A

TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "ABC'S ISSUES AND ANSWERS."

ISSUES AND ANSWERS

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1966

GUEST: Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States

INTERVIEWED BY: Howard K. Smith,
and
Edward P. Morgan, ABC Commentators.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Vice President, one of your predecessors, Vice President Nixon, the other day quoted President Johnson as saying that a vote for Republicans could cause the nation to falter and fall back and fail in Vietnam, and Mr. Nixon commented that this was a vicious, unwarranted, partisan assault on the Republican Party that could destroy bipartisan attitudes towards Vietnam. What is your comment on that?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, my recollection is that

President Johnson asked for the election of a Democratic

Congress to support his policies. This was obviously a

political rally that the President addressed and you would

expect, I am sure, the President of the United States, as the

head of the Democraty party, as well as being the President

of our great nation, to ask for the election of Democrats that

support his policies.

Mr. Nixon often finds partisanship in statements of others. I regret that in this instance because Mr. Dirksen, for example, the Minority Leader of the Senate, only recently paid very high tribute to President Johnson at a luncheon over at the Unitd States Senate, a sort of a going-away party for the President on his Manila trip, and both leaders of the Senate, Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Dirksen, praised the President for his leadership, for his willingness to make this journey and wished him Godspeed and all possible success.

As I recollect, most of the Republican leaders have expressed themselves the same way.

I think Mr. Nixon is reading a little of his own partisan attitudes into some of Mr. Johnson's utterances.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Vice President, while we are on the inevitable subject of Vietnam, some people feel that although our military position is certainly secure there, that we may be overdoing it. Indeed, there are more American ground troops in Vietnam today than there are first-line troops in the entire South Vietnamese Army.

Now, all three of us have been in South Vietnam and we know the marshy conditions of the Delta. The Americans have just committed some troops to the Delta. Do you feel that this is going to be a quicksand area that is going to suck us in, so to speak?

1 2

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I can say for the information of the American people that the military situation in South Vietnam is considerably improved from the allied point of view; that our military successes have been very, very important and they have been, as I indicated, successes. Our military activities have been successes.

(3)

Our problem in Vietnam today, while, of course it is one of military confrontation with the enemy, is essentially political and economic and diplomatic. Militarily we have gained many victories. Militarily we have administ ered a series of defeats to the enemy. Militarily we have proven our strengt and our ability to conduct a struggle in this kind of an environment such as you find in Southeast Asia. Hopefully, we will not have to commit large numbers of troops into the area, the Delta area that you speak of. Thus far the number that have been committed to that region I think is very small. I am not sure. I think it is less than a battalion if I am not mistaken.

MR. MORGAN: It is about a battalion of ground troops.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: It is about a battalion. And we do hope we can push on the political and diplomatic front so we can bring this confrontation in Southeast Asia to a head.

It is my view that the Delta region is very, very important; it is the source of food for most all of Vietnam and, indeed, for a good deal of Southeast Asia, and

it is there where the AROSVN -- that is, the Army of South Vietnam, -- has been taking on the major responsibility, and we hope that that military force will be able to meet the basic military requirements of the area.

MR. SMITH: What about this political question
you are talking about? Now, this past week President Johnson
and Mr. McNamara have said that pacification is not doing too
well. You went there and you studied pacification for a while.
What is wrong?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, quite frankly, as I have indicated, militarily -- as I have indicated -- we have done very, very well, and I thought we were doing well when I returned last February, as you gentlemen may recall -- militarily. I said we had reason for restrained optimism, reason for encouragement, but then I noted that the major problem confronting us -- and you gentlemen likewise have seen this -- is in the area of what we call the revolutionary rural development or the pacification program.

What is wrong, it seems to me, is that the civilian components that are responsible for pacification have not been
able to really fulfill the requirements of that task. Of
course, you require -- first of all, you must have security
before your civilian officers or your civilian forces can
really do the job as you expect them to do. The cadres that
have been trained -- that is, the South Vietnamese that are

S

being trained to move in, these teams of 59 that moved into a village and into an area, they have been coming along, but the training was not as good as it should have been and it has had to be improved.

I can say that the pacification program has not worked as well as we had hoped it would on the basis of our goals at the Honolulu Conference. I can also say that we are going to redouble our efforts. Not only we, but one of the things undoubtedly that will be discussed at the Manila Conference is this whole matter of the social-economic conditions in South Vietnam, the rural development, the pacification, the post-war plans for South Vietnam. This will be the central point, I am confident, of the discussions.

MR. MORGAN: Well, this tees up the question that I wanted to ask next, Mr. Vice President, and I was wondering if one of the difficulties with pacification has been that we have been too much emphatic on the military side.

Now, the President leaves for the Manila Conference tomorrow. One of the first things he said about the conference was that the United States and its allies were going to examine their military position in Vietnam. A liberal Republican that I talked to in New England while I was up there with you actual criticized that statement and said that he should have said, first, that the conference should be looking for peace in Vietnam.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I remember the press conference that the gentleman refers to and, as a matter of fact, the President's emphasis on the military matter came at the end of his statement about the purpose of the Manila Conference. Needless to say, allies that are in combat, that are working together in common cause in South Vietnam, will, of course, evaluate the military situation. However, as President Johnson has made it quite clear, the purpose of the Manila Conference is not to design any great new strategy, nor does it have as its purpose the twisting of arms, so to speak, to gain new military commitments. The men that -remember, this conference was not called by the United States and I think this is very important for us to underscore, gentlemen. The Manila Conference is not an American conference. The Manila Conference was not called by President Johnson. The Manila Conference was called by Ferdinand Marcos, the President of the Philippine Republic. A similar conference was suggested some time back by President Pak of Korea. It is really the outgrowth of two or three meetings, one at Honolulu where President Johnson said it would be desirable later on to take another look at how we were doing, how all nations were doing in Southeast Asia, what the situation was in Southeast Asia, and then it was in Seoul, Korea, some months back, where nine of the Asian nations met and suggested that it might be well to have another conference later on. This is

4

3

2

3

5 6

7

8

5

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

100,000

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an Asian conference in which we are a participant and this conference will, I am sure, give an opportunity for considerable coordination of effort in the social-economic-political aspects of the struggle in Southeast Asia. To be sure, the political matter -- the military matters will have to be review ed and evaluated. After all, men are giving their lives there. The nations that are at this conference will be nations that are committed militarily in Southeast Asia, in Vietnam, but we know what the real problem is in Southeast Asia today. It is, of course, first, the confrontation, the battle against the Viet Cong and North Vietnam. But the major weakness that we sense today is in pacification. It is in rebuilding the nation. This is the real struggle, the building of the nation, and I would suppose that the Manila Conference could be called the Nation-Building Conference. How you best can join your efforts or combine your efforts, not only as military partners in a struggle against a common enemy, but how best you can combine your efforts and join together collectively to improve the life of the people.

非 於 惟 惟 册 册 册

誓

MR. MORGAN: Vice President Humphrey, Foreign Minister

Gromyko of the Soviet Union saw President Johnson at the

White House on Monday. After that there was a slight atmosphere

of ancouragement in Washington, but yesterday Chairman Breznev

in Moscow sharply poured cold water -- if I cam make a clumsy

figure -- in American-Russian relations and today there has

even been a stronger communique from the Russians saying

that we can't really have any rapport without the

U. S. settling in Vietnam more or less on the Communist

terms. (A), what is your reaction to that; (B), how much

of a blight will it be on the Manila Conference?

as you have indicated -- I mean I think there was a feeling as you have indicated, that there might be some hope for improved relations between ourselves and the Soviet Union vis-a-vis the activities in Southeast Asia, after Mr.

Gromyko's visit here at the White House. I'd like to examine what has happened since. Breznev's statement of a day or so ago, while it was hard, a hard line on Vietnam, did not foreclose other developments between ourselves and the Soviet Union. It did not repudiate, for example, what has been said by President Johnson that the peace of the world depends upon cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. That important statement has never been denied or repudiated by the Soviet leaders.

B

Furthermore, President Johnson indicated that there were other axeas that were of vital importance. While we sought the good offices of the Soviet Union in terms of its influencing Ranoi to bring about negotiations for a peaceful settlement, those other areas of discussion and hopeful settlement would be, for example, civil aviation between the United States and the Soviet Union, the opening on consular offices, the expansion of trade, the improvement of trade between our two countries, and more importantly than anything else, on the matter of nuclear proliferation, to engage in discussions and negotiations that would result in a pact that would prohibit further proliferation of nuclear weaponry. The non-proliferation agreement, as we call it.

I think this is the top priority of American foreign policy today, and I believe that it is of vital importance to the Soviet Union. On those issues of aviation, of trade, of improved relationships relating to our consular services, and on nuclear proliferation, and the space treaty, what we call the "Moon Treaty," keeping space as an area for peaceful exploration rather than a new battlefield, on these areas the Soviets have not closed the door. As a matter of fact, they are moving towards a better understanding with the United States all of the time.

But when it comes to Vietnam, once again I think we see the Soviet Union in its ideological struggle with Red China.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

14

13

15

. ...

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This regretably is one of the sad facts of our time. Here is China in turmoil, in confusion; China bitter, militant, aggressive and dangerous -- not only to Southeast Asia, but to the Soviet Union and to ourselves. Here is the Soviet Union contesting for leadership in the Communist world, and really the test of that leadership in many ways is in Vietnam, because it is there that China and the Soviet Union have literally locked forces. You maybe recall the other day where the Chinese have accused the Russians of being the lackey of the United States. And then the other day where the Russians accused the Chinese, saying that if there was failure of Communist success or if there was lack of Communist success in Vietnam it would be due to Communist China's delay in getting materials through and all of their obstructionist tactics.

So I think we have to weigh all of these things, gentlemen, that we hear from the Kremlin, very, very carefully and with the backdrop, to look at them with the backdrop of their relationships with China. Now I am not encouraged by what I heard and what I read from Breznev in Pravda and the official statement of the Soviet Union today. On Vietnam, this makes it exceedingly difficult. And once again the Communist powers have slammed the door -- at least slammed it shut, I don't say they have locked it but they have slammed the door in our face in every effort that we have made

Ď,

to open up the talk for peace and a peaceful settlement.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Humphrey, more than half our time is used up so I am going to change the subject abruptly and ask you about elections. Now you are campaigning in 38 states, I believe. Do you think you have been doing much good for the Democratic candidates?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Some -- I hope. I qualify that. I said "I hope," Mr. Smith. I am not sure that I will make my goal of 38 states, because I will be staying a little closer into Washington for a few days here while the President is away, but on week-ends I am stepping up my tempo in order to move around quite rapidly.

The candidates feel that we are of some help. I am sure that we get, by a Vice President or other, or a Senator, obviously, coming in, those that are running for reelection get a good deal of exposure in the public press and the media. We do a good deal of fund raising at these dinners. For example, I was in Bangor, Maine, the other night. We had a huge dinner, the largest one they have ever had in the history of Democratic politics in Maine. It was a marvelous dinner, proving that Ed Muskie, by the way, is a very strong leader in Maine, and I think we were of a little help there.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Vice President, before you took over your present job and were interrupted by the hand of fate and President Johnson, you were a commentator, a political

4 5

commentator on this network. Could we ask you to comment now, how do you think these elections are going to turn out, do you think there are going to be big losses for the Democrats in the House and the Senate?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Now you have really put me on the spot for objectivity and as I have said to your associate here, Ed Morgan, I try to be objective about this because it is really unforgivable to fool yourself. Sometimes people fool others, but you ought not to mislead yourself.

The situation politically as I see it is now that for the -- at this moment, about this week on, political interest is beginning to grow. There has been a sort of voter apathy, up until now. I think most of you men who have been out in the hustings feel that way. There are some contests that are hot contests. The Governorship in California, the Senatorship race in Illinois, just to select two. Those are -- the focus of national attention is on those contests. But even in those areas the voter interest has been modest up until now. I have a feeling that it is growing.

Now my own view is that if there is a reasonably good turnout on election day -- and I tell my Democratic friends that this is their first responsibility, to get that voter turnout -- that the Democratic Party will fare very well in the election.

I can't tell you that we are going to hold every seat. No one

knows that. As a matter of fact, the odds are against us doing so, simply because in the 1964 election we gained so many seats. We will remember, I think, Mr. Nixon predicted that we would lose 40 and we gained 38. I don't pay too much attention to Mr. Nixon's predictions on any of these things.

7 7

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Vice President, voter interest in civil rights and the so-called white backlash has been undeniably revived. In Boston on Thursday you said that the Senate would have passed the '66 Civil Rights Bill, including the housing section, except for the 19th Century machinery of the filibuster.

Now you are the presiding officer of the Senate and we have a new session of Congress coming up in January. How might you rule as the presiding officer of the Senate that would affect a filibuster?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: If I were to answer that question now, Mr. Morgan, there would be no suspense. There would be no drama, there would really be no interest in the opening of the 90th Congress.

I can only say this, that the filibuster was one of the factors, and a very significant factor in preventing the passage of the 1966 Civil Rights proposals of President Johnson, because we did have a majority vote in the Senate for those proposals. There will be an effort made, I am confident, in the opening of the 90th Congress, to change the

Rule 22, the so-called filibuster rule. As presiding officer of the Senate I would owe it both to the Senate itself and my own conscience not to predict what my rulings might be, but I have indicated that the filibuster rule is an impediment to what I consider to be necessary social progress.

I believe, however, in the Senate having firm rules, and I think my past/ actions indicate pretty much my views on the filibuster rule, so you do a little research and you might have some predictions to make.

MR. MORGAN: Howard, before you move to another political topic, may I just follow up this civil rights thing in a question for clarification? You got a big hand at Philadelphia the other day when you addressed the International Police Chiefs Convention when you said that when you were Mayor of Minneapolis you did the civilian review board thing yourself. Now, some people inferred from that that you were against civilian review boards, which is a hot contest, in New York particularly.

Would you clarify that a little?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I noticed that one of the leading newspapers tried to make quite a bit out of that statement. I had many things to say to the Chiefs of Police. What I did say was that I had a law enforcement commission when I was the Mayor of Minneapolis that advised me on all matters of law enforcement, how to improve police training, how to improve police-community relations, how to improve the working conditions of our police department; in other words, to advise and counsel the Mayor. I said in my experience — and that is 1945, not 1966, in a city of a half a million, not a city of several million — that my law enforcement commission and myself handled the police problems, that I did the matter of review.

Now, civilian review boards may be desirable in some cities. I have heard, for example, that in New York City that

it has worked well. If it has worked well, that is their business. I don't have any particular antipathy, or any particular antagonism towards a civilian review board, providing that the Mayor still assumes the ultimate responsibility or the Commissioner of Police assumes the ultimate responsibility for his police department. I just don't want a civilian review board to be one that undermines the authority of the police. If it is a board that is designed to promote better relationships between the police and the community and to examine into so-called infractions of police authority, then it has a very usable and I think helpful role to play. But if it is an escape hatch for a public official to avoid taking on the responsibility of law and order, and the enforcement of law and order, then I am opposed to it.

Now, I have a feeling that in New York City that this board may have worked quite well. That is what I have been told, and I don't want to have any statement of Hubert Humphrey's as Mayor of a city of half a million act as a national pattern. I never knew anybody to put that much emphasis upon it.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Vice President, you have spent most of your career taking initiatives on almost everything. How has it been for two years, not being able to take initiatives, but having to accept someone else's?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I have tried to take

some initiatives, but I have taken them within the confines
of a cabinet and within the limitations of an administrative
establishment. There is a great deal of difference between
being a Senator where you are totally a free agent and one
where you are a part of a team where you have one President
and that is all that this nation needs and wants, and it has a

good President. I work within the confines of the Cabinet.

Now, I have had the chance to take some initiatives,
Howard, when I have been out, for example, on our Youth Opportunity Program. I have strongly advocated, for example, the
non-proliferation agreement in the field of nuclear weapons.

I spoke to a group of young people the other day and I said,
"Now, if we can get this war settled in Vietnam, will you back
me? Will you back me if I ask the country to start to dedicate
the resources that we are spending in this war to rebuild our
cities? Will you back me when I ask that we spend some of this
money to help an impoverished and a hungry world? Will you have
the same kind of enthusiasm for a better world that you have
had for carrying those signs saying that we ought to end the
war in Vietnam?"

No I doubt that you can stifle Hubert Humphrey's initiative?

MR. MORGAN: Can I make one quick one: It looks inevitable that a third party, a sort of a Dixiecrat outfit, will come up in '68. Isn't this going to damage both the

moderates in Democratic and Republican parties?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I am not quite sure. In some sense it might be helpful. It will maybe clean out of both parties those that ought not to be there.

MR. SMITH: I am sorry we can't let you expand on that.
Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-President, for being with us on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

* * * * * * *

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.

