

The National Broadcasting Company Presents



MEET THE PRESS

America's Press Conference of the Air

Produced by LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

Guest: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (D., Minn.)
and
SENATOR EUGENE J. McCARTHY (D., Minn.)

VOLUME 8

SUNDAY, AUGUST 23, 1964

NUMBER 30

Merkle Press Inc.

Printers and Periodical Publishers

809 Channing Street, N. E. Washington, D. C. 20018

10 cents per copy

Panel: BENJAMIN BRADLEE, *Newsweek Magazine*
RAY SCHERER, *NBC News*
JOHN STEELE, *Time & Life Magazines*
LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK, *Permanent Panel Member*

Moderator: EDWIN NEWMAN

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. NEWMAN: This is Edwin Newman, inviting you to MEET THE PRESS. MEET THE PRESS comes to you today from Convention Hall in Atlantic City where the Democratic Convention begins tomorrow. Our guests on this special one-hour edition of MEET THE PRESS are Senator Hubert Humphrey and Senator Eugene McCarthy, both from the State of Minnesota. One of them, most political observers believe, will be President Johnson's running mate.

The order of their appearance today was decided by the toss of a coin. We will interview Senator McCarthy first.

Now we will have the first question from Lawrence E. Spivak, Permanent Member of the MEET THE PRESS panel.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator McCarthy, I assume that if President Johnson asks you to be his running mate, the answer is still, Yes.

What I would like to ask you is, why would you be willing to give up a Senate seat which allows for so much independence for a job that doesn't allow for nearly as much independence?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I think the offer of the Vice Presidency by the President of the United States, speaking for your party, is the kind of offer which no person, who has been a member of a party, can really turn down. I think it is a matter of obligation, apart from any personal feelings that one might have,

either by way of desiring the office or by way of being particularly happy with the office of United States Senator.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, you once thought there was need—"to clarify the basic principles and traditions of the Democratic Party and apply them clearly to the problems of today." What do you consider some of the basic principles of the party to be today?

SENATOR McCARTHY: That is rather a large order. I have written really two books in which I have attempted to clarify those principles and as a member of the House of Representatives helped to form what has become the Democratic Study Group in that body, which has been concerned about clarifying principles and going on from that to laying out a basic program, which I thought would accomplish those principles and purposes. I don't think the program of our party is very far from what I would like to see by way of the ideal.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, maybe you can give us a brief answer on this one: You have been in Congress since 1948. What do you consider your own major contributions in the period you have been in Congress?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I think my major interest has been with the basic economic structure of the country. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee, I have been concerned about the reform of the tax structure of our country so that it would have the greatest possible effect by way of stimulating economic growth in the United States. I think the tax reduction which we approved in this last Congress was by way of a realization of some of the principles which I have been speaking about and talking about and recommending through these many years.

In addition to that, I have been concerned about what might be called the social welfare programs which I think are needed on a national scale today to reflect the fact that this is a single-nation economy. We should have a kind of common market, and we should have a truly national program of retirement as we have in Social Security. We should have a truly national program of unemployment insurance, which we do not now have, and we should have a truly national program of medical benefits for the aged, which we do not yet have.

MR. SPIVAK: One more question on the Vice Presidency: You have written a great deal on democracy in your various books. Everyone seems to be agreed that the President of the United States should pick his running mate, who may be the next President. Why should one man, rather than the Convention itself, in

your judgment, be allowed to select the man who may be the next President of the United States?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I don't believe that under all circumstances this would be the position of the party people, but I think in this instance it reflects a confidence in President Johnson and a realization that in making his choice he will make the choice which will reflect the overall interests of the party and his good judgment, in which we have confidence, with reference to the kind of man whom he would want to serve with him in the office of Vice President.

MR. BRADLEE: Senator, about this Vice Presidency, do you know anything that we don't?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I don't know what you know. I know very little about it. It may be that you know more than I do.

MR. BRADLEE: Have you ever discussed this with President Johnson?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I have not discussed it with President Johnson in any way.

MR. BRADLEE: When was the last time that you saw President Johnson?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I saw the President last week. We were down for the signing of the poverty bill, and he greeted me as I came in, and he greeted me as I left.

MR. BRADLEE: How do you think that your presence on the Democratic ticket would help elect Lyndon Johnson? What benefits would you bring to the ticket that others might not bring?

SENATOR McCARTHY: It is rather difficult to say. I think that this is the kind of determination which must be left up to the President himself. I am not really making my case to him. So far as I have been making a case, it has been to try to be as sure as I could that the President had the knowledge of what kind of limited support I had and what my qualifications were, if he were in any doubt. I have assumed that since he has known me during the 16 years that I have been in Congress, he is reasonably well informed.

My approach has been what I think the approach to the office of the Vice Presidency ought to be, namely, in important decisions—and I think this is an important decision for the President—to try to leave him as free to make the decisions as it is possible for him to be free. This means to give him a reasonable amount of information, that information which is necessary, but not to subject him in any way to any kind of pressure or any kind of special demand.

MR. BRADLEE: What part of the country do you think would be more liable to vote for Lyndon Johnson if you were Vice President than otherwise?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I don't know. I think that from whatever the columnists and the commentators have said, there is some indication I would have some support in every part of the country, perhaps not as enthusiastic support in some parts as other candidates might have but a kind of second position in almost every part of the country.

MR. STEELE: Senator, a man named Marshall Smelser, whom I believe is a friend of yours and sometime advisor, wrote recently of you in Harpers, "It might be said he is equidistant from his admired friend President Johnson, from his beau ideal, Adlai Stevenson, and from his respected colleague in chief, the late President Kennedy." That covers an awful lot of real estate.

Could you narrow it down a little bit and tell us what kind of Democrat you are?

SENATOR McCARTHY: He said "equidistant." He didn't attempt to measure the distance. That could mean that I was very close to each one of them rather than that I was very far away from them, and I don't have any indication of what measurement he was using.

MR. STEELE: Senator, I would like to ask you where you stand on the fight that is now raging here in the Convention Hall over the seating of the Mississippi delegation. Do you favor seating the regular Mississippi delegation or the so-called Freedom Party which opposes them?

SENATOR McCARTHY: It is my opinion that if the regular delegation were to take a loyalty oath on an individual basis, as they are being asked to do, it would be extremely difficult to deny to them a place in this convention. I do think that if that is done, we must somehow insist on action by way of resolution in this convention that when the next convention meets that we shall have assurance that every opportunity has been given to everyone in Mississippi who wished to participate in Democratic caucuses by way of coming to a Democratic convention, that all of their rights have been respected.

MR. STEELE: Then if this comes down to a roll call in the convention, you will vote against seating the Freedom Party?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I would say that if the regulars have taken a loyalty oath on an individual basis, we would have great difficulty in refusing them under the rules of this convention from being seated at the convention.

MR. STEELE: So far as I know the rules of the convention don't provide for a loyalty oath. Don't they only provide for state—that a state must—

SENATOR McCARTHY: This convention is still a going body.

MR. STEELE: The rules may be changed?

SENATOR McCARTHY: The rules may be changed, yes.

MR. SCHERER: Senator, it strikes some of us that you have an embarrassment of riches in Minnesota. There are 49 other states, yet if Mr. Newman's introduction is to be believed, you and your colleague are the two leading candidates. How do you account for this? What is there about Minnesota?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I don't know as either my colleague or I would say that we are necessarily the leading candidates. Certainly we know that we are not the only ones who are being considered. But I would like to give credit to the politics of my state, which is a very open kind of politics and one in which the competition, at least since 1944, has been rather severe. I would hope that this would continue in our state.

In part, as you know, it has been indicated that there is a great deal of pressure in our state from some of the able younger men, although neither Senator Humphrey nor I consider ourselves elder statesmen—it has been charged there is not enough room at the top in Minnesota. It is not so much pressure; it is rather a kind of open acceptance of what seems to be presented to us that moves us in this case.

MR. SCHERER: Which other names around the country do you think the President should consider in this matter?

SENATOR McCARTHY: Oh, I could make out, I think, a rather long list of names that he could consider and probably is considering. Senator Mansfield, certainly, would deserve some consideration. I think that you would have to give some consideration to people like Senator Fulbright, Senator Muskie from Maine, and you could go on listing a number of people from the north-eastern part of our country.

MR. SCHERER: One keeps hearing, Senator McCarthy, that you are more acceptable to the South than your colleague. I am wondering why this might be? Isn't it true that your record on civil rights is very much like his?

SENATOR McCARTHY: My record on civil rights, I think, as far as the voting record and so far as our statements have been concerned, has been almost identical. I have had no correspondence with the South on this. I would have to leave the determination as to why I may be more acceptable, if this is the case, to others who are taking a position on it.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator McCarthy, you have been quoted as saying that you don't think that Barry Goldwater can be beaten with a high level peace and prosperity theme. Were you accurately quoted?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I said that he could not be beaten on that theme alone, that I didn't think the issues in this campaign which would ultimately emerge as important would be the traditional ones in which we could speak in all honesty as to the achievements of the Democratic Party with regard to peace and prosperity, that he was attempting to, with some success, really to cast the campaign on a kind of ideological basis, in which case the achievements would come to be of somewhat secondary importance, and that we had to be prepared to meet him on the basis upon which he would present an attempt to conduct the campaign. The fact is, in American politics the challengers really more or less determine the nature of the campaign and of the contest.

MR. SPIVAK: How do you think he can be beaten?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I think he can be beaten—we do two things, one we talk about the record, certainly, but in addition to that, we have to make very clear the nature of the kind of ideological choice which he is attempting to lay down before the American people. In fact, his approach was made clear, I think, at the Republican Convention when not just liberals but even moderate Republicans were rejected. He is asking the people to make a clear choice between what he says is right and what he says is wrong, between what he says is good and what he says is bad, really, to make a case against the history of the United States and whatever may be wrong or whatever may be bad in it. And I think our approach must be to present to the people what has been the tradition and the record and the achievement of the United States.

If I could just give one example, let's take the matter of foreign policy: The record, I think, is very clear—what we have done, and this is by way of achievement at home, economic growth, by way of what we are doing in the field of civil rights, our action with regard to the test ban, that in effect what we have going now is, if I could describe it, I would say that there is the specter, really of—democracy and freedom is really haunting the Communist world, and this is the point we have to make. Not only are we haunting the Communists, but the vision and the dream of democracy and freedom is attracting all of the uncommitted peoples of the world. This is the record which American has made and which it is making, and I would hope that this would be the basis

upon which we could cast this campaign and certainly this would be my effort.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, I believe you referred to Senator Goldwater as a radical rather than a conservative. By our definition of the word that seems like a strange appellation to give him. How do you justify the use of the word "radical" for him?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I think it is a proper application in that he is not content with preserving the traditions and the continuity of his own party in the way, for example, that Bob Taft was concerned with preserving that continuity, but rather recommends a rather violent attack upon the traditions and the practices and the very movement of history in the United States. This can be radical whether it is from his point of view or whether it is by way of a kind of extreme attack from those whom we call and have called the left.

MR. BRADLEE: How about Congressman Miller, he was a colleague of yours for many years. What is your candid assessment of him?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I served with him in the House for a year or two.

My general feeling about Congressman Miller is that he will get better as the campaign goes along. It has been my observation that once a man has been Republican National Chairman, there is a period after he leaves that office that he is unfit for civilian life. He is like a war dog. It takes a little bit of time for him to be reconditioned, and I think Bill Miller will be a reasonably responsible candidate as this campaign goes along.

MR. BRADLEE: He is a Catholic, Senator McCarthy, and so are you. What role do you think religion is going to play in this?

SENATOR McCARTHY: If we could get them to cancel out the Notre Dame fight song, I would think it would have very little influence on the campaign.

MR. BRADLEE: He describes himself as a Notre Dame Catholic as against a Harvard Catholic, which President Kennedy was. Do you think there is a viable distinction there?

SENATOR McCARTHY: That is a new distinction. It is one that I really have never attempted to make, and I have never heard it defined.

MR. BRADLEE: Senator, you have been sparring with the sensation-seeking columnists and they with each other on this question of the vice-presidency.

Have you been able in the last two months to come up with any new concepts of what this job might mean, what it might be made into?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I don't think I have any new concepts. I do think that the office has become more important in recent years, principally in the post-war years. You have the constitutional responsibility of presiding over the Senate which of course is a limited responsibility. You have the responsibility of more or less representing and standing for your party. This office, I think, or this responsibility, I think, has become more important since the President now has less time for making party rallies and party dinners. And the third area of responsibility, of course, is that in which the President's determination is all important, and on the record, Vice President Nixon under President Eisenhower, and Vice President Johnson under President Kennedy, were called upon to do many more things than Vice Presidents of earlier years were called upon to do, and I would expect that this might continue after 1964.

MR. STEELE: Senator McCarthy, you said about a year ago that the idea that federal deficits can be justified only to control recession is outdated. Indeed you said it was as outdated as Newton's laws of physics.

Aside from meeting recessions and using this kind of financing to meet a recession, is there any excuse for running a federal deficit?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I think you have the best example in the current year when by positive decision we increased the deficit through the tax cut, not to prevent a depression but rather to move the economy from a high level to an even higher level of production. This was an application of a reasoned judgment which if you had accepted that the greatest evil was simply to reduce the deficit or to balance the budget, this action would not have been taken.

MR. STEELE: Wasn't one of the real purposes of the tax cut bill eventually to bring up federal revenues and close the deficit?

SENATOR McCARTHY: Yes, that is right. It may close the deficit or it may not, but the point I made had reference to depressions, and in this case the action was taken not to head off a depression in the classical sense but to lift the economy from a high level to an even higher level, even though this involved additional deficit financing.

MR. STEELE: Senator, you also wrote that the absolute control of inflation as an economic and moral necessity is a misconception. This is somewhat confusing to me. Don't you see a great danger in inflation?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I see great danger in uncontrolled inflation and even extreme inflation if it is controlled. But the

history of economic growth in the United States is one during which there has been some slight inflation. And my point there is that you should not raise the question of the absolute control of inflation as any kind of moral absolute but pass a reasoned, economic judgment on it. This is all I ask for.

MR. SCHERER: Senator, returning again to the overriding question of this convention, the Vice-Presidency, is it fair to say that the Kennedy assassination has changed the criteria for choosing a vice president?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I don't think it has changed the criteria very much, Mr. Scherer. I think the criteria would be essentially the same. The assassination, of course, has drawn more attention to the choice, but it is my opinion that any President or any party charged with making a choice of Vice President should, under any circumstances, use essentially the same criteria that are being applied, today.

MR. SCHERER: What would you say those criteria are?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I think that President Johnson has pretty well defined them and listed them. I don't see that I could add anything to what he has listed—in terms of knowledge of the problems of government, some experience in government, and beyond that, in certain virtues of prudence and compassion and those that would make for perfection in any man, whether he was the vice president or president, or in any profession or in any walk of life.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, there have been reports that you are still opposed to federal aid for parochial schools. Are those reports correct, and if so will you tell us why?

SENATOR McCARTHY: Yes. On the record, of course, I have voted for aid to public schools. The position I have taken on this is one in which I have held that it was not clearly unconstitutional to provide such aid, since we have done essentially the same thing at the level of higher education, but that the problem is a practical one and that the practical considerations in this case are of such nature that federal aid to non-public schools is not warranted.

MR. SPIVAK: Drew Pearson the other day wrote that you are the one Senate liberal who has consistently voted for the big oil companies, because you would not vote to change the 27½ percent depletion allowance for oil and gas companies. Would you tell us what your position on that is, today?

SENATOR McCARTHY: Well, I'll say, I am glad you asked that question. In the case of Drew Pearson, this instance, is one in which he ran true to form—I think he does more good than he does harm—but he would be much more accurate if he would use

the telephone once in a while, since the record very clearly shows that, of course, in the House of Representatives, I opposed the Tidelands Oil proposition and the Natural Gas Bill, and in the Senate, every vote that was taken in the Finance Committee on this question and every vote that was taken on the Floor of the Senate, until 1964—and there were, I think, three or four votes in the committee which are votes of record—I voted to cut down the depletion allowance, and I think there were two votes of record on the floor of the Senate. The one he pointed to was one that I missed. I don't think you have to be held responsible for missing a vote once in awhile when the record shows that before that vote and after it you voted to cut down the depletion allowance. But in '64 when the tax bill was up, we had reduced taxes, or rather, reduced the depletion allowance benefits by \$40 million in the committee, and the administration position was that this was as much as we should ask for and that members of the Finance Committee ought to try to hold the line for two reasons: One, they thought it was a desirable objective, and the other was that they were a little bit afraid that the oil people might gather up their strength if we tried to do more and even take this away from them. So as a member of the Finance Committee, I stood firm with the committee position. This involved some votes against the depletion allowance in the Committee and also on the Floor of the Senate, but that is the record, and there is no record of consistent voting in support of the oil interests on my part in the Untied States Senate.

MR. NEWMAN: Gentlemen, we have less than three minutes, and I would like at this point to read a bulletin just handed to me having to do with the credentials fight here at the Convention: Chairman Lawrence of the Credentials Committee has just announced that the committee decided to seat those members of the Alabama delegation who sign the loyalty oath required of the members of the National Committee. The Credentials Committee, after studying the Mississippi contest has named a subcommittee to study the problem tonight and report to the full committee tomorrow morning.

Now, we will continue the questioning with Mr. Bradlee. And questions and answers should be brief at this point.

MR. BRADLEE: Senator Humphrey sponsored the U. S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and you voted for a proposal to strip that agency of its research powers. What was that all about?

SENATOR McCARTHY: There were several things. One, I do not feel that research in disarmament is a particularly profitable

study, since whatever research can be done in that, it seems to me, involves a study of history. At the time I cast that vote, I was recalling what I said about Harold Stassen when he was in charge of disarmament under President Eisenhower, and I remember criticizing him when he sent out letters or asked the public to make recommendations to him with regard to disarmament. And the suggestions I thought might have come to him were of such nature as to recommend something like the Great Wall of China or the Peace of God or the Truce of God which was followed in medieval times.

I could see no point, really, in research in disarmament: It looked to me as though they ought just to take it up as a disarmament project and proceed on that basis. But to come in and say, "We are going to conduct—" this may be the old academic background—when you say, "We are going to do research," you ask the question, "What kind of research are you going to do?"

MR. STEELE: Senator, you said you saw the President recently, and he said, "Hello," "Good-bye." Did he also say, "I'll see you soon"?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I don't think he did say, "I'll see you soon." We may have taken that for granted—

MR. STEELE: Would you regard that as an ominous note?

SENATOR McCARTHY: No, I don't think I would regard it either as plus or minus.

MR. SCHERER: Why is there so much talk about Alabama and Mississippi when it is generally supposed they are going to Mr. Goldwater, anyway?

SENATOR McCARTHY: I think it is a reflection of recognition on the part of the Democrats that these are states which have a long history of support for the Democratic Party and Democratic Presidents and the Democratic programs and also a reflection of the desire on the part of Democrats, all of us, and particularly on the part of the President that he would like to be a President of all of the States. This, I think—or these two considerations, are primarily responsible for our concern.

MR. NEWMAN: Thank you, Senator McCarthy and gentlemen. I must interrupt, here, because our time for the first interview is up.

* * *

You have just heard our panel interview Senator McCarthy. We are now ready to question Senator Humphrey. We will start the questions with Mr. Spivak.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, you have been described as a New Dealer, a left winger and a liberal. What designation do you put on yourself today?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am a Democrat and very proud of it.

MR. SPIVAK: I am not talking about that. I know you are a Democrat. I am talking in terms of conservatism, moderation, liberalism.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am a good, modern Democrat and see the programs of our party doing great good for our country, finding myself in position of support of the basic programs that have been advanced in these recent years by President Kennedy and President Johnson. I've never really cared much for these tags or these labels. I think you judge people better by their record or their performance than you do by stereotypes.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, I recently got a release that came from your office which said, "Professional liberals want the fiery debate. They glory in defeat. The hardest job for a politician today is to have the courage to be moderate."

Do you still consider yourself a liberal or a moderate today?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: What I was attempting to say was, there are those who feel that you must get all or nothing. I have never felt that was very realistic. I think it is well for a person to have goals, goals that reach out a long distance, and to fight for those goals or those objectives, and if you can not obtain them completely at one time, you make what progress is available at the moment or at that time, and then you proceed to do what you believe is best sometime later. I have never felt that you made a real contribution to your country, your family or your profession by seeking all or nothing. I believe that you do much better by seeking progress.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, I know you don't like tags, but you know one tag that has frequently been put on you is that you are anti-business. Yet in your recent book entitled "The Cause Is Mankind" you speak in the very friendliest terms of big business. Who has changed, you or big business?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think some people are getting used to Hubert Humphrey, and possibly Hubert Humphrey is getting accustomed to some other people. One of the real problems in public life, as it is in private life, is that of communication, to know one another, to know each other. Of course I believe in business. I believe in the profit system. I come from a business family. I believe that our free enterprise system has the dynam-

ics of great economic and social progress. I believe that in America you need big business as well as small business.

The only question is whether or not it is in the public interest, and we make those judgments as we see the developments in the economic structure.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, in a recent speech you spoke of the importance of "a recognition by government of the legitimacy of reasonable business profits." Do you think the government ought to define "reasonable business profits"?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that is quite self-evident, as to what is a reasonable profit. It is generally determined by whether or not there is price fixing, price gouging. There is a way of determining that, both through competition and through regulatory agencies. The doctrine of reason is one that is based upon the assumption that you have reason, that you have the capacity to understand what is reasonable. Our courts make judgments every day as to what is a reasonable profit, as to what is a reasonable set of circumstances, so I don't think this is unusual.

MR. BRADLEE: Senator, you have had more than a casual interest in this credentials fight between the regulars and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Can you tell us just what your role has been in the last few days?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: My interest is in seeing this Democratic Party of ours grow and expand and to offer an opportunity for wide participation on the part of many people in many walks of life. I think that the Democratic Party is on the road to victory unless it decides to do something to derail itself, and therefore what I have sought to do, as one individual—not as any mastermind, but as one individual—is to seek understanding, to seek harmony that is based upon principle and to seek accommodation.

MR. BRADLEE: I understand the politics of it, but aren't you derailing, also, the major issue here, of—on one side. It seems to me during this Credentials Committee fight the split between the Democrats has been deeper than the split between the Republicans. On one side you have a Governor who refers to an enormous amount of Democrats as coons and possums and alligators, and on the other side you have these people who want to be seated and who are willing to fight and in some cases die for it. Aren't you burying that fight, that great moral issue?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Bradlee, we don't have much chance to bury it particularly when we have men like yourself who insist on reminding us of it. We are not going to bury it. We have a large number of fight promoters, and I think what we need now are a few people who are peace makers and will try to make

an accommodation based upon what is the standard—what are the standards of our party.

One of the gentlemen that you spoke of has already disassociated himself, so to speak, from the national commitments of the Democratic Party, from the platform of our party. The Credentials Committee is working with this thing, and the Credentials Committee is chaired by one of the senior statesmen of this party, the former Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, David Lawrence, one of the outstanding public officials of our country.

On that Committee are two representatives from each state. They are attempting to work out the credentials problem on the basis of the call of the 1964 convention, which is within the law and within the rules of this party, and I think they are going to do so, and if I can be of any help in that matter, I'd like to be able to offer it.

MR. BRADLEE: Can you tell us what kind of communication you have had with the President during your efforts to settle this dispute?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I haven't been in communication with the President on this matter. I have been in communication with the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence has talked to me about what the position is of the State of Minnesota. He has talked to be about what if anything we thought might be able to be worked out that would be helpful, and I think it will come.

May I say I think we are going to have some good news for you, that this great split that some people prophesied, will not come to pass. I think we will have unity.

MR. STEELE: Senator Humphrey, following up Mr. Bradlee's question for a moment, there has been a considerable number of reports that you undertook a mission for the President last week in trying to, as you put it, cool this thing down by asking northern delegations to go along with a move to seat the regular Mississippi delegation. Is that correct?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is not correct, Mr. Steele.

MR. STEELE: What kind of a mission did you undertake for—

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I did not undertake any mission for the President of the United States. He has been in touch with the Chairman, I gather, of the Committee, Mr. Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence is the Chairman of the Committee, and Mr. Lawrence doesn't need really any advice from Hubert Humphrey. He is an experienced man in these matters. My concern is that people who sit in this convention shall be people who are loyal to our party, people who will support the President of the United States as the

nominee of our party and will see that his name is on the ballot—the President and his Vice Presidential running mate and the electors pledged thereto, on the ballot in each state under the symbol and under the label of the Democratic Party.

I had something to do years back, with Governor Battle of Virginia, in working out what we called the loyalty oath for our party. I am very familiar with it. And the prime consideration here should be to see to it that people who serve in this convention—or that are delegates to this convention are true Democrats and are willing to support this party and its nominees.

MR. STEELE: Senator, you did have an hour with the President alone this week.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh yes.

MR. STEELE: Twice?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I said, "Oh, yes."

MR. STEELE: Did the matter of the Vice Presidency come up?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, it did not. My colleague, Senator McCarthy, and I have had much the same experience. The President has not discussed with me the matter of the Vice Presidency. He has had an opportunity to discuss—I have had an opportunity to discuss with him legislative problems and some of the problems that relate to our party in general, but not the Vice Presidency.

MR. STEELE: Senator, it seems odd, at least to an outsider such as I am, that two such outstanding Senators as yourself and your colleague, could visit the White House repeatedly, campaigns could be started to get the Vice Presidency for them, but nothing is ever said. Hasn't the President indicated to you some qualifications or some problems that he has in connection with the Vice Presidency?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Steele, it may seem odd, but this decision is in the hands of the President of the United States, and that is where it properly belongs, and I am sure the President knows Senator Humphrey. Like my colleague I have known the President for 16 years. I have served in the Congress with the President. I doubt that there is really anything I could tell the President about Hubert Humphrey that he doesn't already know, and I don't believe that it is really necessary for the President to sit down and discuss the qualities or lack of qualities of Hubert Humphrey with the President of the United States.

MR. SCHERER: On that point, Senator, if there was a clear consensus running at the convention for one man, would you think a President with sensitive political antennae would want to override it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am sure the President will take into consideration all the factors that relate to this important office. One of them would be the factor that you have mentioned. There are others. Above all what I am sure of is the President of the United States is a patriot. He loves his country. He is a President who seeks a great national consensus and national unity. He is the President of all of our people. He understands the importance of the office of President and of Vice President. I am sure what he is going to do when he makes his selection is to choose the man that he believes is best qualified in every area of political life of America, as well as to meet some of the needs of the party from whence that candidate would be drawn.

MR. SCHERER: On the more personal aspect of things, what kind of loyalty, what kind of man would make the ideal Vice President for a strong personality like Mr. Johnson?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The President himself has outlined what he considers to be the qualifications for a Vice President. One of your good newsmen said to me one time, "Don't you believe those qualifications are the standards for a saint?" and I said, "If that is the case, then I have to withdraw, because I can't qualify under that."

The President of the United States is the man that will determine whether or not we have these qualifications, and I would say from there on that what the Vice President does, if the ticket is elected, is again very much determined by the will of the President and what the President feels the Vice President should do in behalf of the country and the Administration.

MR. SCHERER: What do you see as the role of a Vice President in the world of 1965?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Vice President has three constitutional duties. First of all, he is the presiding officer of the Senate. That is the link between the Executive and the Legislative Branch.

Secondly, he is permitted to vote in case of a tie in the Senate to break that vote, and thirdly, if anything should befall our President and he should be struck down, the Vice President succeeds the President. That is all the Constitution says. From there on out what the Vice President does is based upon precedent, upon law where, for example, the Vice President is a member of the National Security Council by law, and upon the will of the President.

Vice Presidents at one time did little or nothing, literally nothing. It was an office of very little consequence. But since 1920, if my memory is correct, we have had three Vice Presidents that

have succeeded Presidents as a result of the death of Presidents. So the office is important. The duties of that Vice President are pretty well determined by what the President wishes the Vice President to do. The late Alben Barkley, for example, one of the great men, I think, of American politics, served as a good will ambassador for President Truman. He did a good deal of the political work in the domestic and in the American political scene. He had close connections and good contact with the legislative branch because of his long experience in the Senate and the House.

Richard Nixon served very important functions for President Eisenhower and was sent abroad, as you recall, into Latin America, into Europe, into the Soviet Union. He also did a good deal of the political work. He served on the Security Council in the Cabinet.

Then I think the real dimension of the Vice Presidency was developed by President Kennedy in his relationship with Vice President Johnson. There the President and the Vice President actually worked together formulating policy and program for the Congress and the Administration. And Vice President Johnson as you know was sent to many areas of the world by the President of the United States.

I summarize it by saying, a Vice President will be and is what the President wants him to be, and above all a Vice President must be loyal. He must have a quality of fidelity, a willingness literally to give himself to his President, to be what the President wants him to be, a loyal, faithful friend and servant.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator Joseph Clark, your colleague in the Senate, recently said that you were too valuable in the Senate to be exiled to the Vice Presidency. How do you feel about that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is a high compliment.

MR. SPIVAK: Why would you want to give up the very powerful place you have in the Senate to run as the Vice President?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that was answered in 1960 when the most powerful and influential man in the Congress of the United States and one of the most effective leaders of the Senate that America has ever known since the beginning of this republic gave up being Majority Leader to become the Vice President with John F. Kennedy, and that man was Lyndon Johnson. He knew what he was doing. He recognized the importance of the decision that he was making, and I surely do not feel that my importance in the United States Senate has ever equaled the importance of Lyndon Johnson as Majority Leader.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, after the Civil Rights Bill was signed by the President last month you were quoted as saying "What

used to be an albatross is now perhaps my greatest political asset.”

How has that become your greatest political asset, particularly in the South?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't recall saying it, but I suppose I did. Let me just say this, that I looked upon my work in the field of civil rights not particularly as a political asset but rather as a commitment of conscience. It has never really been a political asset for me to carry the label of Mr. Civil Rights, as some people have tried to call me, but I do know this, that it was right. I know that what I did and what the majority of us did in the Congress in passing the Civil Rights Bill was morally right, and I think in the long run it will be politically right. Therefore I am very happy about it, and I am pleased that I had an opportunity to serve in a capacity of leadership when the Civil Rights Bill was before the Senate and we did pass it. A successful achievement such as this, I believe, is something that one can at least have a moment of pride about—humble pride.

MR. SPIVAK: Do you think we have reached a stage of public opinion in the South, particularly, where it would not do the ticket any harm if you ran as Vice President?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is very difficult for me to make that judgment because that is a subjective judgment, but I will say this, that the people are really going to vote for President of the United States, and I can not imagine the people of the South turning their backs upon President Lyndon Johnson, who has been a friend not only of the South but of every other part of America. He understands the South, he understands their needs, the attitudes of the people, and I am convinced that President Johnson will receive great majorities in the South because he truly represents the legitimate interests of the entire nation and surely represents the needs and the aspirations of a South that is growing and prospering.

MR. BRADLEE: Senator, let's talk about the politics. What state would you help Lyndon Johnson carry that he wouldn't carry anyway, and conversely in what states do you feel that you might make his majority less?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Bradlee, you are assuming, apparently that I shall be—

MR. BRADLEE: I said “would.”

SENATOR HUMPHREY:—that I would have that privilege, and I shall go along with that assumption only for the purposes of this dialogue because that decision is ultimately the President's.

I do believe that whoever is the vice presidential nominee will have a responsibility to carry a good deal of the burden of this campaign, because the President will be needed in Washington a

good deal of the time. We have grave problems facing our country, and I also believe that the people of America are going to want their President in the White House during much of this campaign. They are going to be so tired of some of the noise and clatter, of charges and countercharges, that a quiet, calm, steady voice from the White House will give them assurance, and not only the people at home reassurance but the people abroad.

Therefore it is my view that whoever is the nominee of this party—and there are several who surely could carry this responsibility—the nominee for Vice President—if I were that man, I would feel that I could be of help to the President of the United States in taking on some of the duties and a good deal of the duties of carrying on the program of campaigning of education to every area in this nation.

MR. BRADLEE: Senator Goldwater said that the states that he thinks the election will be decided on are across the middle of the country there, particularly Ohio, Indiana—and Illinois—do you feel that you have qualifications to help President Johnson carry that state that are markedly superior to any other candidate?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wouldn't want to say that. That would be very boastful. But I believe there are several of us who know the issues, both domestic and foreign, that are capable of articulating those issues and of doing a creditable job. I would just note for this telecast that the President seems to have considerable strength, even if he didn't have a Vice Presidential candidate. The recent Gallup Poll which I saw today shows that the President now runs at an average of 68 percent in the nation compared to 32 for his opponent. He has gained some four percent here in just the last four weeks.

Our task, it seems to me, is to consolidate that support, to maintain it as best we can, and then to make this campaign more than just a noisy recitation of political promises and political platitudes, to make it an educational effort so that the American people will know more about their government, know more about the policies and the programs of their Administration—yes, and for the opposition to outline its plans for whatever future it may have for America.

MR. STEELE: Senator Humphrey, did you ever think that maybe the President won't be able to make up his mind with all these candidates that you have named, and maybe he will throw it to the convention?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: He could make that choice.

MR. STEELE: If he does, will you get in and fight for it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Steele, why don't you come around and see me if that matter develops, and I will be more than happy to confide in you.

MR. STEELE: It is a date.

Senator, in your recent book "The Cause Is Mankind" you wrote that "I believe that any policy, foreign and domestic, based solely on anti-communism is an edifice built on sand."

Yet how do you square that with your very strong support of the Marshall Plan and NATO?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I consider the Marshall Plan and NATO to be more than just an attack upon communism. Don't misunderstand me. Communism is an evil. Communism is an enemy, and communism is a virus that could infect the entire earth, that is, a political and social virus.

I don't think, however, that you combat it by just proclaiming against it. I think that you combat it not only with national security and defense and military power and alliances but also with economic programs such as the Marshall Plan, also with social programs and educational programs that we have going throughout the world—foreign aid for example. And NATO surely is in line with what I have said, because it is not only a military alliance, it is also an association of free peoples and free nations.

MR. SCHERER: Senator, on civil rights, Negroes lean strongly toward the Democrats. Is it possible that they are hurting their own cause—that is to say, the Democratic cause—by taking their struggle into the streets of Harlem and Rochester, Patterson, Chicago and all those places?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Scherer, none of us can condone violence or disorder. Enforcement of law and the maintenance of civil peace is the first responsibility of local government and of state government, of mayors and of governors, and we all deplore the fact that these demonstrations, which at one time were peaceful and non-violent, have become in all too many instances violent. But I would also want people to know that in many of these areas these demonstrations are not conducted by the vast majority of the Negro citizens or the American citizen of Negro ancestry. It is a minority. There were less than 1,000 in Harlem, out of 250,000 who lived in an area of three and a half square miles. And just on the way here to this broadcast and telecast, I read something that told me a little bit about the dimensions of this problem. There are 250,000 people in an area of three and a half square miles in Harlem. You could put the entire population of the United States in three burroughs in New York City if the same density were to be applied across those three burroughs. This kind of social tension, Mr. Scherer, lends itself to trouble. So we have to

do something about better housing, better education, better health and at the same time enforce the law.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, some people have been critical of the Democratic Administration because they sent troops into Mississippi to protect one Negro but did not send troops into Harlem to protect hundreds of Negroes and hundreds of whites.

What is your explanation for that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think there is a great deal of difference. In one area there was open defiance of the law by the constituted authorities. In another area, such as in Harlem and in Rochester, the constituted authorities from the Governor to the Mayor and the Chief of Police, sought to bring about law enforcement, sought to bring about domestic peace and used all the power at their command to do that.

Furthermore, in the instance of Mississippi there was a defiance of a Federal Court order, and the President of the United States has the responsibility to enforce the court orders.

MR. BRADLEE: What single issue is Senator Goldwater most vulnerable on?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it is the issue of, which of these two gentlemen is best equipped by temperament, by experience, by background to give this nation leadership in the years ahead.

MR. NEWMAN: Our time is up.

Thank you, Senator Humphrey, and thank you, Senator McCarthy, for being with us on this special one-hour edition of MEET THE PRESS from Convention Hall in Atlantic City.

The Proceedings of
MEET THE PRESS

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. Transcripts may be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope and ten cents for each copy to:

Merkle Press Inc. 809 Channing Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20018

MEET THE PRESS is telecast every Sunday over the NBC Television Network. This program originated from Convention Hall in Atlantic City.

Television Broadcast 5:30 P.M. EDT
Radio Broadcast 6:05 P.M. EDT



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