

11/20/64
- 1 -

VICE PRESIDENT ELECT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
PRESS CONFERENCE

Q. Mr. Vice President, will there be a great change in the United States foreign policy towards Latin America, . . . as for example would the lack of social responsibility of some powerful American companies abroad which create a hostile mentality towards the United States?

A. Well, our policy with Latin America today is based upon our treaty obligations under the Rio Pact and under the obligations of the organizations of the American States, the Alliance for Progress and the economic and social cooperation between the U.S. and the respective Latin American countries. John Kennedy, our late President, attempted to reestablish the philosophy of the Good Neighbor Policy, only to bring it up-to-date wherein our government and our economy would cooperate more fully with the Latin American countries and the individuals in those countries for the betterment of the economic and social life of the Latin American nations. Some of our companies may be guilty of practices such as you indicated but I would also say that many of the American companies, many of the American business institutions, establish higher standards of respect for workers and higher standards of cooperation with community life than even some of the native companies. Therefore, I don't point the finger at American business. I think that American business has learned how to bring humanity and humanism and humanitarianism into capitalism. It is my honest view that there is no more aggressive socially minded or socially conscious business enterprise in the world than the average American company. Now, in some countries this may not be the case, where our capital may be exported. But, at home, here in the United States, it surely is the case. And what our President seeks to do, and what I as his associate seek to do, is to have American business do abroad what it does at home.

Q. How?

A. Extend the same efforts towards recognition of the rights of labor, extend the hand of fellowship and cooperation in terms of community improvement and development, to seek to work with the governments that are responsible governments in the Latin American countries and elsewhere, --- not just in Latin America.

We are now entering in a period of what we call 'joint ventures'. For example, in Chile, just this past week the big Kennicott Copper Company has just entered into an agreement with the Chilean government for a joint enterprise, a joint venture. Anaconda Copper has already done the same thing. I recognize that there are powerful nationalistic forces at work in some of these countries and may I say quite frankly, that once in a while some of the people are rather filled with demagogery, --- because it is one thing to talk about nationalizing an industry for the purposes of the political leader, but the question is, what does it do for the people, what kind of wages do you have, what kind of working conditions do you have, what kind of product-productivity do you have, --- because to nationalize an industry and to destroy productivity is not to perform any social betterment at all. So, what I think we are now coming towards in Latin America is joint venture where there is in countries such as Chile and Peru, etc., where there will be large mining operations, let's say, where the government will join with the American private enterprise in a joint venture where there are members on the board of directors of the host country and the American capital where possibly the country itself will ultimately, a long ways down the road, find itself in complete operation. I believe that this is the pattern that there seems to be developing.

Q. Mr. Vice President Elect, are you going to travel soon in Western Europe for visiting -----and Charles deGaulle, do you intend to try to give a new aspect to the -----nuclear force with the possibility of the reparation of the French Bal----- with West Germany -----income tax in this respect or do you see the -----orations with Western Europe?

A. I have no immediate plans of travel. I want you to clearly understand as the Vice President elect I am not as yet a Vice President. I will be inaugurated and I will take the oath of office on January 20th. In the meantime, we have a good deal of preparation for our next legislative session of the Congress. As a Vice President I will be working closely with the Congress. I am the presiding

officer' to be' of the U. S. Senate and having had 16 years of experience in the Senate I will concentrate my attention in the early days of the new administration upon the legislative program. On matters of national security, the foreign policy, the President of the United States is the spokesman of our country and he is the only spokesman. Now, there are other voices and there will be senators and congressmen and editors and private citizens that will speak out about the policy that they believe in or that they feel that our country should follow. But, the official voice of America is the President and not the Vice President and not the Senator or the the Congressman, --- but the President. Now, I could consider it my responsibility to work closely with our President. I have said to him, and I say to you, that I did not seek the nomination of the Vice President or to be elected Vice President in order to have any public disagreements with the President of the United States. If I have any difference of opinion on policy it will be expressed privately and then when our government arrives at a policy, it is my duty to support that policy unless I feel that it is something I cannot support in conviction and conscience, --- and then it would be a matter, it seems to me, of stating that quite clearly to the Chief Executive. (Someone addressed him May I just complete this? I want to say that despite all the talk and all the reports of the press the government of the United States is committed to the improvement of the relationship in NATO. I have a feeling in the weeks ahead, months ahead, there will be a number of discussions relating to the multilateral force to see whether or not any changes or adjustments can be made that will accommodate the different points of view of the British, French, the German. France is a very key member. In fact, it is the keystone, it is the center of the NATO alliance. And, I am not one of the Americans that feels that the NATO alliance is in jeopardy because of the French action. I know that President de Gaulle has strong attitudes and strong points of view and convictions. Most great leaders do. Our task is to try to find some areas of agreement and to work on those. So, I do feel in the months ahead there will be an improvement in the

relationships rather than a deterioration. Temporarily, as you know, we are in some discussions on the Kennedy round in the common market. All of these matters are very difficult. Every country has its own economical and political interests and since we do not dictate, we have to learn how to negotiate. And when you negotiate you have to expect the other fellow to have a point of view and you don't expect him to give in or to capsize at once, and no one really give in, --- and no one really gives in. You make adjustments and accommodations. That's what a free society seeks to do and if ever there was an example of what I call cooperation and negotiation rather than dictation and domination, it is what we are now seeing where the U.S., powerful and rich and mighty, doesn't, --- isn't able to dictate even if it wanted to, isn't able to dominate even if it wanted to, --- we have to cooperate, we have to negotiate, In a sense, we have to placate to get people to work together. I would say that is our view of it and we want very much to see the relationships in central and western Europe strengthened, we are going through a very difficult time with the Outer 7, the Inner 6, the changes of the power of relationships in NATO with the whole matter of nuclear weapon development. This is another great epic, you might say another great period in the history of the world, and we're going to have to learn how to deal with it. Patience, intelligence and restraint, --- this is what we're going to have to have. I think we'll live up to that.

Q. What's wrong ----- with the impression of the Arab world ----- is that the U.S. is more sympathetic towards Israeli ----- of the next administration ---- what steps could be made ----- to make itself be more understood in the Arab world?

A. Well, here again it is a matter of communication and might I say, and also a matter of national leadership. One of the reasons that the U.S. is very friendly to the State of Israel is of course that there are a number of people in the U.S. of Jewish faith and background that are very, very interested in the developments in the State of Israel. Also, we recognize what happened in World War II when

there was mass extinction of people of Jewish faith by the Nazis; the Facists; and we are sympathetic with the aims and the goals of the people of Jewish faith for seeking a home land for Jewish people, a haven of safety and refuge; but more importantly, may I say quite frankly, that many people in the U.S. are not at all interested in Zionism as such, --- don't even know what it means. They are interested in Israel because Israel is doing something for people. Israel is seeing, --- instead of Israel constantly talking about how it can further arm itself, or acting as if it wanted to conquer other nations. Israel is saying, let's irrigate the desert, let's plant some trees, let's build some industry, let's build some schools, let's get some houses up and besides that, they have elections. They have a free labor movement, they have cooperatives, they have private enterprise; we are interested in these things. Now, in many of the Arabic countries this too, (-I should say in some-), takes place in some of the countries but there have been voices raised that say we will destroy Israel, drive her into the sea. We are not interested in having anybody driven into the sea. If that were the case, why don't Americans shout that we'll drive somebody into the sea? We have the power to do it. Most of the people that are talking about driving somebody else into the sea couldn't hardly lift a tea cup, they don't have the strength, they just talk big, but they threaten the world. I don't think that there is going to be any war because of major powers. If there is any war that jeopardizes the world it will be because of some smaller irresponsible country who will drag other people into it where we have treaty commitments. So, I wouldn't want to say, I want to make quite clear the position of the government of the U.S., --- it is not pro-Israel, it is not pro-Arab, --- it is pro-peace and pro-progress; it is for progress, social progress, political progress, economic progress, and any country that wants to do something about that, and at the same time wants to work in the cause of peace, is going to have our help.

We have given a great deal of help, of course, to all the nations in the Middle East. Many of the private citizens in America, the people of Jewish faith, have given a great deal of economic help to the State of Israel. Now I've been to these countries, not all of them, and I want to say that I have seen many wonderful developments, but I would be less than honest with you if I didn't tell you that I think that the time is at hand for the leaders of the Arabic Countries and Israel to sit down and start talking about their mutual problems, they are not getting any place. Why should these countries spend their money on airplanes and tanks? I have been in Egypt and the poverty is unbelievable. There ought to be an understanding that this area of the world is to be an area of peace. If there ever was a place in the world where there ought to be total disarmament, it is in the Middle East. They can't afford to buy a rifle much less a tank. They ought not to be spending their money on weapons, and the United Nations could protect this area from any potential aggressor; the major powers could have a treaty on non-aggression and of cooperation for this area. Why should the people of Egypt, or Israel, or Jordan, or Lebanon, or Iraq, or Saudi Arabia, or Yemen, where poverty is the common diet of the day; why should they have to spend a nickel for a weapon? It is ridiculous, and this is what makes the American people react the way they do. The people of Israel are spending far too much money on weapons, because they think if they don't then the Egyptians will get them. And the Egyptians say if they don't spend more money, then the Israelis will get them; so both of them have a deficit in the balance payments. Both of them getting deeper and deeper into debt, and who suffers? Not Ben-Gurion, not Nassar, not Eshkol, but the people, and I think our task here is to promote social progress.

Q. Iraq ----said in papers ----future progress in South America ----and I would like you to comment on this and what you think of the future measures of the Alliance For Progress and for future investments of the U. S. in Latin America.

A. Well, I am one of those like the late President Kennedy, that believes that the Latin American area, for we in the United States is one of the most critical areas in the world. First of all, we have a definite sentimental emotional interest in Latin America. It is in our hemisphere we say, geographically of course, many countries are really closer to the United States in distance than let's say Argentina, but for some reason or another, we feel a sense of closeness, togetherness, with our neighbors in Latin America. The alliance for progress, the charter at Punta del Este. All of these things mean something to the American citizen today in terms of a kind of a commitment to work as a partner and as a neighbor with friends maybe that we have never met. We are also deeply concerned of the erosion, the breakdown of economic institutions, of political institutions, which open the gate for more dictatorial regimes ...Castroism, to put it bluntly. So, I suppose that our interest was intensified by the dangers which were evident. I wish to goodness that we would learn to do things without having to be frightened to death. But most people will buy fire insurance on their house when their neighbor's house is burned down. And most people will learn how to drive safely after somebody in their family has been injured in an automobile accident. Regretably people all over the world will take a good deal of shock before they really become interested in doing what they ought to have done anyway. Most people are interested in peace because they see the devastation of war. Now we became more vitally interested in Latin America when we saw what can happen. When there is a lack of cooperation and interest, we are now on the way I might add, to doing a much better job together. I want to make it crystal clear, gentlemen, I am not one of the Americans who think that we have any obligation to save the world alone. I happen to believe that this is a common endeavor in which all of us have a responsibility. We don't have the means or the intelligence to do it alone. And even if we did, we should not do it. People should help themselves - but we should help them help themselves when we are more privileged in our country, than I might add, France and Great

Britain, Germany and Switzerland, Holland and nations of Western Europe, and now Japan. There are many other countries today that are much more fortunate than some of those peoples. Jointly, we have a responsibility I think to help other people lift themselves. But I became a little weary as I traveled around the world having people point their finger at us and saying "Why don't you do more". Well, we have got a lot of things to do right here at home. We have poverty right here in our own back yard. We have problems here, and I think it is important for the United States to fulfill its political and moral obligations, but I also think it's important for other people to fulfill their own. And when I hear people point the finger at me about the way American business does something wrong, or the way we treat some of our minorities, I'd like to remind others - be careful, because you may be sticking your finger in your own eye - because other countries have a great deal of reform to undertake. So, the Alliance For Progress is just beginning, it's less than three years old and within that period of three years many great things have happened. There have been improvements in tax policy, in credit policies, the rate of interest that many people pay in Latin American countries pay today is substantially less because of the Alliance For Progress. The Charter of Punta del Este Economic growth is up, population growth is faster, which is a problem unto itself. But there is beginning to be improvements in housing, people are now wanting to live better - they know they can live better. There are more school classrooms being constructed in the last three years than in the previous thirty. That's something, and we're training teachers, and they are training teachers, and we are learning how to work together. There is a new sense of dignity coming. The Campesino for example, is for the first time learning that he doesn't have to live in abject poverty. He can have a cooperative, he can have education, he can have pure water, he can have simple tools, he can get some farm credit; this is a re-awakening, and I'm convinced that we are going to make tremendous progress. Now our government is committed to this program - I want it crystal

clear that no matter what else may happen in the field of foreign aid, we are committed until at least 1971 - in the ten year period and for a longer period of time, I think, to a great program of economic and social cooperation with Latin America. We want to see free elections and we are going to use, and I want to say quite frankly, whatever influence we have to encourage governments to establish election dates. We think it is better to make slow progress under freedom than it is to make fast progress under dictatorship. Because the fast progress is an illusion, or collapses and I've never known a military dictatorship over a long time that effectively combatted Communism. When the military dictatorship breaks down there are communists all over the place. They come out from under the rocks and they come out of the fields; they've kept them down, they have never been able to really turn the tide. So it is maybe better to stumble and falter and wobble, then occasionally fall flat on your face under freedom and look like you're almost collapsing, then it is to seem strong and strident under dictatorship momentarily. Because people learn how to grow strong under freedom, this is our conviction. I think that we have got to more than just talk economics with our friends in Latin America. I think we have to let them know that we are interested in just more than a high standard of economic productivity. What we are really talking about here is the man that was never listened to before, never had a break in life, giving him a chance to stand up erect and say I want to be heard, I want to speak, I want my vote counted, I want a chance to do something for myself. That's what we are talking about. O.K.

Q. Travel -----

A. I won't be traveling there right away, but I want you to know that I am going to be taking a great interest in Latin America and will travel in the area extensively; Central South America.

Q. Kobayashi from Japan ---comment on ----in South Vietnam ---

A. I can't give you any answer to the latter, although we are surely giving this very serious study. When I say the latter, I mean the solution; because right at the present time our government and other governments are studying very carefully what can, if anything, be done. Let me just say this - we have no intention of withdrawing - that is number one. We start right there, and of course the real solution in South Vietnam is for the treaties and the protocols of 1953-54 to be abided by. That merely means that the South Vietnamese and the North Vietnamese are to leave each other alone, they were to develop separately and ultimately to work out their own destiny. Now what actually ahpped was the Vietmen and the North Vietnamese working with the Vietcong in South Vietnam engaged in a program of infiltration; first intimidation, terrorism, and open guerilla warfare has been stepped up. The question in America is will we step up our counter efforts. But again I want to say, I don't think this country can save any country that doesn't want to save itself. And what is required in a country is the will to live and a will to win and above all the will to govern itself. You have to have, not only military objectives, but political and social objectives. So we are examining this very very carefully; and we want to do it again in concert with others which have a responsibility. I personally, speaking for myself, think it would be a serious mistake and I feel it would be a foreign policy disaster for the United States to suddenly withdraw from the area and just leave it standing there uncertain, divided, confused, it ultimately would fall into the hands of the aggressing force from the North. There is no doubt about that. And we are not a weak country, we have never really poured the power of America into Southeast Asia, and we don't want to have to. Because we are a peaceful people and the people of the United States have no desire to be involved in that area. But equally, they have no desire to be run out. Because we are not there because we wanted to be there, we are there by invitation,

we are there by agreement, we are by treaty and we are there because we happen to feel that the world in which we live today is very much a neighborhood; and if freedom or independence dies in one area of the world it can die someplace else. And I might say that I am one that believes that if the Communist Chinese, the Communist Regime in China and the North Vietnamese, the Ho Chin Minh Regime, if those forces can over run South Vietnam with all of its problems and all of its inadequacies - it has many, then after that part of the world is gobbled up there will be some other part and there are some very juicy plums in Asia. Our friends in India have a little tussle with some border disputes. The Russians are even finding out that the Chinese Communists are not exactly the most peaceful neighbors.

Q. Sir, it has been said the last presidential campaign ---10 days ---contrary -- republic. Will you state your opinion on this, and can you tell us if you have any plans put forward in your reform for this campaign or even the convention.

A. Well, this is a big country and the American people are very demanding of their public officials both in and out of office, this is very much a peoples government and very much a democratic government, the people want to touch you, they want to see you. You know the best way to lose an election is to be in Washington and to be a good Congressman and a good Senator and never come home, you better get back here to see these people because this is a very very big nation and people want to see you, they want to have coffee with you, they want to walk right up to you and say "Look, I don't like what you're doing", they don't want to write you just a letter. And, by the way, the average member of Congress is deluged, he has a flood of mail. In August or July of last year, I was averaging over 1,500 letters a day. Now the campaigns are tiring and American politics are made for the fit, it is much more important to be physical fit to be a politician than it is to be a football player. You can have a man on the football team that isn't in too good a condition, but you better be in good shape when you're in American politics. It

requires a great deal of stamina. I think the campaigns are too long with modern communication, this is not the day of the covered wagon or of the buggy or even of the Model T automobile, it is the day of radio and television and a fast moving news media and we can get to an awful lot of people more rapidly with the plane, in fact you can cover 2, 3, 4, 5 states or centers in one day or one afternoon with the modern communication, with your airports and with your fast planes. So, I would hope we could slow it down some and that we could shorten the campaigns and its being now discussed. The only way you can do it really is by a general agreement between the two political parties on the date they set their conventions and that will take some doing, we may not make it right away because everybody thinks that if he can get a little longer he might win.

Q. At a press conference in ----Mr. Goldwater said ---organize the American party system-----As a man from the liberal wing and

A. I used to think it was very desirable and I've changed my mind and I doubt that its very possible. Mr. Goldwater should be interested, however, in reorganizing and rebuilding the part that he has almost destroyed, and that is a fact. We need a good two-party system in this country; but American politics is not based upon an idiological difference, its based upon a degree of difference within the prospect of obtaining or fulfilling common goals. I'm classified as a liberal in American politics, and its hard to define that phrase or that word. I feel that I'm more effective within my own party, trying to bring the more conservative element over to my point of view within the household of the Democratic Party than I am trying to go over and make a liberal out of conservative in the Republican Party, and I think the Republican feels the same. A Republican conservative feels that he is a little better off to be with a few Republican liberals in his party where he can work on them closely. Now what actually happens is that there is an accommo-
dation process, a man learns soon when he goes to the Congress that he doesn't get

what he wants, but he has the right to present his point of view and to fight for it and then if he has any sense he makes what adjustments are necessary to make some progress. I've never enjoyed taking a firm position on minor or less than critical issues. There are some issues that you just have to stand on, for example, I feel the issue of our participation in the United Nations, the issue of human rights, I don't think you can compromise out those issues. But there are some matters, for example, what should be the minimum wage, you can come down there like a flaming liberal and say it ought to be \$1.50 per hour and the conservative says, well some conservative, I'd call him a reactionary, "you ought not to have any". He doesn't have very many votes, that fellow. But there will be another fellow that says "I think about \$1.00 is enough", and he is considered to be the conservative. So, what do we do? Now, if you want to lose the bill you just stand for \$1.50, you'll make a good headline, some little band of people will say "what a principaled man that is; he fought for \$1.50, of course they killed him. he didn't get anything, we still got .80¢, but he was a fighter". Or you can get \$1.35 and come up you see, the other fellow only wanted to give you \$1.25 or he maybe only wanted to give you .90¢, but you got him up half way and you had to give some. That is the way I learned to work. Those are on what I call economic issues. On housing for example, I was one of those that thought we ought to do much more in the field of low cost, low rent public housing for our low income groups, so I'd come in there fighting, let's say for 250,000 units, somebody else over here said they shouldn't build one, have no government in this business, he didn't have very many votes. But, Bob Taft, the late Senator from Ohio said, "well maybe we ought to get out 100,000 units, that Humphrey is too radical", and I said that Taft is too conservative, so you know what we got ---150,000. I got him to give 50 more than he planned on giving and he made me come down 100, but I got 50 more than he had, and he had the votes. So, I think it is easier to not have the straight party alignments of conservative and liberal in American politics.

The Democratic party is about like this, it is a spectrum with lets say about 3/4 liberal and 1/4 conservative. The Republican party is about 3/4 conservative and 1/4 liberal. The liberals on both parties tend to work on each other, the liberals in the Republicans work on the Republicans and the conservatives in the Democratic Party work on the liberals and vice versa and then when we come around to vote you always have about 10 Republicans that are voting with the Democrats and about 12 Democrats who are voting with the Republicans. You shift around but you don't always hold the same ones on every issue. You know you find, for example, one of the most conservative men in Congress will maybe be a great conservationist and one of the most liberal men in Congress may not be interest in conservation at all. So, as I learned in Congress, you find where the bodies are and round them up when you need them. The main idea is to be able to count accurately.

They tell me the governor is up there, ask him to come down and say hello to these people - tell him to come on down here.

Q. -----and Russia has promised to give them and so the Western Allies are going to lose this island -----the United States -----Western Allies -----How do you think ---

A. Now who do you think is losing the island? Do you really think the Russians are interested in a free Cypress? I think one has to ask himself, have you ever known the Soviet Union to really just be filled with Christian compassion or Arabic or Moslem compassion, I never have. I think that Mr. Makarios is a man of the church showing some very peculiar attitudes. You ask for a blank answer, you got it. I'm interested in a free Cypress and I am interested in having problems settled without blood shed and without war, and I think that many of the responsible leaders in Greece have been very very restrained. I must say that the present government is taking a great deal of abuse from certain extremist elements in Greece about this matter but the Greeks and the Turks are members of Nato and they have responsibilities greater than just Cypress because the enemy is just not the

Cypriots or the Turks or the Greeks, they may have their problems but the real force today of power on the opposition is in the Soviet Union and Communist China, and I think we ought to keep our eye on the main event. Now I know that the government of Cypress has turned to the Soviet Union and if they feel that is going to make the United States any more charitable and reasonable, they're wrong; because if any country feels that the way they ought to get along with the United States is by the process of political blackmail, let them try it. We are not ready to jump for that, and I am very interested, I want you to know, as a citizen, in the freedom of Cypress. I want to see that problem solved some way and it is a difficult one. Whether it can be solved by a normal election process, whether it can be solved by partition, or whether it can be solved by movements of people, or whether it can be solved by just basic understanding. You know, I don't understand why people don't consider themselves to be nationals of Cypress rather than Greeks or Turks. You know, I never quite understood that. You know, if you lived there and are a member of a society that says its a free nation, then act like it. It's like in my own country here, our first obligation is to the United States of America, not to the Norwegians, or the Swedes or the Germans or the Jews or the Arabs or anybody else. We are Americans, and if at any time a person cannot fulfill his American citizenship, I think that he ceases to be really a good citizen of his country. Now, you can have your loyalty, you can have your sentiment, it's just exactly like now, look - now I'm a Minnesotan but I became Vice President elect, I just can't think now of Minnesota, even tho' this State has meant everything to me. My heart is here, my loved ones are here, my friends are here, this State has made it possible for me to have a good life. But, if I've got to make a choice, a decision has been made now I'm going to be chairman of the space council - I can't just say well I'm from Minnesota - by golly I've got my chance, we're going to pour it all into Minnesota. If Minnesota deserves it, Minnesota is going to get a break

but I've got to be Vice President of the United States - they didn't elect me Vice President of Minnesota, we've got a governor. He tells me what to do plenty of times.

Q. Will the United States continue to locate in Cuba ---perhaps in a movement to overthrow Mr. Castro or will the United States seek an approximation with the government of Mr. Castro.

A. Well our policy has been stated in the Organization of American States and the OAS has taken very vigorous action as you know in reference to the subversive activities of the Castro government. The present policy that we pursue is not one of punishing Cuba, its one of trying to permit Cuba to come back into the society of free nations where Cuba can have a progressive government, it can have improvements for its own people. If Mr. Castro ceases and desists from his clandestine subversion activities and ceases and desists from being an aggressor, not only by the movement of men and material but also by propaganda and infiltration it is entirely probable that the Organization of American States may take a new look at Mr. Castro. But this government of the United States does not feel that Mr. Castro is acting responsibly and it feels that he is a threat as he was a year ago in Venezuela landing munitions, open infiltration, open conspiracy in Venezuela and until that type of activity ceases there isn't much ground for any discussion.

Q. (Brazil) Sir: How do you see the operation of Communism in Latin America and what would be the position of the United States towards a country with a leftist government.

A. Well a leftist government is one thing and a communist government is another. Now, lets say, for example, I think the government in Chile - the new election in Chile - President Frei -as former Senator, I've known him - he's a Christian

Democrat; but he is of what you might call the left wing of the Christian Democratic Movement. He is a very progressive man - some people might say that he is a left wing Christian Democrat but he was elected in a free election, he believes in protection of human rights, he believes in the election representation process.

Gentlemen, this is the Governor of the State of Minnesota - Governor Rolvaag and our Senator Designate - Senator Mondale.

I would say that rather than to wait until this unhappy set of circumstances develops, where there could be a Communist takeover, the time is at hand to do something to prevent it and that is by social action, economic action, political action to support the forces of progress, progressive regimes in these governments that are trying to do something for the people. I think all too often we contemplate what will we do if a Communist government takes over, well there was a danger of a Communist backed government taking over in Chile but the people in Chile, the liberal progressive left of center forces and some of them right of center decided that they were not going to let this happen and there was a great victory there for democracy. The same thing was true in Venezuela where Leoni was followed by Betancourt. These are liberal progressive governments and in other countries. You are from Brazil are you not? Well, I knew your former President, Mr. Goulart, I knew something about your problems. I don't mean to interfere in any way or to even cast any disrespectful comment, but there was no doubt that there was very serious movements of, or very significant movements of Communist infiltration in high places in the governmental structure and in the economic and social structure and your country had to take some action because it was an emergency. This was like a person being almost a victim of a sudden attack and you had to take emergency action, now the question is, having taken the emergency action - when do

you prepare to get the country back into democratic paths in terms of free elections, you see, and I think this is the decision your government is making. I hope it shall, and in the meantime there ought to be very close cooperation between our two countries, because Brazil is very very important in the whole structure of Latin America and the United States. Its the biggest country, the most populous country, potentially the richest country, and it has a fantastic economic development - its had one going. Its major problem is keeping its political house clean, keeping its political house in order. But I can tell you this that some of the financial circles such as the World Bank, I'm not speaking now of only the private, but the World Bank feels that there is substantial progress being made in Latin America and in Brazil and are very hopeful. The officers are very hopeful that the future will be a little brighter.

Q. Mr. Vice President Elect - Can you blame the hostilities being shown towards-- --that the United States has a government ----by most young African countries on U.S. present foreign policy or on her relationship ---gives more aid to ----

A. Well, our relations, of course, with South Africa are strictly formal and diplomatic, we don't extend any aid to South Africa and we are very careful in our relationships as you know with that country because of its racial policies. I, as a citizen of America and a Senator, feel that it is to be somewhat expected that we will be accused of many things and occasionally abused. We are the central target of the opposition and in every new country whenever there are problems that seem to be unmanageable for a while its always easier to find an outside foe than it is to come to grips with the problem at home. We've never been able to develop in these countries, and we should not, and I want to make that clear, we should not develop an American force inside of a country to get the students organized to throw rocks at the Soviet Embassy, we don't operate that way. I've

been all around and you can go in many of these countries and if you've got \$50.00 you can get a riot started almost any time - you know that just as well as I do, and you know my friends in Latin America, that you have some professional students that never seem to graduate, they are in college for 20 years - they are there for one purpose - they are there to promulgate their ideas and they're there as political actionists, they're there as conspirators, they're there as agitators. Now we don't operate that way, maybe some people say we should, but I must say that it is not within our political pattern. Therefore we must expect, on occasion, to have a national leader and sometimes a demagogue who is seeking his way up the political ladder in a hurry to accuse the United States of every conceivable thing. For example, may I say most respectfully, in Greece the other day, a very fine friendly country, there were charges made in the parliament that the United States had conspired to get rid of Pantondarou who was, by the way, from the University of Minnesota, I know him personally - know his father, This is so ridiculous that it is utter nonsense, but its easy isn't it to say, well its all the fault of the United States or its easy for some people in America to say that everything that goes wrong in other countries is due to the Soviet Union. That is a very easy thing to say too, we have a lot of them around here that say that any time there is any trouble it is the Communists that stirred it up. Now that isn't true because there would be trouble in this world if you never had any Communists. If you've got hungry people, if you've got sick people, if you've got people that are victims of long term frustration and bitterness, they are going to get angry, they are going to have riots. So we are not worried about this particularly, we are going to continue to work with the responsible leaders and the friendly peoples of these countries and our African policy, frankly I'm not at all disturbed about it. I think we've done quite well in Africa and I think Africa is doing quite well by itself considering that the fulfillment of independence is all within the last decade - in the last 10 years - last 15 years. It is amazing how well things have

gone. To me what is amazing is that the whole continent hasn't been in utter chaos - but what has really happened is that there is some good forces at work and one of them, by the way, happens to be in your country. We feel, you're from Nigeria are you not? That Nigeria represents a very constructive, forward looking, sound, political economic force in Africa. Now we are not always going to agree with what happens there, but take a look for example at Guinea. Not long ago it looked like it was gone, you know the Communists had chewed it up, pretty soon they found out that the Communists were going to chew it up, not the local ones, but some of the other ones and the government took a little turn. Because one thing I've found out in politics is that the man that is in power likes to stay there - that's true isn't it Governor? If somebody is coming in to displace him, he takes a rather strong view to the contrary. So, if you've got some suggestions on our African policy we are always open, we don't know too much about this area. May I just say this to you, please be a little tolerant with us - we've had a tough time developing this, our own country, we've never really had a major foreign policy in America until after World War II. We've had to do everything that we're talking about in the last 15-20 years. In the meantime, we got quite a country of our own and you know everybody over here knows how to run the government better than the people who are running it. We have elections all the time and we've got editors who know how to run the government better than the President, the Senators know how to run the government better than the President, the President knows how to run it better than the Congress and everybody knows how to run it better than the Congress and the President so we have many people telling us what to do.

Q. Sir: The welfare state has arrived in America I believe, and it seems likely that the United States is going to continue to move in the direction of Social progress. I know this is a field in which you are particularly interested. Could you say what developments you foresee in future years in this industry, particularly in regard to public health and poverty.

A. I wouldn't say that we have a welfare state in America. I think we have a society and a social structure that is keenly interested in human welfare. There is a great deal of difference. A welfare state can be one that is totally organized or organized completely down to the last individual by the government, but actually to be quite frank about it, the pension plan of the Honeywell Company here in Minneapolis is much better than the social security program in the government of the United States. We have many social welfare programs by private industry, contracts between labor and industry, that are much better than any thing that the government has. The truth is that the medical programs in the United States today, there are millions of workers covered, fully covered, themselves and their families, by health care programs without any government in it at all. The only thing that the government is in on is that it is a business expense as a deductible tax item. You have for example, a large corporation like Ford Motor Company sitting down with Mr. Reuther of the UAW, and let me tell you that when those two giants come to grips with it, the leaders of both have to think of the workers and the stockholders and the consumers and the general public policy, not just private policy. A Ford Motor Company worker today has as good a health protection and as good a pension plan as any worker any place in the world. They've got a remarkable program. So that what we've really had here is the government by encouraging industry through expansion and tax policy, encouraging labor through collective bargaining, to encourage these two forces to work out programs that are mutually beneficial. Now lets get to the public sector of it. We're going to pass, in this coming session of Congress, hospital and nursing home care for senior citizens. We'll pass that - that'll be before the middle of summer - what we call Medicare - thats a wrong name, its really hospital and nursing home care. It will be some form of it - tax supported for those persons that are active participants in the work force. We make progress slowly but significantly. We are improving our Social Security system, we

are now studying a way that we can upgrade the Social Security system on the basis of the cost of living - some flexibility. This is one of our task forces reports. We are going to do a great deal in terms of elderly housing with special concessions to private industry as well as to the local jurisdictions of government to build apartment housing, not just concrete, but livable units - open spaces, ways and means so that elderly people for example can be brought back into local Peace Corps activity. Why should you let a man age 65 on Social Security just die on the vine. Many people with modern medicine and modern diets are more vital at age 65 today than they were at age 45 - 35 years ago. They just live better. Good medicine, good housing, good recreation, good food, they are strong, they are vital. We want to see those people, not be retired as such, we want them to have the benefits of retirement but we want to ask them to do something for their community, they can work in schools and hospitals, in recreation, they can help in a thousand ways. We can organize a senior citizen corp in the United States to work semi-voluntary, and some with modest pay. Just like we've asked the young people to go overseas to teach and work in the Peace Corps. Now, these are things that we are going to be working on, this is some of our program ahead. So, I think that each country does this its own way, for example, our friend Governor Rolvaag toured the Scandinavian countries recently - I think it was about a year ago wasn't it Karl? (Addressing the Governor) Well, there they have a special type of medical program, different than the British - much different, and you have one in France that is different than the British or the Scandinavian countries. You have one in Germany that is different. Each country develops its own but there isn't any doubt but what they have the welfare society, the society that is dedicated to human welfare is a fact today and that is all to the good.

Q. The United States has a different attitude towards the governments of Latin America. It recognizes the military one of Brazil but not that one of Bolivia. ----democratic election in Chile ---What do you think will be the future attitude of the United States toward a government not elected democratically.

A. Well, sometimes we have to work with these governments, but we surely do not approve. We may have to accept them or condone them, but we do not accept them in the sense of moral approval. You may recall that Argentine had military take over for awhile and then they went to elections. You can recall the problem in Peru, and I was one of the most critical of what happened in Peru because I felt very badly that constitutional government had been destroyed. President Prado, this good man was a conservative, but I have never forgotten that he was the first in World War II to pledge his country's assistance to the United States and I wasn't concerned as to whether a conservative won or a liberal won or a radical won in Peru - as long as it was a free election and I am concerned if a Communist take-over takes place, because I consider that an enemy of freedom - an unqualified enemy.

Q. In the light of China's bomb blast and Prime Minister Shastri's decision to go ahead to spend for economic development rather than the A bomb - do you think that the admission of China to the UN will help make China behave itself?

A. Well its been the position of our government to oppose the admission of China to the UN primarily because China hasn't acted responsibly or in any way indicated that it is willing to act responsibly. I must say first of all, that I cheer the decision of your government, it was a hard decision for your government to make in light of the pressures upon your borders and because of the concern of your own people for military security. But, as our President said, that any country that wants freedom, and any country that is vitally interested in the preservation of peace doesn't have to worry about a nuclear power - we have it, and it will be

available for that country that seeks to preserve its freedom and its power if that country wants it. There are very few countries that can afford this, the Chinese are taking this out of the backs of their people, nuclear power is expensive, The propulsion and delivery of those weapons is only for the rich or for the people that can enslave others. This is why Mr. Wilson in Britain today is taking another look at the whole subject of whether or not Britain ought to have a separate nuclear deterrent. The people of France have paid a high price for nuclear weaponry. Only the well to do countries can afford this, and then it is a very serious burden upon the people. We've put unbelievable billions of dollars into this, and I want to say for India to have spent money in nuclear weapon development at this time would have been tragic in light of the very serious economic needs of the country and the economic progress being made. Now, relating to your own question, I am convinced that your country, and I notice now that Britain and others will press for the admission of Communist China. We have a different view of this. Let's use the British as an example. They recognize Communist China, not because they approve of Communism and not because they approve of the regime', but because it is an established policy. They think it is wise policy - like Mexico recognizes any government that is in power, they don't make a moral judgment but they make a political judgment. The American people would be, I think at this time, very rebellious, they would be very much opposed to our government's recognition - not recognition but voting for the admission of Communist China in the United Nations. We do make moral judgments, sometimes this complicates our foreign policy, and it does to a great deal, but this is our people and our government has the responsibility to represent its people, so whether you could agree with our policy or not, the policy of the government of the United States is the view of the American people, not all of them, but what I think is the majority of the American people.

Q. -----result of the recent study done by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to the question ----business ---university professor the opportunity or not to enlarge trade with the Communist countries, and you probably know for instance what John Galbraith now at the University of Harvard had to say on the economic blockade to Cuba. I would now like to know from you specifically what do you think will be the American government's attitude towards this trade with ---European countries and on the Cuba blockage and if its possible to enlarge China trade.

A. Well we consider Cuba a separate problem because of its activities in this hemisphere, and by violation of treaty agreements and violation of the Rio Pact and Bogota Agreement and in terms of its subversion and activities in this hemisphere, so our policy towards Cuba as I indicated before will be maintained until Mr. Castro takes a change of heart. He betrayed his own people you know, he never told his people he was a Communist. I'm not quite sure when he became one either, but he that as it may, now let us talk about Eastern Europe. It is my view, Sir, and I would say that this is shared by many people in the government, I expressed this as a Senator, and I still am a Senator so I can express it again. It is my view that in non-strategic goods, and by the way we should have a clearer definition of what we mean by strategic and non-strategic, we should try to get our allies, particularly our Western European allies who agree with us on this definition and in the field of strategic goods which basically effects the military capability or capacity of a country, there ought to be a sharp line that is not crossed, we just ought to ask and insist of our allies, if we're allies, that we abide by that. Then you come to the non-strategic, and you can have a liberal interpretation of that, for example buses and cars. Some people would say they are strategic but I would say they are relatively non-strategic. You come to that; then you open up the channels of trade. I think the American business man would be a very good influence in Eastern Europe. I don't think he would turn Communist,

I don't think he'll sell out his country, I think that he might find an awful lot of people over there that would like to hear what he has got to say, and I'd like to see him drive one of those nice American cars over there, I'd like to see him come over with American goods, and I'd like to see the British and the French and the Indians and the Japanese and anybody else do the same thing. I think that once Mr. Krushchev opened the iron curtain, we ought to have rushed in and I think the best contact with the people is through trade. This doesn't bring you into a direct ideological conflict, it does help, it strengthens your hand, particularly when most people yearn for the same things. A housewife in Romania, as the Romanian government has found out, is taking a very independent course as you have noticed, is interested in soap and is interested in clean water and interested when they hear about it and they do hear about it, some of the modern appliances. Not necessarily what you may have in your American home but moving towards at least some more modern techniques and instruments. So, I am for trade, I think it's good, I think it is particularly good in consumer goods and I think that you are going to find our government moving that way.



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