

CBS NEWS
2020 M Street
Washington, D.C. 20036

"FACE THE NATION"

as broadcast over the
CBS Television Network

and the

CBS Radio Network

Wednesday, September 16, 1964 - 7:30 - 8:00 PM EDT

GUEST: THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Minnesota)
Democratic Nominee for Vice-President

NEWS CORRESPONDENTS: Paul Niven
CBS News

John L. Steele
Time, Inc.

Martin Agronsky
CBS News

PRODUCERS: Prentiss Childs
Ellen Wadley

DIRECTOR: Robert Vitarelli

Mills
Mills

ANNOUNCER: The following program is brought to you as part of the continuing coverage by CBS News of Campaign '64, the Presidential Election Year.

From Washington, D.C., Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democratic candidate for Vice-President, will FACE THE NATION.

In a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview, Senator Humphrey will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky; John L. Steele, Washington Bureau Chief of Time, Inc.

To lead the questioning, here is CBS News Correspondent Paul Niven.

MR. NIVEN: Senator, welcome to FACE THE NATION.

You have been out campaigning in eight states now, criticizing Senator Goldwater as the temporary Republican spokesman, and appealing to Republicans to join Democrats in re-electing President Johnson.

In the meantime, the Republicans, including your own opponent, Congressman Miller, have been attacking you as a radical.

We have questions about both campaigns, and we will begin in just one minute.

- - -

MR. NIVEN: Senator Humphrey, the Republicans have been criticized for tagging you with certain policies of the Americans for Democratic Action with which you

personally do not agree.

Well, now, if Senator Goldwater is going to be held responsible for the views of the John Birch Society, of which he is not even a member, why shouldn't Republicans identify you with an organization of which you have been an officer for fourteen years?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Niven, I have never held Mr. Goldwater responsible for the views of the John Birch Society. I have a difficult enough time holding Mr. Goldwater responsible for his own views. Those views are so conflicting at times, it is rather difficult to even keep account of them.

But Senator Humphrey does not say that Senator Goldwater is a Birchite, he doesn't say that he subscribes to the John Birch platform, he doesn't accuse him of being a member of the John Birch Society because I am sure he is not. But what I do feel is that Senator Goldwater's views are not good for America, and that if he were elected President of the United States, that it would not serve our national interest, nor would it serve the cause of peace.

MR. AGRONSKY: There seems to be a certain conflict, Senator, between the position that the ADA has taken on some matters and the foreign policy of this Administration, Cuba being one example.

The ADA wants Cuba brought back into the Organization of American States, the OAS. The Administration has made it

very clear it does not. Where do you stand on this matter?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Agronsky, the Americans for Democratic Action is an open organization, its membership is open -- its membership is open, its meetings are open, it is exactly what it says it is, an American organization for democratic action. It is no conspiracy, it is no closed society, it wears no night-shirts and it has no secret meetings.

MR. AGRONSKY; I didn't imply that, sir.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No -- I just wanted to get that record straight on ADA.

Many of us that have been members and are members -- for example, Elmer Davis, one of the great commentators of our networks, and you gentlemen knew him well, a great patriot of our country, was a charter member of Americans for Democratic Action. Stewart Alsop, charter member. Rheinold Niebuhr, the great theologian, charter member.

Now, these men all held individual views. And in that organization you can hold individual views.

In reference to the Cuba situation, as I recall, -- I know what my view is. Cuba is a menace to this hemisphere. I have called for the sternest action in terms of the quarantine of Cuba, economic and political; called for the Organization of American States to censure Cuba, to impose economic sanctions upon Cuba, just as other democratic leaders --

President Betancourt of Venezuela, and others, have called for this.

ADA has asked for the restoration of free government in Cuba, supports this government's policies of economic sanctions in Cuba, but has said -- and I think somewhat idealistically -- that if Cuba could arrive at a position of non-alignment, if it would quit its program of subversion, that then it should be re-admitted to the Organization of American States. Well, I don't think Cuba is going to quit its program of subversion. It has got a subversive --

MR. AGRONSKY: If they did, would you agree with that objective?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I would not. I do not believe in including in the Organization of American States a Communist country.

MR. STEELE: Senator Goldwater, Senator Humphrey, charged today, I believe, in Des Moines, that since 1960 the Democratic administration hasn't lived up to one single promise it made the American farmer. For instance, he recalls that your party promised to raise farm income, but that in fact the parity ratio is at its lowest level since 1939, and that it is down ten points since the Eisenhower era.

What have you go to say to this charge?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Steele, for Mr. Goldwater to be talking about American agriculture and to indicate

that he has an interest in the American farmer is like putting a fox in charge of the chicken coop.

This really is -- this is ironical, it is paradoxical, it is almost humorous, unless it were so tragic.

Senator Goldwater has voted against every single farm program that has been advanced before the Congress of the United States since he has been in the Congress relating to the protection and the help of American agriculture. This includes rural electrification, it includes farm price supports, it includes the extension of an expansion of farm credit.

Now, this administration has done many things in agriculture.

First of all it had to redeem much of the chaos that came from the Benson era of agricultural policy.

We have increased farm income by over one -- I won't say we have. Let me put it this way. Farm income, under the Kennedy-Johnson Administration has increased in net over one billions of dollars. The farmer today in terms of his family income has a much better income than he had four years ago.

I don't say we have done well enough. But my gracious, for Senator Goldwater who admits -- as he said, "I know nothing about farming" -- that's what he said. For him to criticize us on agriculture is really almost beyond what I would call

human comprehension.

MR. STEELE: Well, Senator, I realize that you are sort of going on the counter-attack there. But he did make a series of very specific charges. Now, he charged that the Democratic platform of '60 promised to help in balancing farm production with the expanding needs of the nation.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. STEELE: But he also charges that the Commodity Credit Corporation investments, the amount of money in loans they put in farm commodities, is up, not down -- that it is up over \$84 million over what it was when your party took over in 1960. What about this?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say, number one, that Mr. Goldwater is wrong. We have fewer farm surpluses today than we had in 1960. We have millions of bushels less in feed grains. We have thousands of bales less in cotton. We have hundreds of millions of bushels less in wheat. And what Mr. Goldwater is referring to is the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has had to be reimbursed for many of the sales under the Food for Peace program, which is a part of the total cost of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

MR. STEELE: Well, on this feed grain matter, he also said that surplus feed grains are being carried into the new crop year at a rate which is ten per cent above that previously pertaining.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Now, Mr. Goldwater is just patently wrong, Mr. Steele.

When we entered into the administration of President Kennedy, we had the largest accumulation of feed grains that the world had ever known. And that feed grain stock has been reduced by hundreds of millions of bushels. And anybody that knows the difference between a ukelele and a turnip knows that that is a fact.

MR. STEELE: Senator, are you ready to defend the Democratic farm program? Is this a good program that you are satisfied with?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is a better program than that that has been offered by the Republicans, and it is a much better one than Mr. Goldwater has ever offered, because his votes have been negative. And it is the program which I believe needs considerable improvement.

MR. NIVEN: Senator, I want to get back to ADA for a moment. You explained there were diversions of view in the organization, and you have explained that you did not agree with it on Cuba. I am sure you do not agree also with its suggestion that we consider de facto recognition of East Germany. I know that you don't agree with it on negotiations leading to UN admission of China because you belong also to the Committee of One Million whose whole purpose is against that.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You are surely right.

MR. NIVEN: But the question arises -- if you disagree with ADA on so many fundamental points of foreign policy and points, furthermore, which invite criticism from your political opponents, why have you stayed in the organization all these years?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, first of all, this organization performed a very valuable function which we all ought to be grateful for -- namely, it was an anti-communist organization that helped clean out in some of what we call the liberal forces of America Communist infiltration.

MR. NIVEN: Didn't that function disappear about fifteen years ago?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I think that you have be ever on guard, Mr. Niven. Secondly, it is an independent political organization that has an opportunity to discuss political issues without the kind of rigid discipline that frequently comes within a political party.

It has a vast galaxy of issues that it is interested in. I have here before me a table of contents of its letter to the Platform Committee of the Democratic National Convention. There are twenty-seven different items. For example, it strongly supports NATO; it strongly supports the United Nations; it strongly supports American presence in West Berlin; it strongly supports SEATO; it strongly supports the

Alliance for Progress. It is vigorously anti-communist.

So you see -- the differences that one might have, for example, in reference to Communist China -- it does not recommend the present admission of Communist China nor the present recognition, so let's clear it up.

MR. NIVEN: Well, Senator, some of its leaders deserted Mr. Truman in 1948; President Kennedy said of ADA "I never feel comfortable with those people"; and the organization circulated an anti-Lyndon Johnson document at your last convention, the convention before last, in 1960.

Well, now, isn't the organization serving the Republicans more usefully as a target than it is serving the Democrats as an ally?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, there have been times when we have all been a little distressed with some of the criticisms of ADA. But let me say possibly it acts as a rather wholesome influence by being willing to criticize not only the conservative or the reactionary Republican, like Mr. Goldwater, but occasionally calling to task even a good Democrat. I think that kind of an organization can perform a reasonably good function.

Now, there is another organization known as the Americans for Constitutional Action. They keep a sort of a roll call on everybody. They represent a legitimate conservative point of view. They are the counter-part of ADA.

Many members of the Congress of the United States have been honored by that organization, getting medals and medallions and plaques for having had a very good conservative record.

I don't criticize the organization. It has a function to perform.

But I venture to say that many who are members of it and who have received their honors have occasionally disagreed with them.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator Humphrey, there have been some very strong attacks made by Congressman Miller and by Senator Goldwater on the ethics and the honesty of the President of the United States. The President himself has not chosen to respond to these. In addition to the attacks of Senator Goldwater and Mr. Miller, just Sunday a clergyman in this city, Dean Sayre, of the National Cathedral, a man of, I am sure you would agree, very high reputation, made a very, very critical attack on both the President and on Senator Goldwater.

He said one party is dominated by a single man, "a man of dangerous ignorance and devastating uncertainty" and he meant there the Republican nominee -- "The other is a man whose public house is splendid in its every appearance, but whose private lack of ethic must inevitably introduce termites at the very foundation".

How would you respond to that, sir?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I regret very much that Dean Sayre said that. I don't agree with him. I have the highest regard for this distinguished churchman. I think he is one of the finest men in our country.

I don't think the President of the United States needs to make any defense of either his public or private life.

After all, in American politics what is private is generally pretty public.

None of us are without sin. I haven't met any man that ran on the sainthood ticket.

And I am just getting a little weary of the constant attack being made, for example, as you indicated in the beginning, of the opposition on all the personal matters, upon all of these charges that are constantly brought up about radicalism or about improprieties when there are so many fundamental issues that need to be discussed.

I would like to find out, for example, just what are the views of the respective candidates on matters of foreign trade; what are the views of the candidates in the United States on matters of the improvement of education; what are the views of the candidates for the Presidency on the matters of strengthening the United Nations.

There are matters that really ought to be discussed, Mr. Agronsky, but they are not getting that discussion.

MR. AGRONSKY: I wouldn't deny any of that, Senator Humphrey. Nevertheless, certainly the character of a public leader, of a man who occupies high office in this country, as it is reflected in his ethics, his morality, his integrity, is a legitimate matter of public discussion.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is -- and the President of the United States is a man of good health, physically, mentally, morally and politically.

MR. NIVEN: Well, Senator, the Republicans are clearly trying to portray him as a man who has, one, become rich, and two, risen to the pinnacle of political power as a sort of wheeler and dealer.

You have known Senator Johnson, Vice-President Johnson for many years. Is he a wheeler and dealer?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, first of all let's talk about his matter of income. I never knew that Republicans were opposed to people making an honest profit if they had some business interests. I never thought that they were opposed to the capitalist system. I never thought they felt that a man ought to walk around in ashes and sackcloth. As long as this is made legitimately, and there has been no indication of anything illegitimate at all.

And as far as being a wheeler and dealer is concerned, the President of the United States has given his life to public service. He has been in the Congress and in the Senate, in the

Vice-Presidency and now in the Presidency. Surely he has sought to be able to bring accommodation, so that we can pass bills. Any man that thinks that you can serve in the Congress of the United States and have it just your way and get something done is living in a fool's paradise.

I think the President of the United States is a man that knows how to bring about accommodation, how to develop a sense of unity, how to develop a sense of purpose.

I believe he is one of the most able, competent, gifted, talented, experienced political leaders that this nation has ever had, and I am proud to be his friend, I am proud to be the citizen of a country over which he is the President, I am proud to be his running mate.

MR. NIVEN: Well, Senator Humphrey, we have some questions on the war in South Viet Nam and we will get to them in just one minute.

- - -

MR. STEELE: Senator Humphrey, you wrote recently -- and I want to quote you directly -- that "our direct involvement in Southeast Asia should be gradually curtailed, and in the Far East our military-oriented program should be gradually scaled down".

Does this mean that you favor a policy of pull-out or a negotiated settlement or what there?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It surely does not. It means just

exactly what it says; that the ultimate objective of American foreign policy is stability and independence and freedom in Southeast Asia. And when that can be achieved, through the cooperation of the United States with loyal friends that have asked us for assistance -- when that can be achieved, then indeed we should not maintain our military forces or our physical presence as a military power in Southeast Asia.

We have no imperial design. But we have no intention of pulling out of South Viet Nam. We are in there at the invitation of a government that is friendly. That invitation was extended in 1954, ten years ago, under the Administration of President Eisenhower. We are carrying out the same policy.

MR. STEELE: Well, Senator, isn't it almost axiomatic that our military effort there and our commitment there will be increased under the current conditions of great instability rather than decreased?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It may be necessary to have some modest increase in our military presence. As a matter of fact, there has been some over the past few years. I recall that some years ago we had less than 15,000 present in the area; I believe there are slightly more now, of American military manpower.

But this is a commitment to assist a government that has asked for help, a government that was guaranteed its neutrality and guaranteed its safety under international

accords which have been violated by North Viet Nam, violated by Communist subversion and Communist aggression.

We are trying our best to save that part of the world from becoming overwhelmed by Communist power.

MR. STEELE: Senator, why doesn't the Administration really level with the people? Now, look. Over the past few months the President, Secretary of Defense, Ambassador Taylor, almost every responsible spokesman has portrayed the effort there as on the upgrade, an improving situation.

We have had repeated coups and repeated lack of government stability in recent days, and apparently a deteriorating condition.

Why doesn't the Administration tell us the real facts about this?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Steele, if there is any one part of the world that has been fully discussed before the American public and for the American public it is South Viet Nam and Southeast Asia.

MR. AGRONSKY: Fully and frankly discussed?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Fully and frankly discussed.

MR. NIVEN: If that is true, Senator, why does the New York Times, a pro-Johnson newspaper, say "The Administration must honor its obligation to take the American people into its confidence regarding the true course of the complex conflict in South Viet Nam".

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think the Administration has done that. I believe it has done that through all of our Ambassadors, through Ambassador Lodge, surely who is not a partisan to this Administration. I think it has done it recently through the President of the United States, the late President John Kennedy, through former President Eisenhower --

MR. NIVEN: Through Secretary McNamara?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Through Secretary McNamara. We have never said that it was easy. The Secretary has reminded you again and again that this was a long ordeal.

MR. NIVEN: Senator, Secretary McNamara said in January that the major part of the US military task would be completed by the end of 1965.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That was his hope. At the time it appeared that it could be, sir. But this is very much like any other part of the world. Changes do take place, and unexpected developments do occur.

MR. STEELE: Much more recently than that one of the top Administration spokesmen -- I believe it was Ambassador Taylor on his return here just recently -- portrayed the war on an upward swing. Do you really think it is on an upward swing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, now, Mr. Steele, I was present when Ambassador Taylor spoke to the bi-partisan group in the

White House in the Cabinet Room, and all that Ambassador Taylor said was that he thought that the military situation was somewhat better than it had been before he had arrived.

MR. STEELE: Do you believe --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I believe that. And he also said that the political situation was somewhat worse, which is a fact.

Now, what we seek to do is to improve the political situation.

There has been complete candor in terms of the dangers involved there, of the problems involved, of the long duration of the struggle, and of the desire of the American government to seek stability and independence of the area so that we can, once that is achieved, seek to negotiate an honorable settlement.

MR. STEELE: In complete candor, are there decisions being diverted now until after the conclusion of the political campaign?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: There are none, sir, that I know of, and I don't believe there are any that you have heard of, and none that anyone else has heard of. And that kind of talk, I might add, only adds to the confusion of American foreign policy and is the kind of talk, I regret to say, that the opposition has indulged in at the expense of the national security.

MR. STEELE: I was asking you a question --

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I wasn't responding to you so much, sir, as the nature of the argument that had been made in the Republican platform.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, let's turn it around and make it a bit more specific and name names on it.

Senator Goldwater has charged very specifically that the Administration is guilty of manipulation for political purposes in South Viet Nam. You have denounced this observation just last night --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And now

MR. AGRONSKY: And now. I was with you when you made that very strong speech in Kansas City.

Now, I would like to ask this question.

Is perhaps the Administration not necessarily guilty of manipulation, but guilty of non-manipulation? Are we doing enough? Are we not permitting it to coast? Are we not sort of standing pat?

Many people feel, as Mr. Steele has indicated, that we are doing everything we can to kind of sit on the lid until the election, that we don't want anything to happen there, we are trying to mark time and hold on.

Is that unfair?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Agronsky, it is my view that Senator Goldwater is manipulating what is developing and

what has developed in Viet Nam for his political purposes.

Let me say quite candidly in the very same address in which he accused President Johnson of manipulating matters in Viet Nam for President Johnson's political purposes, he also accused the late President of the United States, John Kennedy, of having timed the Cuban missile crisis for the purposes of the election in November 1962.

Now, how shameful can you get? Everyone knows that is a falsehood. Every member of the Senate that has any sense of responsibility knows that that is not true.

John McCone, of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the top officials of our military testified under oath, in secret session, before the Senate Preparedness Committee, of which Senator Goldwater is a member. That record is available to members of the Senate. And he knows full well that the charges that he made in that Seattle speech are false, that they are beneath the dignity of the United States Senate, that they violate the published or the printed record of the United States Senate, and they violate the information of the United States Air Force, of which he is a Reserve General.

MR. NIVEN: Senator, to go back to Viet Nam, if the record of the past four years were the record of a Republican administration, would you not, as a Democratic candidate, be drawing attention to the inconsistencies of official statements and criticizing that record?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Listen, I am not opposed to any member of the Senate criticizing the fact that we have not done better in Viet Nam. I am, however, very much upset by any charge that there is a manipulation of the matters in Viet Nam for partisan political purposes.

This country is too important in the world, Mr. Niven, and our actions are too important to play partisan politics with international crises. We never have under any administration, and we don't intend to under this one. And I know of no responsible Democrat that ever accused Dwight Eisenhower of playing partisan politics with international crises.

We have criticized missiles, we have criticized lack of balance in the armed forces. But we have never accused the President of the United States of utilizing an international crisis that involved the safety of America and of the world for a partisan political purpose. And if we ever did, we ought to apologize, and I for one would never do it.

MR. STEELE: Senator, if memory serves me correctly, in 1960 you favored conducting the Kennedy-Nixon debates in legislation that made those debates possible.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. STEELE: Why did you vote to able or to kill legislation to make similar debates possible this year?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: In 1960, Mr. Nixon was not an

incumbent President, nor was Mr. Kennedy. They were both candidates for office.

In this instance, gentlemen, one of the men is a President of the United States.

And I guess my best answer is, is what Barry Goldwater, Senator Goldwater said himself, I believe it was last February, when he said that he thought it would be very foolish for the President of the United States to engage in debate.

MR. NIVEN: Senator, in a sentence, how many states will President Johnson and Senator Humphrey carry in November?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I hope we carry enough, and we expect to. I really could not give you a number on it.

MR. NIVEN: Thank you, Senator Humphrey, I am sorry our time is up. We will have a word about an interview with Congressman Miller two weeks from now in a moment.

ANNOUNCER: Today on FACE THE NATION, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, the Democratic candidate for Vice-President was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky; John L. Steele, Washington Bureau Chief of Time, Inc., and CBS News Correspondent Paul Niven.

- - -



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