

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

4-12-1977

### Best of Times - Worst of Times

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Best of Times - Worst of Times" (1977). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 1502.

[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/1502](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1502)

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

**BEST OF TIMES  
— WORST OF TIMES**

by  
**Senator Mike Mansfield**



ALFRED M. LANDON LECTURES ON PUBLIC ISSUES

1966

ALFRED M. LANDON  
New Challenges in International  
Relations

1967

RALPH MCGILL  
The Emerging South: Politics and Issues  
GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
Higher Education: Its Role in  
Contemporary America  
GOVERNOR GEORGE ROMNEY  
The Challenge of International  
Development

1968

SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY  
Conflict in Vietnam and at Home  
GOVERNOR NELSON A.  
ROCKEFELLER  
Our Country's Problems, Solutions  
ARTHUR SCHLESINGER  
The 1968 Election: An Historical  
Perspective

1969

SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD  
A Pacific Perspective  
GENERAL W. C. WESTMORELAND  
The Role of the US Army in Today's  
World  
SENATOR EDWARD W. BROOKE  
National Security: Dollars, Demands and  
Dilemmas

1970

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
How We Can Make Our Government  
Work  
ARCHBISHOP FULTON J. SHEEN  
Three Forms of Love  
SECRETARY WALTER J. HICKEL  
Be Part of the Solution, Not Part of the  
Problem  
PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON  
It's Time to Stand Up and Be Counted  
CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN  
The Alternative Is Chaos

1971

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT  
Implications of Foreign Policy  
JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH  
Foreign Policy: The Next Reform  
LEONARD WOODCOCK  
The Economic Game Plan

1972

SECRETARY ELLIOT RICHARDSON  
Human Needs and Government—A  
Realistic Assessment  
WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS  
The Crisis of Trust and the  
Environmental Movement  
SECRETARY EARL L. BUTZ  
The Future Belongs to Those Who  
Prepare for It  
DAN RATHER  
Reporter's Notes

1973

REAR ADMIRAL ALAN SHEPARD  
How Do We Stand in Space?  
GENERAL ALEXANDER M. HAIG  
A Strategic Overview  
WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY  
The Assault on the Free Market

1974

ANNE ARMSTRONG  
Crisis and Challenge  
BILLY GRAHAM  
The Divine Answer to the National  
Dilemma  
WALTER W. HELLER  
The Energy Crisis and the Economy

1975

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT  
Energy and the Middle East: Interests  
and Illusions  
SECRETARY WILLIAM E. SIMON  
Restoring Our Prosperity  
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN  
The World in the Year Ahead

1976

SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON  
America and Freedom's Future  
SENATOR CHARLES McC. MATHIAS,  
JR.  
The Alternatives to Detente  
CARL T. ROWAN  
What Jimmy Carter's Election Will Mean  
SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON  
1977: Year of Opportunity in the Middle  
East?

1977

SENATOR CHARLES H. PERCY  
Does the United States have a  
Responsibility to Feed the World?  
SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD  
Best of Times—Worst of Times

Best of Times — Worst of Times  
MANSFIELD

**BEST OF TIMES  
— WORST OF TIMES**

**By  
Senator Mike Mansfield**

**Alfred M. Landon Lectures on Public Issues**

**Tuesday  
April 12, 1977**

**Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas**

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
ALFRED M. LONDON LECTURES ON PUBLIC ISSUES**

In December, 1966, Kansas State University inaugurated a lecture series honoring a most distinguished Kansan and elder statesman, Alfred M. Landon, and exploring the area of his lifelong interest—public issues. The lectures are a tribute to Governor Landon, not only as a governor of Kansas and candidate for the presidency of the United States, but also as a spokesman of unusual spirit and dedication on public issues.

**Duane Acker, President  
B.L. Flinchbaugh, Chairman  
Landon Lecture Series**

## Best of Times—Worst of Times

by Senator Mike Mansfield

Over the years, Europe has pulled the interests of this country in its direction but ever since the founding of the Republic, Asia has pushed us in that direction.

Unfortunately, Southeast Asia, along with Latin America, both seem to rank low on the totem pole of U.S. foreign policy. We talk about NATO, Africa in recent months, the Middle East it seems perennially, the Soviet Union always, and all those areas get much more attention than do the two previously mentioned.

But the thrust of our country has always been westward, even before the revolution. It meant the opening of new frontiers, the settling of Kansas and Montana, the Pacific Coast, it meant the opening of the China trade. When George Washington was inaugurated as the first president of this Republic, there were 13 American clippers in the harbor of Canton. It meant Commodore Perry in the last century opening up the isolated empire of Japan, which until that time had been by and large for several centuries under the control of the Shogunates. It meant Dewey and the Spanish American war, our interests in the Philippines, an interest which exists even to this day because it, along with Japan, form the westernmost defenses insofar as the security of this country is concerned.

It meant statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, both westward. It meant the acquisition of the trust territory at the end of the second war. It meant Korea and it meant Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and it meant war, tragically. It also marked the beginning of the opening of the door between the People's Republic of China and the United States. It proved that foreign policies are not always infallible because one of the reasons we went into Indochina was to contain China and now the wheel has turned.

On April 10, 1975, two years and two days ago, in an address to a joint session President Ford asked the Congress to approve one billion dollars in military and economic aid for South Vietnam. The next day American embassy personnel were evacuated from Phnom Penh. The end of an era was at hand. By the last of that month it was all over, less than two years ago. In Saigon and Phnom Penh the governments of generals Thieu and Lon Nol were out and new governments were in. Thus ended the final chapter in a disastrous and tragic policy to contain a non-aggressive China.

Where do we stand in Asia two years later? What lessons have we learned from this attempt to interfere in vast lands and people halfway around the globe? It is time to take stock.

Since President Nixon's visit to Peking in 1972, the winds of change have blown throughout Asia. After more than two decades of hostility and confrontation, the United States and China began the journey to normalization of relations, a journey still far from completed. At last our nation's policy is now grounded on fact that the United States is not an Asian power but a Pacific power.

The difference is more than semantic. It is the difference between a sensible acceptance of the realities of Asia and the dangerous allusion of military omnipotence. What takes place in that vast region is of concern to Americans, but

concern and control are quite different matters. Simply stated, America's principal long-range interests in the Far East are to avoid domination of the region by any single power, to maintain friendly relations with China, Japan and other nations, and to lessen tensions which could trigger either a local or a great power conflict in the area.

Let us first look at the People's Republic of China, the home for one-quarter of the people on this globe. President Nixon's journey was only the first step on the path to normalization of relations with China. The Shanghai communique was not a document of flesh and blood. It was a skeleton to which the sinews were to be added by both countries.

In the five years since that document was issued some flesh has been added in the form of trade, cultural, educational, and scientific exchanges and visits to China by government officials including members of Congress. One such group is there at the present time. But the basic myth of the old China policy, the obstacle to normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China remains. The United States officially still treats the government of Taiwan as the government of China.

The pertinent provisions of the Shanghai communique to which President Nixon and Premier Chou En-lai both affixed their signatures in February of 1972 reads as follows:

4

"The United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain that there is but one China and that Taiwan is part of China. The United States government does not challenge that position. It reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves. With this prospect in mind it affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations in Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes."

I interpret the Shanghai communique to mean that the United States recognizes that the Chinese Civil War was over and that the eventual goal was full and formal normalization of relations between the People's Republic of China and the United States. So did former President Nixon and so did Chou En-lai. And so have former President Ford, and all indications point to the present administration following along the lines to full normalization of relations between our two countries eventually. A decision, which incidentally, cannot be made by the Congress, but under the Constitution, is the sole prerogative of the President of the United States, whom ever he may be.

He has the right to recognize or to withdraw recognition, and recognition does not mean, under the Cranston Resolution which passed the Senate unanimously in 1971, that it approves the form of government which is in existence and to which recognition has been extended.

President Ford said in Honolulu on December 7, 1975, that on his recent visit to China he "reaffirmed the determination of the United States to complete the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China on the basis of the Shanghai communique."

The Shanghai communique stated that the U.S. would "progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes." With the end of the war in Indochina two years ago, tension in the area, which conceivably could have justified retention of United States forces on Taiwan ended. But there are still approximately 1,500 American servicemen on that island, down from 10,000 in 1972.

In addition to the regular forces, the U.S. maintains a military advisory mission to advise the Taiwan forces on how best to fight the forces of the People's Republic. We also continue to supply Taiwan with large quantities of weapons—\$611 million worth over the last four years, much of that financed on long term government credits. The last administration proposed to sell \$182.5 million more in military equipment to Taiwan by the end of this fiscal year and \$43 million more on credit.

Looking eastward, the partnership between United States and Japan is the fundamental pillar of American policy in Asia. Japan and the United States are military partners. Japan's continued trust in the validity of the United States security commitment is essential to the maintenance of stability throughout the region because a Japan embarked in search of security on its own by way of a major military expansion would unsettle all of Asia. Japan is almost wholly dependent on foreign raw materials to supply its greatly expanded industrial plants. Asian memories of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere are still not forgotten. There have been pressures from the Pentagon for Japan to expand its military forces. I urged the greatest caution in pushing Japan in such a direction. There ought not to be grounds for Japan to have to doubt the U.S. security guarantee and no compelling reasons for the Japanese to make a significant change in their defense policy. Any other course, in my judgment, is playing with fire in the western Pacific. I was deeply concerned about the fallout from the Lockheed Affair on U.S.-Japan relations. This episode and other examples of payoffs in shady American business deals abroad demonstrates the need for reforms inside this nation and an international code of business ethics. This is an appropriate problem for the United Nations, if it will, to tackle. Both buying and selling nations should unite to seek a remedy to cure the dry rot which now afflicts international business dealers.

5

As to the present situation, it was in the interest of all concerned that American and Japanese officials handle the problem in such a manner as to minimize the adverse impact on our relationship. Maintenance of a close relation with Japan should continue to have the highest priority in U.S. policy toward Asia.

Korea, the last remnant of the failure of U.S. policy in Asia, is a time bomb which must be diffused. The United States objectives should be to bring about a settlement between the two Koreas and, in the interim, to ease tension and lessen the possibility for a resumption of hostilities. U.S. policy should not be hostage to any particular government in Korea or anywhere else for that matter. That lesson should have been learned finally in Vietnam and Cambodia, where two generals, Thieu and Lon Nol, became the tails that wagged the dog. Are we to suffer the same experience in South Korea?

Nearly a quarter of a century after the end of the Korean War over 40,000 U.S. troops remain in Korea at a cost to the taxpayers of \$580 million annually. Many are on the DMZ line, in positions which would automatically thrust the United States into the thick of the fighting, should hostilities between the North and South break out again. Indeed, they are there for precisely that purpose, as a tripwire.

U.S. nuclear weapons are also stored in South Korea according to former Secretary of Defense Schlesinger, adding to the dangers of the situation. Our forces in the last bastion on the Asian mainland should be reduced as President Carter has advocated, has promised and has told Prime Minister Fukuda would be reduced over a period of time. And all nuclear weapons, in my opinion, should be removed. In the meantime, the U.S. should re-examine the tripwire concept at



the DMZ. It may be that a more appropriate approach might be to seek and negotiate an even wider demilitarized zone.

The United States must do more than it has in the past to break the impasse in Korea. We should have learned from the long and costly effort to contain the People's Republic of China that quarantine is a reaction, not a substitute for foreign policy, which seeks to solve a problem.

It is in the interest of the Korean people, North and South, for the United States and world peace, that contact be made between the two Koreas to help to minimize the risk of military clash and to facilitate an accommodation between North and South.

In Southeast Asia the foremost task for U.S. policy remains to recognize the reality in Indochina.

The last administration's policy of opposition to trade and commercial relations with Vietnam or Cambodia, and the failure to send an ambassador to Laos, has something in it of the ostrich complex. The fact is that just as China was not ours to lose in 1949, neither was Indochina a quarter of a century later.

That was not the tragedy for us. The tragedy was that the war was allowed to begin and to continue so long. And that so many lives were so needlessly lost.

6 Although the shooting war is over, economic warfare continues as a cornerstone of U.S. policy. There is no way, no way that a unilateral U.S. trade embargo against Vietnam or Cambodia can be effective in a competitive world. Containment is not a policy, it is only a petulant reaction. It is time that the United States act toward the governments of Indochina which have regained their independence in a spirit which seeks to heal the wounds of war.

Like it or not, a unified Vietnam will be a major source of strength, and a major force in Southeast Asia. It is in our long-range interest to accommodate to this fact and make the best out of the new situation.

I share the desire of all Americans to learn whatever can be learned of the missing in action in Indochina; but we can hardly expect to do so by refusing to have anything to do with the new governments of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. The most effective way to obtain information about these MIAs, I should think, is through face-to face, on-the-spot official dealings as the Indochina mission, headed by Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers of America, attempted to do last month.

That is not likely overall without normalization of diplomatic and other relations. The administration has decided to open talks with Vietnam on the range of issues between us, the talks to take place, I believe, in Paris either this month or next and that is a step in the right direction.

In Thailand the United States faces a delicate situation. The question of continued military presence had become a major issue in internal politics, a further manifestation of the forces of nationalism at work in Southeast Asia. All United States forces, except for a small military assistance group, have now left the country, thus bringing to a close an attempt to maintain a second military toehold on the Asian mainland.

The action taken by the Thai government before the last military coup d'état, is both in its interest and the interest of the American people. The closing of the U.S. bases may help to improve the prospects for an easing of tensions between Thailand and Vietnam; an arrangement much to be desired.

What the present Thai government will do still remains to be seen. A smoldering insurgency in the northeast, a genuine fear of Vietnam's intentions, and the continued existence of the SEATO treaty commitment to Thailand—the

only country to which the treaty has practical application—all add up to a sensitive and volatile situation for the United States in that country.

Elsewhere in Southeast Asia there are no major policy problems. Burma continues to go its own way and its government has no desire to open its doors to large-scale foreign economic intervention by the United States or any other country. There is in Burma, however, a danger that overzealous and costly pursuit of poppies may result not so much in a lessening of the supply of dangerous drugs but in involving this nation in Burma's internal affairs and the continued fight of the government against various insurgencies.

A close rein should be kept on anti-narcotics activities, both there and elsewhere in the region.

In the Philippines, the outstanding problem concerns the terms for continued use of the military bases at Clark and Subic Bay, both necessary, in my opinion, as our outer line of defense in the Pacific.

Appropriate recognition of Philippine sovereignty is the issue here. Negotiations to meet this issue have begun between the two countries. I believe that a mutually satisfactory agreement can be reached, given the fact that we want to stay and the Philippine government wants us to stay.

U.S.-Indonesian relations are relatively trouble-free. But this land of 140 million people has a growing gap between rich and poor, which vast amounts of foreign aid, new oil revenues and outside investments seem only to have accentuated.

In both the Philippines and Indonesia, the debacle in Indochina, coupled with the change in U.S. policy toward China, has stimulated new interest in regional cooperation and a reappraisal of basic international relationships.

As new relationships evolve in Southeast Asia, a new spirit of self-reliance and regional cooperation is emerging. It is in our own interests to encourage and to accommodate to this new spirit.

One of the most promising developments is the growth of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), comprised of Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore. This genuinely local arrangement is showing much promise. Although the recent meetings of the heads of state did not produce any startling agreements, it did reaffirm a mutual desire to explore and to develop common regional interests.

Expanding its membership to include Burma and the nations of Indochina, a future possibility, would result in a region-wide organization of great potential for stability in that area. A regional zone of peace and freedom encompassing all the nations of Southeast Asia would be a giant step in that direction.

Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it, [George] Santayna wrote. The era of military adventure on the Asian mainland is over. As a result of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, the American people now have a more realistic view of what, as a practical matter, we can and cannot do. They now know that it is not possible, or even desirable, to remake ancient cultures in our own image. There is a sober realization of the limits of American's resources and power.

As was true of America in the past, the America of the future will be the beacon to the world, not because of its military might, or foreign aid diplomacy, but because of what it stands for in furthering human aspirations for freedom and a better way of life for all people.

America is not becoming isolationist. There is, in fact, a growing awareness of the interdependence of the world and the need to tackle common problems on

a multi-lateral basis. As U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim quoted in a recent speech, "people are not turning away from ideas of world interdependence. What they are turning away from are outmoded and unworkable ways of trying to deal with the world."

I would say that today, the United States' position in Asia is more favorable than it has been since the end of World War II. We enjoy good relations, except for North Korea and those in Indochina which until recently we ignored by choice. Both we and the nations of the region have a better understanding of what it takes to live in peace in a diverse world.

There is no war. American troops, except in South Korea, are coming home from the Asian mainland. And the economic burden of our overseas political involvement is lessened. There is an agenda of unfinished business to be sure. But the problems are manageable.

What is needed is a will to clear away the remaining relics of outdated policies and to face up to the present and the future and to learn from the past.

And speaking of the past, during the 34 years that I had been in the Congress, it is to be noted that World War II was ended; that this country joined the U.N.; that the Marshall Plan was inaugurated—the greatest reconstruction effort the world has ever known and the most productive; that we became a member of NATO and signed a treaty which I think is the most significant in our history.

We grossly emphasized dollar diplomacy and the use of military pacts and power as a substitute for sound progressive policy. We tried to contain China in response to the emotional but false issue of "Who Lost China?"

The McCarthy era was spawned which did untold damage to this country. We faced up to the issue of equality for all our citizens; we fought a war in Korea; we became mesmerized by the "pact-omania" which controlled U.S. policy abroad for so long, and was dependant on signing so many treaties that we lost track of them; and we fought an unwise, an unnecessary and a tragic war in Vietnam.

All this, and it is only a part of our history over the past 34 years.

Retirements—I use the word advisedly in view of my recent appointment—are occasions for looking to the past and to the future. They are a time to take stock.

Any time is an appropriate time for Americans to reflect how well we as a people have lived up to the ideals of the Founding Fathers. What America stands for in the world today and what kind of a world we want to leave to you, and what kind of a world you want to leave your children.

I would like to share with you some reflections on events of the last third of a century and how the future looks to me. Several years after our Constitution created the United States of America, Charles Dickens, referring to the events surrounding the French Revolution, wrote, "It has been the best of times and the worst of times."

That is how I would describe the last third of a century for our country. When I took my seat in the House of Representatives, the nation's population was less than 135 million and largely rural. Today it is approaching 220 million, and it is 78 percent urban.

The exotic, Buck Rogers devices in the science fiction magazines of that time, a quarter of a century ago, have become today's realities, along with their mixed potential for advancing human welfare and man's capacity to brutalize his fellow man.

The frontiers of science have been pushed forward far more rapidly than has been man's capacity to learn to live in harmony with nature and with his fellow man.

In the years since, many resources have been channeled into social programs to help the poor, but America's cities deteriorate rapidly and steadily. Their livability for the poor, who cannot afford to escape, declines as the tax burden rises for those who must pay the bills for essential public services.

Although there has been a virtual revolution in race relations since I came to Washington, that revolution is far from concluded. More money, more laws and more government programs are not necessarily the answer.

The basic need is to structure the social system in a more equitable fashion. To break the vicious circle of poverty, joblessness and welfare.

Whether one is born on the right or wrong side of the economic tracks is still too significant and controlling a factor in American life.

With the coming of the mid-60s, the peace of the Eisenhower years, the bright promise of the Kennedy years faded in the haze of burning cities, and in the elephant grass of Indochina. As both President Johnson and the Congress became increasingly absorbed by the Southeast Asian War, attention was distracted from the problems here at home, with families torn apart as in the Civil War, with neighbor pitted against neighbor and ultimately with the government house divided as well.

Those aspects of this era seem to be forgotten.

The ultimate costs of this tragedy, which took the lives of 56,000 Americans, wounded 305,000 more Americans, cost \$150 billion up to this time and drove tens of thousands of our young into exile are incalculable.

Public opposition mounted with the casualty lists, culminating in the eruption on the campuses and in the streets, following the administration's 1970 order for the invasion of Cambodia.

Even the passage of the 26th amendment, giving 18-year-olds the right to vote—an act long overdue for a nation which throughout its history had sent adolescents into battle but not allowed them to have a voice in choosing those responsible for sending them—did little to pacify the anti-government attitudes of the young. Only an end to the discriminatory draft system brought a measure of relief.

However there are pluses in our constitutional system from this sad chapter in our history. For one, Congress, led by the Senate, began to resume its proper role as a somewhat equal partner with the President in the making of foreign policy. For the first time, Congress forced a president to end American involvement in a foreign war by use of its constitutional power over the purse strings.

From a modest effort in 1969 to avoid U.S. involvement in the ground war in Laos, Congress steadily enacted a series of restrictions on President Nixon's authority to wage war in Southeast Asia, culminated in 1973 by prohibiting use of funds for any further American military involvement in Indochina.

But, even after that decisive step, a proxy war fed by American dollars continued for another 18 months, ending only in the final debacle in the fall of Phnom Penh and Saigon.

What lessons have we learned from this sad chapter? Our nation is neither omnipotent nor are our resources unlimited. Yet executive branch officials were still too prone to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations.

Only six months after the final end of the Indochina war, executive branch

officials urged that the United States become more deeply involved in civil war in Angola, a situation where no vital American interests were even remotely involved. Congress, fresh from ending American involvement in a civil war in Asia, refused to allow America to become involved in Africa, and wisely prohibited funds for the administration's proposal. The American people, more than Washington officials, have a new and realistic awareness of the limits of America's power to influence and shape events in far off lands.

As Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos symbolized an unprecedented failure of American policy abroad, Watergate symbolized an unprecedented threat to our constitutional system here at home.

Initially the burglary of the Watergate apartment complex excited little public interest. Its impact on the 1972 presidential election campaign was negligible. But several months later, as Americans opened their arms to returning American POWs following the January, 1973 Vietnam ceasefire agreement, the true dimensions of Watergate began to unfold. The trauma of an unpopular war in Indochina was succeeded by a threat of a different but more frightening kind which compounded growing deep public skepticism about the American political process.

There came a period of hammer blows to the American political system.

- 10
1. Disclosures of a vast pattern of political chicanery and law-breaking by high government officials.
  2. The resignation of a vice president which enabled him to avoid criminal prosecution.
  3. The resignation of a president which enabled him to avoid the impeachment process.
  4. Revelations of widespread violations of the civil rights of American citizens by government agencies.
  5. Gross misconduct by intelligence agencies in the name of national security.

The outcome of these events, rather than being cause for despair, gives cause for renewed confidence. The inherent strength of our constitutional system has been revalidated. Watergate shows once more that the Founding Fathers did their work well, extremely well. The system they devised not only endures but that system has been strengthened.

Watergate in its full meaning was far more than a second rate burglary, as an administration press spokesman initially described it. It was an effort:

1. To subvert our system of separation of powers.
2. To make Congress and the courts impotent in dealing with executive crimes.
3. To cripple our political processes and the party system.
4. To deceive the people through fraud and secrecy.
5. To muzzle the press through intimidation.
6. To make a mockery of important guarantees in the Bill of Rights.

In essence, Watergate was an attempt by the administration to put itself above the law. But as Henry Steele Commager said, "in the end it was the law that imposed its majesterial authority upon the President."

Americans can take pride in how the legislative and judicial branches responded to the chief executive's disregard for the rule of law and his attempts to undermine the Constitution.

It was the Senate that perceived in late '72 the full constitutional significance of the actions that came to be known as the Watergate "dirty tricks."

It was the Senate which took the initiative, through the Ervin Committee investigation, to bring under the public spotlight the national wrongs symbolized by Watergate.

It was the Senate which insisted on setting up a special prosecutor for investigating and pursuing the Watergate crimes, knowing full well that the Justice Department could not be relied upon to do the job.

It was our independent judicial system, from the District Court to the Supreme Court, which insisted on developing the truth, resisting efforts by the President to suppress evidence of criminal misconduct and meting out justice in accordance with the evidence.

It was the Congress, in this instance the House of Representatives, which started the constitutional process to determine a president's guilt for high crimes and misdemeanors, a process thwarted only by resignation.

Not only did the Congress, Courts and the special prosecutors each do their jobs to protect and defend the Constitution in the Watergate affair, but the press also did its duty, doggedly pursuing the facts in the face of intimidating pressures from governmental institutions. Instead of a bloodletting for the vitality of our Constitution, Watergate gave it a transfusion.

Notwithstanding the political turmoil of the last decade, a decade of war, political corruption at the highest levels, and a terrible recession, our democratic system is strong and it is healthy. I believe that recent generations, whose faith in government may have been momentarily shaken, have a strong desire to make self-government work.

At every level of government, from Congress to City Hall, individuals and public interest groups are making an impact on the decision-making process as never before. They are proving that an individual can make an impact in our system and that an individual does count.

Decisions being made by Congress, administrative agencies and the Courts, reflect that fact.

There is a large and unfinished agenda of business ahead for the Republic. Our attention has been distracted too long by fleeting crises, which have left the nation's political leaders with too little time for reflection about where our country should be going and how to get there.

It is not easy for individuals to throw off long time habits or for governments to change outmoded policies. But daily living is a matter of constant decision-making, adapting to new situations and needs. So it must be with the government. Policies and institutions must be shaped to fit the needs of the future and not the past.

If freedom is to survive and prosper in the world, mankind must do better at living and working together. More emphasis must be put on the common good, and less on individual self-aggrandizement. "A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom," said Judge Learned Hand, "soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few."

Democracy is a very demanding system, a difficult and fragile form of human activity at best. "It is," Winston Churchill wrote, "the worst form of government, except all these other forms that have been tried from time to time."

The world's resources must be shared by four billion people today, and they are finite. It took from the beginning of mankind until about 1850 for the world's

population to reach one billion. It took only 15 years for the total to increase from three to four billion, and we can expect that number to double by shortly after the turn of the century.

This means that the world's supply of housing, food, clothing and all the other essentials required to meet day-to-day human needs must be doubled, at least within the next quarter of a century. The nations of the world must learn to work together to meet this challenge and to solve the problems of recurring wars, pollution, and overexploitation of natural resources.

Today Americans and people everywhere are coming to understand the eternal truth that John Donne described: "No man is an island entire of the main. Never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

Man is the only animal which kills its own kind, and its capacity for mass destruction grows far more rapidly than its capacity to live in peace in a diverse world.

Mankind shares but two things in life, this globe and the future. Swords have not been beaten into plowshares. World tensions have lessened it is true, but the growth of nuclear arsenals and man's capacity to destroy all life on earth continues apace.

12 The nation's Founding Fathers were men of vision and courage. They dared to dream the impossible dream. And as a result gave birth to a government which has ever since become a beacon of hope for mankind. We have not yet attained perfection in the goals set for our union. The purpose of the government the Founding Fathers established was not to create Utopia, but to engage in a continuing quest for a balance between liberty and social justice as life itself is a constant search for meaning.

The responsibility for continuation of that quest rests with each individual because each of us is a custodian of our individual liberties and ultimately the fate of civilization.

After a third of a century of observing the response of the American people to challenge, I look to the future not with despair, but with confidence. The torch of history passes on. How it is used will determine ours and the world's future. May you of the younger generations profit from our mistakes and those which in the course of human events you will make.

My fervent prayer is that you will do better than we have done. I think you will learn from the past, face up to the reality of the present and confront the future with faith in our country and confidence in yourselves.

I wish you well.

## PATRONS OF THE LANDON LECTURE SERIES

Mr. & Mrs. Charles S. Arthur  
Mr. & Mrs. Willard E. Balderson  
Dr. & Mrs. George S. Bascom  
Miss Mary E. Border  
Mr. & Mrs. Charles L. Brainard  
Mr. & Mrs. Fred C. Bramlage  
Mr. E. C. Bray  
Mr. & Mrs. Robert H. Brewer  
Mrs. Helen Brockman  
Mr. & Mrs. Bruce W. Buehler  
Dr. & Mrs. Paul E. Bullock  
Dr. & Mrs. James C. Carey  
Mr. & Mrs. Robert Clack  
Mr. & Mrs. Don E. Combs  
Mrs. Charles S. Cook  
Mr. & Mrs. Glenn G. Crofoot  
Mrs. Roe R. Cross  
Mr. & Mrs. W. G. Daly  
Mr. & Mrs. W. F. Danenbarger  
Mr. & Mrs. Robert L. DeBruyn  
Mr. & Mrs. William D. Denholm  
Dr. & Mrs. R. D. Dragsdorf  
Dr. & Mrs. William R. Durkee  
Mr. & Mrs. William R. Eidson  
Mr. & Mrs. Conrad J. K. Eriksen  
Mr. & Mrs. Wilfred F. Farrell  
Mr. & Mrs. R. J. Fegan  
Mr. & Mrs. Bernd Foerster  
Dr. & Mrs. Ellsworth M. Gerritz  
Mr. Kenton L. Glasscock  
Mr. & Mrs. Jack Goldstein  
Mr. & Mrs. Mont J. Green, Jr.  
Mrs. Thomas J. Griffith  
Mr. & Mrs. Arthur Groesbeck, Jr.  
Mr. & Mrs. James C. Hammel  
Mr. & Mrs. Tom W. Hampton  
Dr. Ruth Hoeflin  
Mr. & Mrs. Alvin A. Hostetler  
Mr. & Mrs. Charles H. Hostetler  
Dr. & Mrs. Harold Howe  
Mr. & Mrs. Philip Howe  
Mr. & Mrs. Kenneth E. Johnson

Mr. & Mrs. Philip Kassebaum  
Mr. & Mrs. Ward A. Keller  
Mr. & Mrs. O. W. Kershaw  
Kevin & Barbro Kirk  
Mr. & Mrs. Robert F. Logan  
Mrs. James C. Martyn  
Mrs. Frank H. Meek  
Mr. & Mrs. Joseph H. Mills  
Mr. & Mrs. John D. Montgomery  
Dr. & Mrs. Robert T. Morrison  
Dr. & Mrs. Gerald L. Mowry  
Mr. & Mrs. Leon B. Mugler  
Mr. & Mrs. Dennis A. Mullin  
Mr. & Mrs. Terry A. Pearson  
Miss Caroline F. Peine  
Judge & Mrs. Richard D. Rogers  
Mr. & Mrs. S. M. Samarra  
Mr. & Mrs. Herbert W. Sandell  
Mr. & Mrs. Thad M. Sandstrom  
Dr. Leonard W. Schruben  
Mr. & Mrs. Edward L. Seaton  
Mr. & Mrs. Richard M. Seaton  
Mr. & Mrs. Grice Sexton  
Mr. & Mrs. John Simpson  
Mr. & Mrs. Thomas W. Skinner  
Dr. & Mrs. Floyd W. Smith  
Mr. & Mrs. Robert J. Smith  
Mr. & Mrs. Leo W. Stolzer  
Mr. & Mrs. Richard L. Thiessen  
Mr. & Mrs. Bernard L. Ulrich  
Mrs. Harry Valentine  
Mr. & Mrs. Fred Vandegrift  
Mr. & Mrs. Paul Van Nostran  
Mr. & Mrs. T. William Varney  
Dr. Arthur D. Weber  
Mr. & Mrs. Ralph L. Weir, Jr.  
Mr. & Mrs. Merrill H. Werts  
Miss Christine Wiggins  
Mr. & Mrs. J. Robert Wilson  
Mr. & Mrs. Floyd O. Wolfenbarger



