

*The National Broadcasting Company Presents*



# M E E T   T H E   P R E S S

*America's Press Conference of the Air*

*Produced by*    LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

*Guest:*    HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
*The Vice President*

SPECIAL EDITION

AUGUST 25, 1968

---

*Merkle Press Inc.*

*Printers and Periodical Publishers*

*Division of Publishers Co. Inc.*

*Box 2111, Washington, D. C. 20013*

10 cents per copy

*Panel:* ERWIN D. CANHAM, *Christian Science Monitor*  
JOHN H. JOHNSON, *Ebony and Jet*  
VERMONT ROYSTER, *Wall Street Journal*  
JOHN COWLES, JR., *Minneapolis Star &*  
*Minneapolis Tribune*  
JOHN B. OAKES, *The New York Times*  
THOMAS VAIL, *Cleveland Plain Dealer*

*Moderator:* LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

*Permission is hereby granted to news media and magazines to reproduce in whole or in part. Credit to NBC's MEET THE PRESS will be appreciated.*

## MEET THE PRESS

---

**MR. SPIVAK:** The Democratic National Convention opens tomorrow and our guest today for this special one-hour edition of MEET THE PRESS is the Vice President, Hubert H. Humphrey, a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy was also invited to appear on this program.

Interviewing the Vice President is a panel of six of the nation's most distinguished publishers and editors.

(Announcements)

**MR. ROYSTER:** Mr. Vice President, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has consistently taken the position that you would not stop the bombing of North Vietnam unilaterally. In fact, President Johnson reiterated that in his VFW speech just recently, and now in Chicago the McGovern-McCarthy forces have come up with a peace plank which calls for an immediate halt to the bombing, an early withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam, supporting the idea of a coalition government with the Viet Cong in it. Could you run on such a platform, Mr. Vice President?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** That will not be the platform. That is a minority position, I am confident, in the Democratic Convention. I am happy to note that the McCarthy-McGovern effort at the Platform Committee has made some change from previous position. For example, there is no request for a unilateral withdrawal on the part of the United States, which I think would have been disastrous.

Secondly, insofar as the coalition government is concerned, that has been, I'd say, somewhat reduced in terms at least of its preciseness in the McCarthy-McGovern presentation.

My position on the Vietnam War and our effort to gain peace is as it has been. I believe that we could and should stop the remaining bombing of the North if we receive indication that there is restraint and reasonable response from Hanoi. I think that is a common sense provision.

**MR. ROYSTER:** Would you as President, be willing to accept a coalition government with the Viet Cong unit as a part of the negotiations if it were to come out of the Paris group? Would you accept that?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I believe in free elections. I do not believe that the government of South Vietnam should be designed and imposed either from Washington or Hanoi. I believe that if the people of South Vietnam want to—whatever form of government they wish, whatever they wish to elect is their business. That is why we are there. We are there for the principle of self-determination. We are not there to force American will or American convenience upon the peoples of South Vietnam.

There isn't any problem at all in my mind about the one man-one vote, that all the peoples of South Vietnam who are willing to accept the results of an election and who are willing to engage peacefully in such an election process ought to be permitted to engage in the political processes—

**MR. ROYSTER:** That would include the Viet Cong.

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** It would include all people who are willing to accept the results of an election and engage in the peaceful political processes of an election. That would mean that those who are involved would have to renounce the use of force insofar as being able to gain their objective.

**MR. ROYSTER:** You have said several times, Mr. Vice President, about Vietnam, you have mentioned the "lessons" we have learned from Vietnam. That is the quote you have used. What are these lessons you would apply if you were President of the United States? Would that mean you would not get us involved? Would you not intervene in foreign actions? We would return to isolation? What are these lessons we have learned from Vietnam?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** One lesson surely is not to return to isolationism.—Isolationism has no place of responsibility on the part of people or governments in the modern world. This is a world that is more closely knit than ever before.

**MR. ROYSTER:** Do you think—the people who are urging us now to get out of Vietnam, do you think they are being isolationist?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** No, I use the term that you offered, sir. I do believe there are some in our country today who have become very frustrated with the world in which we live because it does not yield itself or lend itself to prompt and quick remedies, and they want to withdraw. But some of the lessons I would imagine we will have learned from Vietnam are, for example, the importance of the development of political institu-

tions, as well as the application of economic and military assistance. I think we have to be very selective in our commitments as well around the world. I think we really have to assess what is in our national interest, and then we need to ask ourselves before we commit forces or large sums of money or manpower: Will these people really help themselves? Are they willing to work together in cooperation with their neighbors in the region for their own common defense or their own self-defense?

I believe those are some of the lessons that we can gain out of this rather costly and tragic experience.

**MR. CANHAM:** Mr. Vice President, do you think there is somewhat of a conservative tide running in the United States?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I think there is a tide running in the United States of deep concern over whether or not we are able to face up to the many problems that confront us today.

This tide lends itself, again, to the spirit of withdrawal, hopefully that we can just ignore some of these matters for a while and that things will work out all right. I think that is wrong.

No, I do not believe there is a conservative tide. I think there is a tide in America, a spirit that wants to see genuine, step-by-step, steady, social progress. But they want to see it without the destruction of institutions or of things or people. They want to see progress with order, and they would like to have a degree of order with progress.

I am concerned, as all Americans are, with some of the developments that we see when people become overly anxious, when they turn to violence, which I think is the wrong way of gaining any social objective. This is what I believe the American people feel.

I believe there is a basic goodness in the American people that can be called into action, and one of the reasons I want to run for President and one of the reasons I wish to be the President of this country is to call upon that basic goodness that can help meet the problems of our times.

**MR. CANHAM:** How do you relate this feeling of concern with the policies of this administration? Has it been intensified by the policies of the administration or has it been not?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Somebody said to me the other day, he said, "You know, Mr. Vice President, you have to recognize that we are in a great period of change," and I said, "That is constant. Change is inevitable. The only question is, can you make change your ally? Can you in a sense fashion the forces of change for constructive purpose?"

I think we have been doing that, and in a sense part of the restlessness in America today is the fact that people now begin to see that they do not have to live in the abominable conditions

of poverty and slumism to which many people have been forced in the past. They see that there can be a better day. In fact, this very instrument that we are using now, the television, has brought the message of the affluence of American society to the poor and the rich alike. There are rising expectations in America, and I happen to believe that one of the signs of the success of some of the endeavors which our government has made and our private enterprise system has made is the fact that there is this restlessness, that what seemed inevitable in the past no longer is inevitable and therefore it becomes intolerable.

**MR. CANHAM:** Doesn't this restlessness in public thought mean that the "ins" are in trouble?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I don't think so. As a matter of fact, I believe that we can demonstrate that we have made tremendous progress in these last few years and that that progress merits a continuation of the leadership and the policies that helped form the forces of progress.

I don't want to burden you with statistical evidence, but the results of our economy and of our government working together—and I repeat, they have been working together, government and the economy, as partners—the result of that has been nothing short of astounding. Over ten million people, over ten million people in the last four years have come out of what we call poverty, and of that over three, almost four million of them are black. That is a remarkable achievement. There has been no country on the face of the earth that has ever made such an achievement in such a short period of time.

I believe that policies that have given us almost—well seven or eight years of continuous economic growth, policies that have improved our educational structure, policies that have improved the economic base of our people are worthy of continuity.

Compare that, if you please, with the previous eight years in which there were three recessions that took a terrible economic toll.

**MR. COWLES:** Mr. Vice President, just a moment ago you spoke of change. I ask this question seriously, not facetiously: All other things being equal, wouldn't you agree that it is a good thing for the country from time to time to have a turn-over of administrations? For the past 28 years out of the past 36 the country has been governed by a Democratic administration, and for the past eight years the country has had a Democratic administration.

At what point might it not be clearly desirable for a change in administrations simply so that new people, new ideas, new concepts get brought into the executive branch of the government?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Mr. Cowles, change just for the purpose of change is not necessarily a desirable develop-

ment. It is the question of what does the change bring. You mentioned new ideas and new policies. There has been a continuous line of new ideas and new policies that have come in with Democratic administrations. The fact is that when the Republicans have had their opportunity, they haven't had many new ideas and they haven't brought in many new policies. They have tended to say Amen to what has been done before and say that maybe they can do it a little better.

I believe that innovation in American public life, the creativity in American government has been essentially the product of Democratic leadership and Democratic administrations.

You don't throw out a good coach because he has a winning team, just because you say "Wouldn't it be nice to see another fellow down on the sidelines?"

You do not do away with the business management and the corporate structure that continues to improve the profits and continue to improve the sales of the company just because you say, "Well, wouldn't it be nice to see a new figure?"

To the contrary, you try to keep them. I think we have got a pretty good record of performance. New Presidents come. If I am permitted to be the President of the United States I will be the President in my own right with my own personality, with my own way of doing things, with my own ideas and my own policies, not to destroy the past, but to build on the past.

There is a continuity in government, and I think that continuity is healthy.

**MR. JOHNSON:** Mr. Vice President, legal discrimination in the United States has been eliminated for some time by the striking down of discriminatory laws by the Supreme Court and by the passage of new civil rights laws by the Congress, and yet many black Americans find themselves far away from total equality. I would like to know, if you are elected President, what do you propose to do to implement these laws and to help bring about total equality? What would your program be that would be different from that which has been done by previous Presidents?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Mr. Johnson, as you know I have had quite a hand in the fashioning of the policies that thus far have become public law or statutory law. I have tried to be throughout my public life a leader in the field of civil rights. We have a good body now of public law. There isn't any doubt about that. Now it is a matter of the application of it, and it is also the matter of the acceptance and the practice of it by the American people. I think we can say that it does little good to have equal employment opportunity laws if a man isn't trained for a job. You cannot banish discrimination in employment until you banish the illiteracy and the condition of being unskilled. So what do we do? We step up our programs of train-

ing and education as never before. We encourage black entrepreneurship so that the members of the black community can be owners of property as well as just job holders. We include into the decision-making processes of the community and the government itself black representation on a larger scale than we have ever had before. Above all what we seek to do is to give real equal opportunity, not just in theory or in the statute books, but in the practices of life, in the neighborhood, in the community, and in every area of human endeavor.

**MR. OAKES:** Mr. Vice President, I would like to know how you consider the proper role of the United States in the world. A few weeks ago you were quoted as saying this: "We don't want to get in the position of being the world's policeman." But a few months ago you were quoted as saying this: "What kind of a world do you think it would be if the United States didn't stand guard?"

I would like to know really what is your position?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I don't think there is any contradiction at all, Mr. Oakes. The world's policeman would mean that wherever there is any trouble, anyplace, we would go around and try to put it down. Obviously we do not do that. There are civil wars in countries, there are civil disorders and rebellions which are not our business. But we do feel that we have made some contribution to the kind of a world that you and I would like by the fact that we have had forces standing guard in NATO, not as a world's policeman, but as a defensive force in common alliance with people of like purpose.

I believe that is quite clear. I believe that it is fair to say that Organization of American States does not make us the world's policeman, but it does permit us to stand in cooperation with our neighbors in Latin America under the Rio Treaty and under other agreements we have to see to it that there is peace and stability in this hemisphere.

The world's policeman carries with it the kind of an onus and responsibility which I don't believe that the United States wants or should have, namely, patrolling the world. We seek not to patrol the world. What we seek to do is to help the world build the conditions which lend themselves to an enduring peace, but we also seek to stand with our neighbors and our friends of common faith against forces of aggression. I believe that that policy has served the interests of the United States and the cause of peace.

**MR. OAKES:** Do you believe in the spheres of influence theory? That is, that, you spoke of the Latin American—our relations with Latin America. Do you feel that our intervention, for example, in the Dominican Republic represented an expression of the sphere of influence of the United States in this area,

and, I would like you to compare that, for example, to the intervention of the Russians in Czechoslovakia, as an expression of their sphere of influence in Eastern Europe?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I do not endorse or include in my thinking the concept of the spheres of influence. I know there are areas in the world in which we have had a long and traditional relationship, such as in Latin America. I believe that there is a great deal of difference between the Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia and the United States coming to the Dominican Republic. First of all, we entered the Dominican Republic under a resolution of the Organization of American States. We were there in conjunction with other units of the Organization of American States. We went there because American personnel and the personnel of other countries were being threatened and their lives were being taken. There was open rebellion, and there was every reason to believe that there was to be an invasion or at least the subversion of Communist and Castro influences. It is very different than coming into Czechoslovakia where you were supposed to have had a government that invited the Communist forces of the Soviet Union to enter. That, of course, is just not true. I believe now we have had evidence that the so-called request of the government of Czechoslovakia for Soviet forces never took place. I don't believe there is any comparison whatsoever. Under one instance, we went there for protection; we went there under the Organization of American States. We withdrew our forces promptly; a free election has been held. The Dominican Republic, today, has had the democratic processes at work. To compare that with Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, I think is to deceive the American people.

**MR. VAIL:** Mr. Vice President, you have mentioned at various times several able men you would consider for Vice President, including Senator Muskie of Maine, Mayor Alioto of San Francisco and others. At this late date, I presume you know who your choice is. Would you be kind enough to let us in on the secret?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** If I were to, you would surely have some story.

**MR. VAIL:** Yes. That is what we are here for.

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** The fact of the matter is that something of this seriousness—and I do take it very seriously—is not something that is quickly resolved. There are many men that I consider to be extremely capable and able. I have not tried to play games with the Vice Presidency. I have made no commitments to anyone anywhere, nor have I excluded any region or any area. There have been a number of names mentioned in the press. Some of them I have referred to and

alluded to on programs such as this. No final decision has been made. I can just tell you one thing: If I have that opportunity to make my choice or at least make my recommendation to the Democratic Convention, it will be a man who is thoroughly experienced in government, one whom I really believe could take over the responsibilities of the Presidency and handle them well.

I believe the nominee of a political party for the office of President owes it to the American people to give to the American community, to the American citizenry, as a vice presidential candidate, someone who is experienced, mature, responsible, someone who is capable of fulfilling the responsibilities of that high office.

I think that is more important than geographical consideration or any kind of political adjustment or accommodation that you have to make, and I will act accordingly.

**MR. VAIL:** Sir, what about an open convention? Is there any possibility of that?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** It seems to be rather open now, Mr. Vail. I am not so sure but what it is so open that some people feel we won't be able to tidy it up, but I think we will. There is all the openness that one could ever hope for. There are hearings before the Rules Committee, the Credentials Committee, the Platform Committee. Every conceivable effort is being made and has been made—and I have made those efforts—to see that this convention was open to all the candidates and all the delegates without any favor or privilege.

**MR. VAIL:** Mr. Vice President, what I meant was, is there any possibility of your throwing the question of the vice presidency open to the convention if you are the nominee for President?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I happen to believe that the man who is selected as the nominee of the party for President ought to at least make known his personal selection and his personal choice.

That can always be subject to challenge, as it was for example, in the Republican Convention. I recall, that Mr. Romney received a number of votes and his name was put into nomination. But I believe that one of the responsibilities of the nominee of the party is to at least let the delegates know his personal selection and choice.

**MR. VAIL:** Mr. Vice President, could you possibly tell us a few of the men that are within consideration?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** You have done about as well, Mr. Vail, as I could do. I have just simply laid out the boundary lines that there is no restriction on area or geography.

What is important, I think, are the qualifications and the experience and the talents of the individual that we select.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Vice President, may I ask you a question? President Johnson seems to believe that if he ran again the country would remain divided and his move towards peace would be suspect.

In view of your close identification with him and the Administration, why do you think that what applied to him doesn't apply to you also?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Because I have not been President. This is not to detract from President Johnson at all, but he has had to make the tough decisions, Mr. Spivak. That is, it is President Johnson that has had to call the shots, so to speak, that has had to face up to the responsibilities of the management of our affairs. The Vice President of the United States does not do that.

I knew when I became Vice President that we only had one President at a time and that I ought not to act like the President nor should I try to pretend that I am President. I hope that I can go to the country, and I say, I *hope* I can go to the country and to unify it as best as possible and to lead this country to good performance, to higher standards. I think I can. I have a deep affection for the American people. I have a profound belief in their basic decency. I have a great respect for their common sense and the basic judgment of the American people.

I have a feeling that with that kind of attitude, plus my own ideas and policies and programs I will advance, that I can be a healer, that I can help unite this country. I hope to be able to do so.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Vice President, there are many indications, of course, that the Democratic party is badly split. Why do you think you can unite the country since it seems impossible to unite the party?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I don't feel that unity means unanimity. I think we have to differentiate. Unanimity means of one mind. The unity that I seek is of one spirit. I believe that there is a basic spirit in this country of reconciliation among most people. Now, there are some extremes. There are the extremists on the left and on the right. I guess that is about the easiest way to identify them. There are those who are the segregationists, the white supremacy crowd, and there are the others over here who are unwilling to work with the institutions of government or society, the extremists. I doubt that you can bring them into this circle of unity, but I do think there is a vast majority that can be appealed to, in which there are a large number of independents that are neither Democrats nor Republicans. I intend to make my appeal to them.

**MR. ROYSTER:** Mr. Vice President, on the question of this division within the party—both parties have it—you have criticized Mr. Nixon for accepting support from Senator Thurmond. You coined a very nice phrase: “Nixicrats.” But you have described Governor Maddox as a good Democrat. You have Senator Eastland and so forth in your party. Do you accept support of Governor Maddox and Senator Eastland of Mississippi as part of this unifying the party?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Mr. Royster, there are all kinds of Democrats. That is one thing that we were commenting on a moment ago. The Democrats seem to have ways of getting into a good deal of ferment and difficulty and battles and fights, particularly just before a convention and during a convention. This is as traditional in the Democratic party as the Fourth of July is for the nation.

There is a great deal of difference between saying a man is a Democrat than there is having him be your advisor and the man that you clear things through. I do not clear things through Governor Maddox. Governor Maddox says he is a Democrat. I take him at his word. There are all kinds of Democrats, but I do not join in an alliance with Governor Maddox. I do not clear it with Lester as Mr. Nixon clears it with Strom.

(Announcements)

**MR. CANHAM:** Mr. Vice President, of course I couldn't equate in any way the Soviet position in Czechoslovakia with ours in Vietnam, not at all. But there appear to be a few signs this week end that the Soviets are getting ready to cut their losses in Czechoslovakia, to pull back to some extent. Looking with all the advantages of hindsight, don't you think the United States should have started to cut its losses in Vietnam a number of years ago?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** It is my view that the United States has sought repeatedly to try to bring this struggle in Vietnam to a prompt and quick ending. The Soviet Union went into Czechoslovakia in really naked aggression, no matter how you look at it. The United Nations I think has pretty well described in its resolutions what has happened.

We went into Vietnam, not as the aggressor, whatever anybody may think about our policy, but we went there under treaty, under commitment and to resist an aggressor. We have continuously offered ways and means to bring this struggle to an end. In other words, if you wish to speak about cutting our losses, we have offered to North Vietnam time after time ways and means that the losses could be cut, that this struggle could be brought to an end, that a cease-fire could be achieved, the troop withdrawals could be brought about, that free elections could be held and even under the Geneva Accords, how we might

very well project a long-term peace for all of Southeast Asia. I believe that our record is pretty good in that. The problem we have had is that we haven't been able to get anybody on the other end of the line to be willing to agree with us.

**MR. CANHAM:** If the situation is in fact stalemated as some people think it looks like, how long do we continue this business?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** We are in Paris now hopefully to find some way through negotiations to bring this struggle to an end. Mr. Dubcek and Mr. Svoboda are now in Moscow hopefully trying to find some way to bring that struggle to an end.

**MR. CANHAM:** Do you know that Mr. Dubcek is in Moscow?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** That is what I read in your papers, gentlemen. I really hope that is the case. May I say that if the Soviet Union shows a willingness to come to some reconciliation of the differences between Czechoslovakia, upon which it has aggressed, and the government of that country, it will be setting a good example for North Vietnam, because North Vietnam can come to some kind of an agreement with the United States. What have we asked for, for example? We have said: Let's reestablish the demilitarized zone. That is not a farout request. That could lend itself to substantial improvement in the negotiations. We have said: Let's see if we couldn't have some deescalation of the fighting on both sides? That is a reasonable request. All of these have been turned down by North Vietnam. It is interesting to note that North Vietnam is about the only Communist country outside of the Eastern bloc countries that are involved in the aggression on Czechoslovakia that supports the Soviet Union today in this effort.

**MR. CANHAM:** Do you realistically expect any progress until after the election?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I do think this, Mr. Canham: I believe that the candidates who are nominated by the respective political parties owe it to the American people and owe it to the men in the field in Vietnam to make it crystal clear to Hanoi that they are not going to get a better deal—they are not going to get a better deal out of either one of the candidates, of the Republican or the Democratic Party, than they are going to get out of the present situation.

In other words, I do not want any word of mine or any platform of the Democratic Party giving the hope to Hanoi that if they just hold out and continue the fighting, continue the killing, continue the attacking, continue the shelling of the cities, that somewhere down the line they are going to get a better deal from Hubert Humphrey or from Richard Nixon. I want them to know they are not going to get a better deal from me. I am perfectly

willing to sit down and negotiate in good faith, to walk the extra mile in honor and in decency, but I would not want an action or a word of mine to be interpreted now or in the days to come to Hanoi, that if they just stick with it and keep killing our men, keep shelling those cities, that somehow, somewhere down the line they are going to get it easier from me, because they are not.

**MR. CANHAM:** Suppose I am an American voter and I am very unhappy about the Vietnam war and I want to express a dissent, a perfectly legitimate dissent with these policies.

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Yes, sir.

**MR. CANHAM:** For whom can I vote?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** You can vote for one of four candidates, I suppose. There will be Mr. Wallace, there will be Mr. Nixon. I don't think you are going to find that your dissent will be very effective there. I think you can vote for Hubert Humphrey, for the man that you are talking to, vote for me.

**MR. CANHAM:** Is this dissent, really?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Knowing that in that vote I will do everything that is within the possibilities of the protection of our forces in the field in Vietnam and will do everything that is possible in the name of common sense to find an accommodation between ourselves and North Vietnam at that peace table. But I do not believe the American people want the next President of the United States to either unilaterally withdraw or to leave our forces subject to unlimited punishment from the North, or in any way to make adjustments or political concessions that would make the sacrifice that we have made in the past seem meaningless. I just couldn't put myself in that position, Mr. Canham, and believe that I was worthy of public trust.

(Announcements)

**MR. COWLES:** Mr. Vice President, I'd like to return to this subject of change. A few minutes ago, in response to my earlier question about whether a turn-over of national administrations from time to time wasn't a good idea, you suggested, I think, that each new President brought with him in a new administration a certain amount of change.

What new characteristics or differences or changes would you foresee in a Humphrey administration different or changed from the administration of the past eight years?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Change does not necessarily mean an abrupt cleavage from the yesterdays. It means that you learn and you build from the experiences that you have. New conditions come. New forces are at work in every year.

Just the sheer impact of science and technology itself, if there were no human relations involved, brings us a degree of change that we have to cope with.

For example, the change in the sharecropping of the South, the change in cotton, in agriculture, has brought a tremendous change in the South which has projected itself into our great urban centers with the mobility of people.

What kind of changes would I see? I happen to believe that what we call the urban crisis has come into its fullness now. For a long time we knew it was here, but now all at once it is here with sudden impact, and we now realize that whoever is the next President of the United States, Mr. Cowles, [he] must come to grips with this matter in cooperation with state government and local government, with the private sector. It can no longer be put off. It has been put off piecemeal over a long period of time. That is one change.

I think another great change is coming over us, and I think we have now found that we do have ways and means of alleviating what we call poverty—not just the poverty of the purse, the poverty of the lack of income, but the poverty of spirit. We found out through some test runs, through Project Head Start, through a Job Corps, through Upward Bound, through VISTA, through the Teacher Corps and through other things, that there are things that we can do to lift the level of life and the standard of life for people. I want to see those experiments, and I think they have been primarily experiments, I want to see them refined and applied in a much larger way. Those are just a couple of the changes.

**MR. COWLES:** Mr. Vice President, I think we would all agree that the problems change or the circumstances change, but in what specific ways do you foresee your policies or the kinds of men in your administration differing from the current administration?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Mr. Cowles, I know everybody wants to have a fight and wants to have us differ from the previous administration. I am not a fighter in a sense. I try to be a reconciler. I believe we have a lot of fight promoters in the country. What I believe we need now are a few people who can bring about reconciliation. I have offered for example on cities a very specific proposal, a Marshall Plan for our cities that is different from what the present administration has in current law. It builds on the Model Cities, but it goes beyond it.

That is one of the changes.

I have suggested, for example, that we ought to have day care centers across this country to help working mothers. I have suggested pre-school education, that we have learned from an experiment in Project Head Start.

Those are some of the changes. Another change that we can

have is that no one in America need starve. For goodness sakes, a country that has an abundance of food ought not to have a single child that ever goes to bed hungry. We have had some that go to bed hungry. We have started the program. We made some progress. We have been building. I believe it is my job, if I am elected President of the United States, not to tear down the house in which we have been living, but to make it better, to try to make it more adaptive, to try to make it a more livable home for the American people, to try to adjust it and adapt it to the needs of our time.

What is another change? The change that a man who is President of the United States must say to the American people that we must be one nation, not two; not split and unequal. As John Johnson, Mr. Johnson, asked the question here a moment ago about our civil rights legislation. Yes. Civil rights legislation. But we now must have the practice of human rights and the practice of human equality, and I believe the President must use his authority, his influence, his prestige, to make it crystal clear that it isn't just a job for a black man that is required in America. But it is entrepreneurship; it is ownership; it is dignity; it is self-respect and it is the willingness to take him in as an equal partner in the great American experiment.

**MR. JOHNSON:** Mr. Vice President, one of the major issues of controversy among politicians this year has been a definition of law and order. I'd like to know, what is your definition of law and order that would be accepted by both the black and white communities?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I speak of this subject not as a theoretician, but one who gave a community law and order and at the same time I brought with it a sense of social justice.

I do not believe that the only thing that you need to have in America are repressive measures in the name of law and order, but I do believe that the first duty of government, Mr. Johnson, is to protect life. That is the first responsibility. It is to see to it that we have conditions of order in society so that the programs and the processes of equality and social justice and opportunity can be at work.

I put it this way: civil order and civil justice. They are one and inseparable. We do not want to live in a police state, and we surely cannot expect to have law and order just by people going around saying we ought to do more for people and we ought to be kinder and more compassionate. They come together. You cannot rebuild a city if it is burning, if there is looting, if there is crime, organized, and lawlessness going on throughout the city, but likewise, you cannot very well put down the crime, and you cannot very well, over a long period of time, have stability and law and order if you have the conditions in a community

that create the infection of violence and lawlessness and crime. So we must come at it with both hands, so to speak.

On the one hand, yes, enforcement of our laws, respect for the law, improvement of our law enforcement agencies, coordination of those agencies. But I want the same zeal, Mr. Johnson, for the improvement of the living conditions of the people as we had in the improvement of the law enforcement conditions for the total community. They need to come as twin efforts, as simultaneous efforts, and if I am permitted to be President of this country, I hope to bring that message to the American people.

**MR. JOHNSON:** Just one other question, Mr. Vice President: On the Kerner Commission, as you know it was appointed by the President, and it made a report which said that much of the problems in the urban crisis, many of the problems are due to white racism. As far as I can determine, the administration has been rather silent on this Commission's report. What is your assessment of the report?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** First of all, the Commission was appointed, as you noted, by the President.

Secondly, the report has been taken into each department of the government for its implementation, to see what we are presently doing to implement it, what more needs to be done.

Thirdly, I believe that the basic findings and recommendations of the report are sound. I regret to say that there are in America patterns of discrimination, and we know it.

What do the kids say? Tell it as it is. Now, the fact is that there are patterns of racism in America, and that is what we were talking about a moment ago. This we must cleanse ourselves of. We must get away from it, and why not? Not only is it morally wrong, but it is economically wrong.

I happen to think that the greatest resources of America yet on tap are to be found amongst our poor and our needy, white or black, and might I say that the question of poverty and of the lack of respect for human beings is not related simply to the black community. There are more poor whites than there are poor blacks. There are more poor rural people than there are poor urban people. I believe that in these great areas of poverty, and they are limited fortunately, in America—there are great human resources yet untouched, untapped and undeveloped. I want to see that they are developed and brought to the forefront.

**MR. OAKES:** Mr. Vice President, because it is so vitally important, I am returning to Vietnam.

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Yes, sir.

**MR. OAKES:** What is the difference between your position and that of Mr. Nixon in respect to Vietnam policy?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Both of us feel that we ought not to say anything that will jeopardize the position of the negotiators on Vietnam. At least that is my understanding of Mr. Nixon's position. I believe that I have emphasized, Mr. Oakes, during the entire Vietnam conflict, the importance of this country, of our government and, indeed, of our allies, of trying to improve the social, economic and political framework in South Vietnam.

I have talked, as you know, about the so-called "other war." I have said there are two struggles. There is the military front on the one hand, and then there is the war that deals with the lives of the people, with the saving of the lives of the people.

I have a great deal of concern about the refugees, for example: a great deal of concern about the necessity of land reform in Vietnam. I have spoken up from time to time about the necessity of our government being willing to walk that extra mile, as in the bombing halts that we have had in the past, the bombing pauses. I do not recall that Mr. Nixon has put himself quite on the line in that way.

**MR. OAKES:** But we do have a live war going on?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Yes, sir.

**MR. OAKES:** And you said recently and again a few minutes ago that you believed in a policy of restraint?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Yes, sir.

**MR. OAKES:** And reasonable response?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** Yes, sir.

**MR. OAKES:** As a condition for a bombing halt.

If the de-escalation or the slow-down in operations of a month or so ago had been seized upon by the administration as an indication of a tacit response by Hanoi, could we not have possibly made progress toward this goal of which you speak in the same way that President Kennedy did at the time of the Cuban crisis in respect to the rather doubtful message that he received from Khrushchev?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I don't think they are at all analogous, Mr. Oakes. I wish I did. I examined the lull, which is what I think you are referring to, very, very carefully, and my experience tells me that we have had the same situation before other increased attacks. There was a lull in December before the Tet offensive in January. There was a lull in earlier spring before the step-up in attacks in May and June, and I believe that we now see that there was a lull before the increased attacks that we have had in recent weeks and recent days.

On Friday of last week there were over 60 separate attacks on

cities in the Northern area and around the demilitarized zone. It has been general throughout all of Vietnam.

I wanted to believe—I want you to know quite frankly—I deeply wanted to believe that that lull was a political signal. When I examined the evidence that comes to me as the Vice President of the United States, I could not come to that conclusion. I believe it is fair to say now in retrospect that the lull was not a political signal, that we are going to have to wait yet for some political signals.

I can say to this audience that we did during that period of time go to the North Vietnamese and say, "Would you be willing now to talk about reconstituting the demilitarized zone as a DMZ area?" "Would you be willing to do that as a—sort of one of the ways of demonstrating some restraint and reasonable response that could let us proceed for the stopping of the remaining bombing?"

They said, "No."

"Would you be willing to talk about the stopping of the use of artillery over the DMZ?"

They said, "No."

Every single proposal that we made—and the American public must know this—every single proposal made by Mr. Harriman and Mr. Vance was summarily rejected. I do not consider either Mr. Vance or Mr. Harriman to be hawks in the parlance of our time. I think they are men of peace. I think they are dedicated diplomats to the cause of peace.

We have tried and we must continue to try. Two weeks ago, three weeks ago, Mr. Oakes, I had reason to believe that maybe we were going to make some progress. I found those hopes dashed, not by the United States, but by North Vietnam.

**MR OAKES:** You don't think the risk of stopping the bombing might be less than the risk of going on and not stopping it?

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I know that the men of good will and of deep and dedicated feeling to this country of patriotism feel that way. I must say there are honest differences of opinion on this, but here is my view: All we are asking for from North Vietnam, as the President put it, is some little sign that if we were to stop the remaining bombing they would at least seriously discuss with us some of the problems which exist, like the demilitarized zone. We have gotten not a signal. I think that the American people are fair minded people. I think they feel that we have a right, since we have presently limited our bombing to—78 percent of the area excluded from it. 90 percent of the population of North Vietnam is excluded from the bombing. That was a unilateral decision on our part. I think the American people now feel that we have a right to expect some way, directly or indirectly from North Vietnam some restraint,

some reasonable response, some indication that if we were to stop all of the bombing it would lend itself to peace.

In the meantime, Mr. Oakes, we have a half million men in Vietnam, and we have a large number of them in the I Corps area right south of the DMZ. If we stop that bombing above the demilitarized zone, I think we have to ask ourselves how many more tons of equipment, how many more thousands of men come in unmolested across the demilitarized zone to attack the men we have in the I Corps area and the First Corps area just south of the DMZ. I have to think about that.

**MR. OAKES:** But Secretary—

**MR. SPIVAK:** Gentlemen, we have less than three minutes.

**MR. VAIL:** Mr. Vice President, to sum up Vietnam, on what points, if any, do you disagree with the Vietnam policies of President Johnson.

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I think that the policies that the President has pursued are basically sound. I believe that those policies have been directed towards a political settlement. They have been directed towards negotiations. They have been directed toward the development of constitutional government in South Vietnam. They have been directed towards the peace and the security of all of Southeast Asia, the development of the Mekong River, for example. I believe that those policies have contributed to some stability in that area. I believe today that Indonesia is doing what it is currently able to do in part because we have taken a stand in South Vietnam. I believe that Southeast Asia will be a more secure and a more stable, vital area of the world if the war in South Vietnam can come to a political settlement as we are trying to get it in Paris.

So those policies I do not believe have been wrong.

There may have been some nuances of differences if I were the President of the United States, but I must say to you gentlemen, to play President is not a role for a Vice President. Maybe a Senator can play President, but the Vice President of the United States has a special responsibility because he is the partner of the President. One thing I have tried to do is to respect the limitations of that office. It has great responsibility with little or no authority, and I believe that I would have served to injure the cause of the United States and to injure this republic if I were to have injected myself with any little differences that I might have had into the public arena. I have had to present those points of view privately in the councils of this government, and I think you men know that I am not exactly the silent type, that I have been willing to present them on the occasion when I thought they were needed.

**MR. VAIL:** Mr. Vice President, if we may just quickly change the subject for a moment to the question of youth. You mentioned a moment ago that the kids say, "Tell it as it is." In 1970, 50 percent of Americans will be 25 years old or younger. This past year there have been a record number of student revolts. A strong student protest movement has been evident in student support for the late Senator Kennedy and Senator McCarthy.

Obviously the nation's youth is dissatisfied to an extent with the way things are being—

**MR. SPIVAK:** I am sorry, gentlemen, our time is up. I am sorry to interrupt.

**VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY:** I had a good answer for you.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for being with us today on this Special Edition of MEET THE PRESS.

*The Proceedings of*

# M E E T   T H E   P R E S S

as broadcast nationwide by the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed and made available to the public to further interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare. Transcript may be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope and ten cents for each copy to:

*Merkle Press Inc. Box 2111, Washington, D. C. 20013*

*(Division Publishers Co., Inc.)*

*MEET THE PRESS is telecast every Sunday over the NBC Television Network. This program originated from the NBC Studios in Washington, D. C.*

Television Broadcast 5:00-6:00 P.M. EDT

Radio Broadcast 6:05-7:00 P.M. EDT

Hubert H. Humphrey Meet the Press Sunday August 25, 1968

~~HHH~~

Royster: Mr. Vice President, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has consistently taken the position that you would not stop the bombing of North Vietnam unilaterally, in fact President Johnson just reiterated that in his VFW speech <sup>just</sup> recently. And now in Chicago the McGovern-McCarthy forces have come up with a peace plank which calls for immediate ~~halt~~ <sup>an</sup> halt to the bombing, ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> early withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam, ~~and a coalition government~~ supporting the idea of a coalition government with the vietnam <sup>cong</sup> in it. Could you run on such a platform, Mr. Vice President?

HHH: Well, that will not be the platform. That's a minority position, I'm confident, in the Democratic ~~party~~ convention. I'm happy to note that the McCarthy-McGovern efforts at the platform committee has made some change from previous position. For example, there's no request for a unilateral withdrawal on the part of the United States, which I think would have been disastrous. Secondly ~~on the part of the~~ in so far as the coalition government is concerned that has been somewhat reduced in terms of at least its preciseness in the McCarthy-McGovern presentation. My position on the Vietnam ~~war~~ and an effort to gain peace is as it has been. I believe that we <sup>could</sup> and should stop the <sup>remaining</sup> bombing of the North if ~~we~~ we receive indication that <sup>there</sup> is restraint and <sup>reasonable</sup> response from the ~~North~~ Hanoi. I think that's a common sense provision.

Q: Would you as President be willing to accept a coalition government with the Viet Cong in as part of a negotiation ~~if it~~ if it were to come out of the Paris group? Would you accept that?

HHH: I believe in free elections. I do not believe <sup>that</sup> the Government of South Vietnam should be designed and imposed ~~on~~ either from Washington or

~~HHH~~

More

Hanoi. I believe that if the people of South Vietnam, whatever form of government they wish to elect is their business. That's why we're there; we're there for the principle of self-determination. We're not there to force American will or American convenience upon the peoples of South Vietnam. Now there isn't any problem at all in my mind about the one-man-one-vote, that all the peoples of South Vietnam were willing to accept the results of an election and were willing to engage peacefully in such an election process ought to be permitted to engage in the political process.

Q: That would include the Viet Cong?

HHH: It would include all people who were willing to accept the results of an election and engage in the peaceful political process of an election ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~. That would mean that ~~those involved~~ those who were involved would have to renounce the use of force in so far as to be able to gain their objective.

Q: Now you've said several times, Mr. Vice President, about Vietnam that the lessons we have learned from Vietnam, is a quote that you've used, what are those lessons that you would apply if you were President of the United State. Does that mean that you would not get us involved, you would not intervene in foreign actions, we would return to isolation, what are these lessons that we've learned from Vietnam.

HHH: Well one lesson is surely not to return to isolationism. Isolationism has no place of responsibility in the part of people or governments in the modern world. This is a world that is more closely knit than ever before.

Q: Do you think the people that are urging us to get out of Vietnam, do you think they're being isolationists.

HHH: No I used the term that you ~~was~~ offered.

More

page 3

HHH: I do believe that there are some in our country today who have become very frustrated with the world in which we live because it does not yield itself or lend itself to prompt and quick remedies, ~~and~~ they want to withdraw. Some of the lessons that I would imagine that we will have learned from Vietnam are, for example, the important<sup>ness</sup> of the development of political institutions as well as the application of economic and military assistance. I think we have to be very selective in our commitments as well <sup>the world</sup> around. I think we really have to assess what is in our national interest. And then we <sup>need</sup> have to ask ourselves before we commit <sup>forces or large</sup> our sums of money or ~~our~~ manpower, will these people really help themselves? Are they willing to work together in cooperation with their neighbors in their region for their own common defense and their own self-defense? I think those are some of the lessons we can gain out of this rather costly and tragic experience.

Cannon: Mr. Vice President, do you think there is <sup>what a</sup> some kind of conservative tide running in the United States?

HHH: I think there is a tide running <sup>of deep concern</sup> in the United States, <sup>or not</sup> over whether we are able to face up to the many problems that confront us today. This tide lends itself, again, to the spirit of withdrawal, hopefully that we can just ignore some of these matter for a while and that things will work out <sup>all</sup> right. I think that is wrong. No I do not believe there is a conservative tide. I think there is a tide <sup>in America,</sup> a spirit that wants to see genuine step-by-step, steady, social progress but they want to see it without the destruction of institutions, or things or people. They want to see progress with order, and they'd like to have a degree of order with progress. I'm concerned, as all Americans are, with some of the developmen<sup>ts</sup>

that we see when people become overly anxious, when they turn to violence, which I think is the wrong way of gaining any social objective. This is what I believe the American people feel. I believe is a basic goodness in the American people that can be called into action. And one of the reasons I want to run for President and one of the reasons I wish to be President of this country, is to call on this basic goodness that can help meet the problems of our times.

Q: How do you relate this feeling of concern with the policies of this Administration? Has it been intensified by the policies of the Administration or has it <sup>been</sup> not?

HHH; Well, ~~somebody~~ <sup>said</sup> to me the other day, ~~that~~ you know Mr. Vice President, you have to recognize that we're in a great period of change and I said "that is constant." Change is inevitable; the only question is, can you make change your ally? Can you in a sense fashion the forces of change for constructive purposes? I think we've been doing that, and in a sense, part of the restlessness in America today is the fact that people now begin to see that they do not have to live in the ~~poverty~~ abominable conditions of poverty and slummism to which many people have been forced in the past. They see that there can be a better day. In fact this very instrument <sup>that we are using now - the television -</sup> ~~has~~ brought the message of the affluence of American society to the poor and the rich alike. There are rising expectations in America and the I happen to believe that one of the signs of success of some of the endeavors <sup>which</sup> ~~that~~ our Government has made and our private enterprise system has made is the fact that there is this restlessness, that what seemed inevitable in the past no longer is inevitable and therefore it becomes intolerable.

Q: Doesn't this restlessness in public thought mean that the "ins" are

in trouble?

HHH: Well, I don't think so. As a matter of fact, I believe that we can demonstrate that we've made tremendous progress in these last few years, and that that progress merits a continuation of the leadership and the policies that helped form the forces of progress. I don't want to burden you with the statistical evidence, but the results of our economy and of our government working together, and I repeat they've been working together, government and <sup>the</sup> economy as partners. The result of that has been nothing short of astounding. Over 10 million people—over 10 million people in the last 4 years have come out of what we call poverty, and of that almost 4 million of them <sup>are</sup> ~~have been~~ black. Now that is a remarkable achievement. There's been no country on the face of the earth that has ~~na~~ ever made such an achievement in such a short period of time. I believe that policies that have given us almost 7, 8 years of continuous economic growth, policies that have improved our educational structure, policies that have improved <sup>the</sup> ~~our~~ economic base of our people, <sup>that,</sup> if you please, are worthy of continuity. Now I compare ~~this~~ <sup>that,</sup> with the previous 8 years in which there were 3 recessions ~~with~~ <sup>that took</sup> a terrible economic toll.

Cowles: Mr. Vice President, just a moment ago you ~~said~~ spoke of change, and I ask this question <sup>ser</sup> ~~ser~~ <sup>iously,</sup> not facetiously, all other things being equal, wouldn't you agree that it is a good thing for the country from time to time to have a turn-over of <sup>Admi</sup> ~~Admi~~ <sup>nistrations?</sup> Now for the past 28 years out of the past 36, the country has been governed by a Democratic Administration. And for the past 8 years the country has had a Democratic Administration. <sup>might it not</sup> ~~might it not~~ <sup>clearly</sup> ~~clearly~~ <sup>be</sup> ~~be~~ <sup>desirable</sup> ~~desirable~~ for a change in ~~administration~~ administration simply so that new people, new ideas, new concepts

1

page 6

get brought into the executive branch of the government?

HHH: Mr. Cowles, change just for the purpose of change is not necessarily a desirable development. <sup>ment</sup> It's the <sup>of</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>And</sup> question ~~is~~ what does a change bring. You mentioned new ideas, <sup>and</sup> new policies, there's been a continuous line of new ideas and new policies that have come in with Democratic administrations. The fact is that when the Republicans have had their opportunity, they haven't had many new ideas and they haven't brought in many new policies. They have tended ~~to say~~ to say amen to what has been done before and say that maybe they can do it a little better. I believe that innovation in American public life, that creativity in American government has been essentially the product of Democratic leadership and Democratic administrations. Now you don't throw out a good coach because he has a winning team, just because you say wouldn't it be nice to see another  <sup>fellow</sup>  ~~guy~~ down on the sidelines. You don't do away with a business management in a corporate that continues to improve the profits and continues to improve the sales of the company just because you say  <sup>well</sup> wouldn't it be nice to see a new figure. To the contrary, you try to keep  <sup>him</sup>  ~~him~~ them. I think we've got a pretty good record of performance. Now new presidents come. If I'm permitted to be the President of the United States, I'll be the President of  ~~the United States~~;  ~~I'll be~~ in my own right, with my own  ~~right~~ personality, with my own way of doing things, with my own ideas and my own policies. Not to destroy the past but to build on  ~~the~~ the past. There's a continuity in government and I think that continuity is healthy.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Vice President, legal discrimination in the United States has been eliminated for some time by the striking down of discriminatory laws by the Supreme Court and by the passage of new civil rights laws  <sup>the</sup> by Congress.

~~And you can see that~~

More

page 7

And yet many black Americans find themselves far away from total equality.

I would like to know if you are elected President <sup>what do</sup> ~~you~~ propose

to do to implement these laws and to help to bring about total equality, <sup>what do</sup> ~~you~~ <sup>be</sup> what would your program <sup>be</sup> that would be different from <sup>that which has</sup> previous presidents? <sup>been done by</sup>

HHH: Well, Mr. Johnson, as you know, I've had quite a hand in the fashioning of public policies that thus far have become public law or statutory law. I've tried to be throughout my public life a leader in the field of civil rights. We have a good body now ~~in~~ of public law. There isn't any doubt about that. Now it's the matter of the application of it and it is also the matter of the acceptance and the practice of it by the American people. I think we can say that it does little good to have <sup>-en</sup> equal employment opportunity law if a man isn't trained for a job. You can not banish discrimination in employment until you banish the illiteracy and the condition of being unskilled. So what do we do? We step up our programs of training and education as never before. We encourage black entrepreneurship so that the members of the black community can be owners of property as well as just job holders. We include in to the decision making processes of the community and the government it self black representation on a larger scale than we've ever had before. <sup>Above all</sup> ~~theory~~ what we seek to do is to give <sup>theory or in</sup> real equal opportunity, <sup>aid</sup> Not just in the statute books, but in the practices <sup>human</sup> of life, in the neighborhood, in the community, in every area of endeavor.

Q: Mr. Vice President, I would like to know how you consider the proper role of the United States in the world. A few weeks ago you were quoted as saying this: "We don't want to get in the position of being the world's

I

page 8

policeman ~~business~~." But a few months ago you were quoted as saying this:  
"What kind of a world do you think it would be if the United States didn't stand guard." Now I'd like to know what really is your position?

HHH: Well, I don't think there's any <sup>Oaks.</sup> ~~cont~~ <sup>radix</sup> ~~radix~~ <sup>at all,</sup> Mr. Aoks.  
The world's policeman would mean that where <sup>was</sup> ever there were any trouble anywhere, anyplace, <sup>that</sup> we would go around and try and put it down. Now obviously we do not ~~do that~~. There are civil wars in countries, there are internal, civil disorders, and rebellions <sup>which</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>r</sup> are not ~~out~~ <sup>a</sup> ~~business~~ <sup>that</sup>. But we do feel that we have made some contribution to the kind of world you and I would like by the fact that we've had forces standing guard in NATO, not as a world's policemen but as a defensive forces in common alliance with people of like purpose. I believe that's quite clear. I believe that it's fair to say that the Organization of American States does not make us the world's policeman <sup>a</sup> but it does permit us to stand in cooperation with our neighbors in Latin America under the Rio Treaty and under other agreements that we have to see to it that there is peace and stability in this hemisphere. The world's policeman carries with it the kind of a onus and responsibility <sup>that</sup> ~~that~~ which I don't believe the United States wants or should have. <sup>pa</sup> Namely ~~controlling~~ the world. We seek not to patrol the world, what we seek to do is to help the world build the conditions that lend themselves to an enduring peace. But we also seek to stand with our neighbors and <sup>O U T</sup> friends of common faith against forces of aggression and I believe <sup>that</sup> that policy has served the interest of the United States and the cause of peace

AUGUST 25, 1968

Q: Mr. Vice President, of course I wouldn't equate in any way the Soviet position in ~~Czechoslovakia~~ with ours in Vietnam, not at all. But there appear to be a few signs this weekend, that the Soviets are getting ready to cut their losses in ~~Czechoslovakia~~, to pull back to some extent. Looking with all the advantages of hindsight, don't you think the United States should have started to cut its losses in Vietnam a number of years ago?

A: It's my view that the United States has sought repeatedly to try to bring this struggle in Vietnam to a prompt and quick ending. The Soviet Union went into ~~Czechoslovakia~~ in really naked aggression. No matter how you look at it, and the United Nations, I think, has pretty well described, in its resolutions, what has happened. We went into Vietnam, not as the aggressor (whatever anybody may think about our policy) but we went there under treaty, under commitment, and to resist an aggressor. Now we have continuously offered ways and means bring this struggle to an end. In other words, if you wish to speak about cutting our losses, we have offered to North Vietnam, time after time, ways and means that the losses could be cut, that this struggle could be brought to an end, that a cease-fire could be achieved, that troop withdrawals could be brought about, that free elections could be held, and even under the Geneva accords, how we might very well project a long-term peace for all of Southeast Asia. I believe that our record ~~is pretty good~~ is pretty good in that. The problem that we've had is that we haven't been able to get anybody on the other end of the line to be willing to agree with us.

Q: Well if in fact the situation has become stalemated as some people think it looks like, ~~how~~ do we continue this business?

A: well, we're in Paris now, hopefully, to find some way in negotiations to bring this struggle to an end. Mr. <sup>DUBCEK</sup> Dubeckeck and Mr. <sup>SLOBOVADA</sup> Slobovada are in Moscow now, ~~happ~~ hopefully to find some way to bring their struggle to an end

Q: Do you know that Mr. <sup>DUBCEK</sup> Dubecheck is in Moscow?

A: Well, that's what I read in your paper, Gentlemen. I hope that-'s the case. I really hope that's the case, May I say that if the Soviet Union shows a willingness to come to some reconciliation of the differences between <sup>Czechoslovakia</sup> ~~Czechoslovakia~~ upon which it has aggressed, and the government of that country, it will be setting a good example for North Vietnam. ~~Because~~ Because North Vietnam can come to some kind of <sup>an</sup> agreement with the United States. Now what have we asked for for example? We've said, let's re-establish the de-militarized zone. Now that's not a far-out request. That could lend itself to substantial improvement <sup>in</sup> of the negot-iations We've said let's see if we couldn't have some de-escalation- of the ~~fighting~~ <sup>Fighting</sup> on both sides. That- is a reasonable request. All of these have been turned down by North Vietnam. Now it's interesting to note that North Vietnam is about the only Communist country, outside of the Eastern block countries that are involved in the aggression on <sup>Czechoslovakia</sup> ~~Czechoslovakia~~, that supports the Soviet Union today. in this effort.

Q:

III

Q: Do you really expect any progress until after the election?

A: Well, I do think this, Mr. Cannon, that I believe that the candidates who are nominated by their respective political parties owe it to the American people and owe it to the men in the field in Vietnam to make it crystal-clear to Hanoi that they're not going to get a better deal out of either one of the candidates of the Republican or the Democratic Party than they're going to get out of the present situation. In other words, I do not want any word of mine or any platform of the Democratic Party giving the hope to Hanoi that if they just hold on, continue the fighting, continue the killing, continue the attacking, continue the shelling of the cities, that somewhere down the line they're going to get a better deal from Hubert Humphrey, or from Richard Nixon. I want them to know they're not going to get a better deal from me. I am perfectly willing to sit down and negotiate in good faith, to walk the extra mile in honor and in decency, but I would not want an action or <sup>a</sup> word of mine to be interpreted now or in the days to come to Hanoi, that if they just stick with it and keep killing our men, keep shelling those cities, that somehow, somewhere down the line they're going to get it easier from me, because they won't.

Q: Suppose I'm an American voter, and I want to ... and I'm ~~unhappy~~ <sup>very</sup> unhappy about the Vietnam war, and I want to express a dissent, a perfectly legitimate dissent with these policies, for whom can I vote?

A: You can vote for one of four candidates, I suppose; ~~they will~~ <sup>there will</sup> be Mr. Wallace, ~~there will~~ be Mr. Nixon -- I don't think that you're going to find that your dissent will be very effective there -- I think you can vote for Hubert Humphrey, for the man that you're talking to, you can vote for me ...

Q: Is this dissent?

A: . . . knowing in that vote that I will do everything that's within the possibilities of the protection of our forces in the ~~field~~ <sup>field</sup> in Vietnam, and will do everything that's possible in the name of common sense to find an accommodation between ~~peace, yes and us~~ ourselves and North Vietnam at that peace table, <sup>but</sup> I do not believe that the American people want the next President of the United States to either unilaterally withdraw, or to leave our forces subject to unlimited punishment from the North, or in any way to make adjustments or ~~political~~ political concessions that would make the sacrifices that we made in the past seem meaningless, I just couldn't put ~~myself~~ myself in that position, Mr. Cannon, and believe that I was worthy of public trust.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Q: Mr. Vice President, I'd like to return to this subject of change.

A few minutes ago, in response to my earlier question about whether a turnover of national administrations from time to time wasn't a good idea, you suggested that, I think, that each new President brought with ~~it~~ him in a new administration a certain ~~an~~ amount of change. Now, what new characteristics, or differences, or changes, would you foresee in a Humphrey administration, different or changed from the administration of the past eight years?

A: Well, Mr. Coles, change does not necessarily mean an abrupt cleavage from the yesterdays, it means that you learn and you build from the experiences that you have; new conditions come, new forces are at work in every year. Just the sheer impact of <sup>(science and)</sup> technology itself, if they were no human relations involved, brings ~~us~~ us a degree of change that we have to cope with. For example the change in the sharecropping of the South, the change in cotton agriculture in the South, ~~has~~ <sup>has</sup> brought a ~~new~~ tremendous change in the South, which has projected

itself into our great urban centers with the mobility of people. Now what kind of changes would I see? Well, I happen to believe that we call the urban crisis has come into its fullness now. For a long time we knew it was here, but now all ~~at~~ at once ~~it's~~ it's here with sudden impact, and we ~~now~~ now realize that whomever is the next President of the United States, Mr. Coles, must come to grips with this matter in ~~the~~ cooperation with ~~the~~ state governments, local ~~government~~ government, with the private sector; it can no longer be put off, it's ~~been~~ been put off piece-meal over a long period of time. That's one change. I think another great change is coming over us. I think we've now found that we do have ways and means of alleviating what we call poverty; not just the poverty of the purse, the poverty of the lack of income, ~~but~~ but the poverty of spirit. We found <sup>then</sup> in some test runs, <sup>then</sup> Project Headstart, <sup>then</sup> Job Corps, ~~and~~ <sup>though</sup> ~~and~~ Upward Bound, through VISTA, ~~the~~ the Teacher Corps, and through other things, that there are things that we can do to lift the level of life and the standard of life for people - I want to see experiments, and I think they've been primarily experiments - I want to see them refined and applied in a much larger way. Now ~~these~~ these are just a couple of the changes.

Q: Mr. Vice President, I think we'd all agree that the problems change or the circumstances change, but in what specific ways do you ~~fore~~ foresee your policies or the kinds of men in your administration differing from the current administration?

A: Well, Mr. Coles, I know everybody wants to have a fight and wants to have us differ from the previous administration; I'm not a fighter in the sense; I try to be a reconciler. I believe we have a lot of fight promoters in the country; what I think we need now are a few

4

people that can bring about reconciliation. I have offered, for example, on cities, a very specific proposal, a Marshall plan ~~for~~ for our cities, that is different ~~from~~ than what the present administration has in current law. It builds on the Model Cities but it goes beyond it. Now that's one of the changes. I have suggested, for example, that we ought to have day-care centers ~~&~~ across this country to ~~help~~ help working mothers; I have suggested pre-school education that we learned from an experiment in Project HeadStart. Now those are some of the changes. We surely know that another change we can have ~~xxx~~ is that no one in America need starve. For goodness sakes, a country that has an abundance of food ought not to ~~be~~ have a single child that ever goes to bed hungry. We've had some that have gone to bed hungry. Now we have started the programs, we've made some progress, we've been building. I believe that ~~xxx~~ it's my job, if I'm elected President of the United States, not to tear ~~&~~ down the house in which we build, ~~xxx~~ in which we've been ~~living~~ <sup>living</sup>, but ~~&~~ to make it better, to try to make it more adaptable, to try to make it a more <sup>liveable</sup> ~~liveable~~ home for the American people, to try to adjust ~~&~~ it and adapt it to the needs of our time. What's another change? The change that a man who is ~~President~~ President of United States must say to the American people that we must be one nation, not two, not separate and unequal. As John Johnson - as Johnson asked a question here a moment ago about ~~xxx~~ our civil rights legislation - yes, civil rights legislation - but we now have the practice of human rights and the practice of human equality and I believe ~~xxx~~ the President must use his authority, his influence, his prestige, to make it crystal clear that it isn't just a job of a black man that's required in America, but it's entrepreneurship, it

ownership, it's dignity, it's self-respect, and it's the willingness to take him in as an equal partner in the great American experiment.

Q: Mr. Vice President, one of the major issues of controversy among politicians this year has been a definition of law and order. I'd like to know - what is your definition of law and order? that would be accepted by both the black and white communities?

A: Well, I speak of this subject not as a theoretician, but as one who gave a ~~community law and order and at~~ <sup>community law and order and at</sup> the same time brought with it a sense of social justice. I do not believe that the only thing you need to have in America ~~is~~ are repressive measures in the name of law and order, but I do ~~believe~~ believe that the first duty of government, Mr. Johnson is to protect life. That's the first responsibility. It is to see to it that we ~~have~~ <sup>have</sup> conditions of order in society so that the programs and the process of equality and ~~opportunity and~~ social justice and opportunity can be at work. I put it this way - civil order and civil justice - they are one and inseparable. We do not want to live in a police state, and we surely ~~cannot~~ cannot expect to have law ~~and~~ and order just by people going around saying we ought to do more for people and we ought to be kinder and more compassionate. They come together; you cannot rebuild a city if it's burning, if there's looting, if there's crime organized and lawlessness going on throughout the city, but likewise you cannot very well put down the crime and you cannot very well over a long period of time have stability and law and order if you have the ~~conditions~~ <sup>conditions</sup> in a community that create the infection of violence and lawlessness and crime; so we must come at it with both hands, so to speak; on the one hand, yes enforcement of our laws, respect for the law, improvement of our law enforcement agencies, coordination of those agencies, but I want

the same zeal, Mr. Johnson, for the improvement of the living conditions of the people as we had in the improvement ~~in~~ in the law enforcement conditions for the total community. They need to come as twin efforts, as simultaneous ~~efforts~~ efforts, and if I am permitted to be President of this country, I hope to bring that message to the American people.

Q: Just one other question, Mr. Vice President, ~~was~~ the Kerner Commission, as you know it was appointed by the President, it made a report which said that much of the problems in the urban crisis that many of the problems are due to white racism. As far as I can determine the administration has been rather silent on this Commission's report. What is your assessment of the report?

A: HHH: Well, first of all, the commission was appointed by the <sup>noted</sup> President, as you ~~know~~ knew. Secondly, the report has been taken ~~into~~ into each department of the government ~~for~~ for its implementation to see what we're presently doing to implement it, what more needs to be done. Thirdly, I believe that the basic findings and recommendations of the report are sound. I regret to say that there is in America patterns of discrimination and we know it. Now, what do the kids say? Tell it like it is? Now the fact is that there are patterns of racism in America. And that's what we were talking ~~about~~ about a moment ago. This, we must cleanse ourselves of. We must get away from it, and why not? Not only is it morally wrong, but it's economically wrong. I happen to think that the greatest resources <sup>of</sup> ~~in~~ America yet to be tapped are to be found among our poor, our needy, white or black, and might I say that the question of poverty and the lack of respect for human beings are not related simply to the black community. There are more poor whites than there are <sup>poor</sup> blacks, there are more <sup>poor</sup> rural than there are <sup>poor</sup> urban people. I believe that in these great areas of

pverty, and they're limited fortunately in America, that great human resources, ~~yet~~ untouched, ~~yet~~ untapped, undeveloped, I want to see that they're tapped and that they're brought to the forefront.

Q: (Oakes) Mr. Vice President, because it's so important, I'm returning to the item of Vietnam. What is the difference between your position and that of Mr. Nixon's in respect to Vietnam policy?

HHH: Well both of us feel that we ought not to say anything that would jeopardize the position of the negotiators in Vietnam. At least to my understanding of Mr. Nixon's position. I believe I have emphasized during the entire Vietnam conflict the importance of the country, of our government and indeed of our allies, of trying to improve the social and economic and political framework in South Vietnam. I've talked as you know of the so-called ~~single front struggle~~ other war. I've said there are two ~~war~~ struggles. There is the military front on the one hand and then there is the war that deals with the lives of the people, with the saving of the lives of the people. I put a great deal of concern ~~on~~ about the refugees, for example, a great deal of concern about the necessity of land reform in Vietnam. I've spoken up from time to time about the necessity of our government ~~being~~ <sup>walking</sup> being ~~able~~ to walk that extra mile as in the bombing halts that we've had in the past, the bombing pauses. I do not recall that Mr. Nixon has put himself quite on the line that way.

Q: Well, we do have a live war going on and you said recently and again a few minutes ago that you believe in a policy of restraint and a reasonable response <sup>(as a condition of a bombing halt)</sup> Now if the ~~policy~~ <sup>of</sup> de-escalation or the slowdown of operations of a month or so ago had been seized upon by <sup>the Administration</sup> as a tacit response by Hanoi, could we not have possibly made ~~progress~~ toward this goal of which you speak in the same way that Pres. Kennedy did at the time of the Cuban crisis in

III

10

respect to the rather doubtful message that he received from Mr. Kruschov.

HHH: I don't think there at all analogous, Mr. Oakes. I wish I did I examined the lull of which you speak very, very carefully, and my experience tells me that we had the same situation before other increased attacks. There was a lull in December before the Tet offensive in January. There was a lull in early ~~late~~ spring before the stepped up attacks in May and June. And I believe that we now see that there was a lull before the increased attacks that we've had in recent weeks, in recent days. Friday of last week there were over 60 separate attacks on the cities in the Northern area and around the demilitarized zone. And it's been general throughout all of Vietnam. And now I want you <sup>quite frankly</sup> know that I deeply wanted to believe that that lull was a political ~~signal~~ signal. & When I examined the evidence that comes to me as the Vice President ~~of~~ of the United States, I could not come to that conclusion and I believe it's fair to say now in retrospect, & that the lull was not a political signal, that we're going to have to wait for some political signals. I can say to this audience that we did during that period of time go to the North Vietnamese and say 'would you be willing now to talk about reconstituting the demilitarized zone as a DMZ area, would you be willing to do that as a sort of one of the ways of demonstrating some restraint and reasonable response that could let us proceed for the stopping of the remaining bombing?' They said no. 'Would you be willing to talk about the stopping of the use of artillery over the DMZ?' ~~and~~ they said no. Every single proposal we made and the American public must know this, every single proposal made by Mr. Harriman and Mr. Vance was summarily reject. Now I do not consider <sup>either</sup> Mr. Harriman

or Mr. Vance to be hawks in the parlance of our times, I think they're men of peace, I think they're dedicated diplomats to the cause of peace. Now we have tried and we must continue to try. Two weeks ago three weeks ago, I had reason to believe that maybe we were going to make some progress. I found those hopes dashed, not by the United States but by North Vietnam.

Q: You don't think the risk of stopping the bombing might be less than the risk of going on and not stopping.

HHH: I know that men of good will and of deep <sup>and</sup> dedicated feeling to the country of <sup>(Patriotism)</sup> ~~men~~ feel <sup>that</sup> this way. I must say, there/honest difference of opinion of this, but here's my view. All we're asking for from ~~North Vietnam~~, as the President put it, is some little sign that if we were to stop the remaining <sup>(at least)</sup> bombing, that they would discuss with us some of the problems which exist, like the demilitarized zone. We've gotten not a signal. I think the American people are fair minded people. I think they feel we've <sup>(have a)</sup> ~~right~~ right since we have presently limited our bombing to 78% of the area, excluded from it, <sup>99.0%</sup> ~~80%~~ of the population of North Vietnam <sup>the bombing</sup> excluded from ~~it~~. That was a unilateral decision on our part. I think the American people now feel that we have a right to expect <sup>(from North Vietnam)</sup> some way, directly or indirectly, <sup>some indication,</sup> some reasonable response <sup>that</sup> if we were to stop all of the bombing that it would lend itself to peace. In the mean time, Mr. Oaks, we have a half a million men in Vietnam and we have a large number of them in the I Core area <sup>and the south core area just</sup> south of the DMZ and if we stop that bombing above the demilitarized zone I think we have to ask ourselves our many more tones of equipment, how many more thousands of men come in unmolested

across the demilitarized zone to attack the men we have in the I Core area in the First <sup>F</sup> Corps Area, I have to think about that.

Q: Mr. Vice President, to sum up Vietnam, on what point if any, do you disagree with the Vietnam policy<sup>ies</sup> of President Johnson?

HHH: I think that the policies that the President has pursued are basically sound. I believe that those policies have been directed toward a political settlement. They've been directed towards negotiations, they've been ~~xxx~~ directed towards the development of constitutional government in South Vietnam. They've been directed toward the peace and security of all of Southeast Asia. The development of the Mekong River, for example I believe that those policies have contributed toward some stability in that area. I believe that Indonesia today is doing what it is currently able to do in part because we have taken a stand in South Vietnam. I believe that southeast Asia will be a more secure and a more stable, vital area of the world, if the war in South Vietnam can come to a political settlement, as we are trying to get in Paris. <sup>So</sup> ~~those~~ ~~the~~ policies I do not believe have been wrong. Now there may have been some nuances of differences, if I were the President of the United States. But I must say to you gentlemen, to play President, is not role for a Vice President. Maybe a Senator can play President, but the Vice President of the United States has a special responsibility because he is the partner of the President. And one thing I tried to do is to respect the limitations of that office. It has great responsibility with little or no authority. And I believe that I would ~~have served to injure the cause of the United States and to injure this republic if I had~~ were to have ejected myself of any little differences that I might have had publically into the public arena. I've had to present those points of views privately in the councils of government and I think you men know that I'm not exactly the silent type. And I

III

page 13

have been willing to present them on the occasion that I thought they were needed.

Q: Mr. Vice President, if we may just quickly change the subject for a moment to the subject of youth. You mentioned a minute ago that the kids say, tell it ~~like~~<sup>is</sup> is. In 1970 50% of Americans will be 25 year old or younger. This past year there have a record number of student revolts, a strong student protest movement has been evident and student support for the late Senator Kennedy and Senator McCarthy. Obviously the nation's youth is dissatisfied with the way things are being....

Moderator: I'm sorry gentlemen, our time is up.

REP: I had a good answer for you too.



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



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