been initiated in the Congress and much that would have been of impairment to this country has been stopped in the Congress. And I think we'll just have to rely upon first the proposals of the Executive Branch, the Department of Defense. I kind of think I know what some of those proposals might be even though it's not fully determined as yet. It has not been laid before the Congress and then we'll have to rely upon the cross-examination and the debate in the Congress of the United States. I expect it'll end up, my own feeling is, that it'll most likely end up about where it is. Where you'll have Reserves in National Guards.

You got another one?

We have quite a stack. Don't you think we might let Congressman Jones take these and prepare an answer to the rest of them?

I should say so. Let me just conclude then by saying that I appreciate these questions and I do like the opportunity of coming here to visit with you. The most important thing that we need to keep in mind, my fellow Americans, is that when we have differences of point of view, that we have those differences and exercise those differences in a responsible and in an intelligent manner. I don't think that we contribute to the processes of Democracy through undue emotion, passion, irrationality and demagoguery. The fact is that seldom do all of us know what is right. It's not at all difficult to do what's right if you know what's right. And the longer you're in public life, the more difficult it becomes to always know what is right. And the reason for it is there's so much information that comes to you. I get questions every day on economics, on the war, on foreign policy. And I'm staggered when I have to try and figure up an answer, because they're not all black and white. They're shades of grey. They're not all simple, that you can answer yes or no. The fact is that whatever answer you make, sets in effect a whole series of relationships which may cause another answer or even change in your original answer. So we need to be tolerant of one another. Be considerate of one another, and to recognize that there are no easy instant solutions to grave and complex problems.

We can add basic ideals and basic principles. I've tried to mention some of them to you tonight. And I must say,...

...here in this great part of this great State that if there's one thing that's evident today, to a nation that bears such tremendous burdens, to a nation to whom so many look, to a nation that's been blessed with such wealth and such power and yet at the same time has been burdened with such awesome responsibilities. If there's one thing that is quite obvious to me is that we need everybody in this country working at their desk. Every man, every woman, every child, regardless of their national origin, how they spell their last name, as I said earlier today, their race, their color, their creed, everyone of them is needed. And they need to be told they're needed. And we need to reach out to them, not to reject them, but to bring them in to make them participants in the community. And remember that that potential is there. It may not be obvious right now, but it is there. And we have learned that we do enrich our culture, we do expand our economy, we do make our country stronger and better as we include more people within what we call this main stream, is the word they use now, the main stream of American life. This is why our efforts in fields such as human rights and civil rights which are such explosive subjects in so many areas, that these contests and these discussions are so vital. We're going through a period of change. Fantastic change. Scientific and technological change that's shaking the foundations of society. Urbanization from rural society. Industrialization...

...from primitive society. Hundreds of...well, hundreds of millions of people gaining what they thought was their freedom, only to find that this thing that they call freedom was so illusive. That it's lost in their inadequacy, and their lack of capital, their lack of professional ability, their lack of know-how. These are the changes that are taking place, and changes are taking place in our America too. Not just in the rest of the world. Every place we go we hear people talk about rising expectations, as if it were all in Africa, or Asia, or Latin America.

My fellow Americans, rising expectations are here even more so when a person sees on television what the good life can be, he wants some of it. When people know that most people live in good homes and some are compelled to live in hovels, they don't like it. When they see other people making their decisions for them and they're not permitted to participate in the political process, they resent it. And there is no way that you can do anything about it except to come to grips with it and help people help themselves. To help people move into positions of citizenship responsibility. To include them in, rather than to keep them out. Because remember this, that a militant, aggressive, determined minority, whatever its cause, can cause unbelievable troubles to any majority. Some of us are here tonight representing the majority in this country. But that majority is no more stable, no more prosperous,...

...no more safe than the humblest member of the minority. And I've gone across this country for twenty-five years preaching the doctrine of one citizenship of one nation, indivisible, as I've said to you before, and with liberty not for Hubert Humphrey, or not for Frank Rose, or not for Carl Jones or Bob Jones alone, but for the meaning of liberty for everyone. The right of that person to make something out of his life, and to have the impediments removed so he can make something out of his life. And with justice. The Scriptures remind us in the Old Testament...the prophet Amos...that justice shall roll like a mighty river. And believe me, unless a society is just, it does not long endure. And it's our task to make it just because in that just society we're more safe. And in that just and free society, we're all stronger. This is the only way to look at it. It isn't easy. It'll be terribly difficult. We're going through a period of violence, of uncertainty, but we've got to ride it out... at home and abroad. And I noticed that some people seem to have lost faith. They wonder whether we can take it abroad. Of course, we can. If we can't, who can? If this great free nation can't last, which nation can? There isn't anyone that can compare to us. And if we falter, what do you expect of the weaker? If we can't keep our ideals and live by them, what do you expect of those of lesser strength and of lesser abundance or affluence? So we must be able to do what we are set out to do, at home and abroad.

And our goals are right. The goals of expanding the frontiers of freedom...abroad. And of making freedom meaningful at home, meaningful in jobs and education, in social acceptance and human dignity. That's what it's all about. And I have a feeling that you're going to do more about it right down here in some of these areas than we'll do about it some other places. And I want to salute you for your valiant efforts. Thank you very much.



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