

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

HIGHLIGHTS OF REMARKS BY VICE-PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
TODAY ON "FACE THE NATION" ON THE CBS TELEVISION AND THE CBS
RADIO NETWORKS TODAY (SUNDAY, JAN. 16, ¹⁹⁶⁶ 12:30 - 1:00 PM EST):

1. We should not be overly optimistic about Hanoi response to peace overtures - Hanoi still suffers from "euphoria".

PAGE 5

2. Mans field report "too gloomy". PAGE 6.

3. Soviet Union trying to build a "containment wall" against Communist China, one of reasons for Tashkent talks.

PAGES 11, 12.

4. U.S. will maintain "a presence" in Asia though Russians won't be too happy about it. PAGE 11.

5. Doesn't think Julian Bond should have been denied seat in Georgis legislature. PAGE 16.

6. Questioned on his "image" said as things go from "worse to worse we still have the family drugstore". PAGE 15.

Mills

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

FACE THE NATION

as broadcast over the

CBS Television Network

and the

CBS Radio Network

Sunday, January 16, 1966 - - 12:30 - 1:00 PM EST

GUEST: HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
Vice-President of the United States

NEWS CORRESPONDENTS: Martin Agronsky
CBS News

Marquis Childs
St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Marvin Kalb
CBS News

PRODUCERS: Ellen Wadley
Prentiss Childs

DIRECTOR: Robert Vitarelli

2

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Vice-President, in New Delhi last week you had a longer talk with Soviet Premier Kosygin than any American official has had since Mr. Kosygin took office. As a result of that conversation, are you more or less optimistic about the possibility of negotiating an end to the war in Vietnam?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I did have an opportunity to discuss matters of mutual concern to our respective governments, and, indeed, to all countries in the world. But, Mr. Agronsky, I believe that these discussions are of a nature which require that they be held in private, or that any report of them be only to the President of the United States.

The discussion was frank, candid and constructive.

ANNOUNCER: Live, from CBS Washington, FACE THE NATION, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with the Vice-President of the United States, Hubert Humphrey. Mr. Humphrey will be questioned by CBS News Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb; Marquis Childs, Chief of the Washington Bureau of the St. Louis Post Dispatch. CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky will lead the questioning.

We shall resume the interview with Vice-President Humphrey in just a moment.

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Vice-President, you said your conversation with Premier Kosygin was constructive. I don't

ask you for any specific. I understand, as you have explained, that you cannot give us any specifics of our report to the President.

May I return to my original question.

I asked you for your personal opinion, your evaluation of the talk with Mr. Kosygin.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I feel that any exchange of views between responsible officials of governments is helpful, and there was an opportunity, through a rather extended period of conversation, for the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and for myself to state our government's position on several matters, and of course we had a response from Mr. Kosygin.

I have always been of the opinion that as long as leaders of nations are willing to talk to one another in a responsible and reasonable manner, that it is helpful to the common cause of peace.

MR. CHILDS: Mr. Vice-President, do you feel that in Vietnam there is a middle course whereby we might hold the port areas and Saigon and the area around Saigon without a major escalation of the war and the possibility of doubling the number of ground troops, American ground troops there?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Childs, that is, of course, a matter of high military and political policy.

It is my view, and I think it was well expressed by the President, that the enemy is no longer close to victory, as

the President put it, and that the aggression has been -- that is, the thrust of the aggression, has been blunted, that victory cannot come to the Communists; and, as the President has made it clear, that we shall seek every possible avenue for a peace that is fair and just; but, by the same token, that we shall continue to resist the aggressor and to pacify the area.

Now, I know what the meaning of your question involves, as to whether or not there should be a massive military offensive, or whether we should take this step by step and stage by stage. I think that the general policy of our government has been that we move prudently, that we do not seek to unnecessarily escalate any struggle.

What we have tried to do is to escalate the peace. And we have had regrettably not as much response as I would have liked, or as our government would hope. And I think that we will continue to follow the same policy which we have thus far maintained.

MR. KAIB: Mr. Vice-President, in this connection, sir, the President said in his State of the Union Message that so far the response from Hanoi indicates neither success nor failure. I wonder, sir, is it safe to assume, therefore, that we have received some kind of response from the North Vietnamese and you are now in the process of assessing this?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think the President's statement speaks for itself when he said that the response had neither indicated success nor failure.

There is a considerable amount of diplomatic activity under way these days, and I would imagine that the Foreign Office in Hanoi is a very, very busy place.

But I don't think that we should be overly optimistic, that as yet Hanoi has not given any direct indication that it seeks peace. I think it still suffers from some euphoria of its so-called inevitable victory. The fact is that they ought to know, as many nations have already told it, that it is impossible for it to gain a victory, and therefore we pursue the cause of peace, we continue to make the diplomatic overtures that we have made in the past, and that we are making even today.

The President, I think, told you -- the nation, that we had had over 300 talks this past year in an effort to find a peace initiative or some beginning towards the discussion of peace. His emissaries have been to over forty countries, seeking ways and means of finding how we could get the contestants in this struggle to the negotiating table.

At this stage, sir, what we are seeking above all is to get people to sit down to talk about the conditions of peace.

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Vice-President, can I ask you this

specific question.

Two weeks ago we made public the fact that we had communicated directly in a secret memorandum to Hanoi the conditions under which we could negotiate a peace. Have they specifically answered that communication?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Not to my knowledge, sir.

MR. CHILDS: Mr. Vice-President, Senator Mansfield made a very gloomy report to the President after his trip around the world, a gloomy report on Vietnam, saying that we face the choice between an open-ended land war, with the possibility of a full-scale war with China, and a rather doubtful success in the negotiation for peace.

Do you think that report was too gloomy?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, I do. I think it was too gloomy. I think it had a great deal of factual information in it, and it had considerable merit. But I think its conclusion was too gloomy.

First of all, the military situation, while it is not what we would like, it is a fact that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese have suffered many military reverses.

It is also a fact that the thrust of the aggression which was mounted earlier this past year, in the spring, at the time of the monsoon season, that that has been turned back. And, as the President pointed out, that the possibility of Viet Cong success militarily is no longer present. The

Viet Cong cannot win militarily. And the aims of the enemy, as the President put it, have been put out of reach; that is, the aim of the conquest of the country.

So I would say that while there was much in the Mansfield report that deserves the thoughtful attention of the American people, because it points out the gravity of the situation, the difficulties that we encounter, and gives a more thoughtful and mature evaluation of the nature of this conflict, that its conclusions, I believe, are just a little bit too pessimistic.

MR. CHILDS: Would you include in that the threat of the possible intervention of Red China into this war, as being too gloomy?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: One never knows, of course, what a nation like Red China will do; because its spokesmen are very aggressive, at least in their words, and China has shown a good deal of aggressive action in recent years. For example, twice in the last four years against India. So you cannot tell what the Chinese will do.

But it does appear that at this stage, at least, there is not -- well, that the Chinese have shown no indication of direct intervention. However, they are supplying the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong with substantial quantities of materiel. I have no doubt but what there are Chinese technicians at work in North Vietnam and assisting the Viet Cong.

But as of now, and I repeat as of now we have no indication

that the Chinese Communists are going to make any direct military intervention.

But we must always be prepared for the worst.

I think none of us should ever forget what happened in Korea, when one of our greatest and bravest military men, General MacArthur, had assured President Truman that there was no danger of Chinese intervention as he moved towards the Yalu River in the Korean conflict.

The difference is, however, that in that area there was an attack, a ground attack by American forces repulsing the North Koreans, a ground attack into North Korea.

As yet, there is no ground attack by the American or the South Vietnamese forces upon the territorial jurisdiction of the regime of North Vietnam. I think that is a substantial difference and ought to be so considered.

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Vice-President, would it be fair to draw from the observation that you have just made that we are completely aware of the possibility of pulling Communist China into this war if we were to extend the attack into North Vietnam, such as we did in North Korea, as you have noted, and that bearing that in mind, we will always try to confine the war within the territorial area in which it now exists?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think the President answered your question, Mr. Agronsky, about as succinctly and definitely as anyone could under the prevailing circumstances. After all,

a struggle such as this is not always within our own hands. There are actions on the part of the enemy which do sometimes compel a response on the part of the defenders, namely, South Vietnam and the United States. And what that response will be must be decided on the basis of the military and the political necessities of the time.

But the President pointed out, as our objective in this struggle, one of self-determination for the South Vietnamese people.

He said --- and if you will permit me, I would like to just quote from that remarkable passage on Vietnam in his State of the Union address -- I think it was the best statement that has been made any time by anyone on the struggle in South Vietnam, and with the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong. He said "We seek neither territory for bases, economic domination or military alliance in Vietnam. We fight for the principle of self-determination, that the people of South Vietnam should be able to choose their own course, choose it in free elections without violence, without terror, without fear. The people of all Vietnam should make a free decision on the great question of reunification. That is all we want for South Vietnam, and it is all the people of South Vietnam want".

I think that tells pretty much what our objective is and that objective stated will, I think, govern the military actions of this country.

MR. KALB: Mr. Vice-President, in a somewhat different area, I wonder, sir, since east and west in a way seem to be stalemated in Vietnam at the moment, do you feel that there are other fruitful areas for bilateral Russian-American cooperation in the near future, and, if so, could you possibly give us some indication of what they are.

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, it is a fact that the Vietnamese struggle has chilled the relationships between our two countries and -- that is, between the Soviet Union and the United States, and I trust that is only a temporary matter. I think it ought to be quite clear to any thoughtful observer that while the struggle in South Vietnam is of concern to the Soviet Union, and surely to us, since we are so deeply involved, that the main concern of the Soviet Union is its relationships with Communist China, and those relationships are anything but friendly.

The regime in Peking continues to insult and verbally attack the government in Moscow. There seems to be no love lost between these two Communist giants.

So I imagine that the government of the Soviet Union is much more concerned today about its relationships throughout the entire world vis-a-vis Communist China than it is over anything that the United States may be doing in any part of the world.

I would say that temporarily, at least, that the

possibilities of expanded contacts with the Soviet Union may be somewhat limited. However, we are in constant contact with her. As I said earlier, our visit with Mr. Kosygin, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, was frank and candid. It was polite, reasonable. Our government representatives are in constant contact with the Soviet Union. There are some indications that are not too good, like on the cultural exchange program. But I think those are temporary.

Yes, I would say in the main that looking ahead for the next few years, that the contacts between ourselves and the countries of eastern Europe and the Soviet Union will expand, that the relationships can and should improve.

I think this will be due to our own initiative in part, but also to the needs of the Soviet Union to look elsewhere for association and relationships rather than just into the so-called Communist orbit, which is being seriously ruptured by the aggressiveness of Communist China.

MR. KALB: Mr. Vice-President, there is an impression in this capital that to a certain degree the interests of the Soviet Union and the interests of the United States coincide, run along parallel lines, even in the Far East; that in a way we are both out to contain China.

Is that impression simply wishful thinking, sir, or do you find real substance to it?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, the best that one can do

11
to a question like -- such as you have propounded is to give a personal point of view, with some knowledge and background.

It is a fact, of course, that the Soviet is attempting to build a containment wall, so to speak, around Communist China. I don't think there is any doubt about that. I think this was in part one of the reasons for the meeting at Tashkent, where Mr. Kosygin took a hand to bring about some understanding and the declaration there between India and Pakistan. By the way, that was well done. And, as you know, I expressed the commendation of our government to Mr. Kosygin.

I am sure that the Soviet Union is seeking to build a number of friendly, well, areas of friendly government surrounding Communist China. But this does not mean that the Soviet Union would like to have the United States in Asia -- not at all.

I think we have to clearly differentiate the purposes here of the Soviet Union.

On the one hand, its struggle in the Communist bloc with Communist China. On the other hand, it still is not exactly a loving partner of the United States of America. And the decision of our government is to stay in Asia. That is, we are going to have a presence in this area of the world, simply because we know that without our presence in Asia, that the hope of free countries is severely limited.

And I believe that this decision has been made and that

it is one that we will maintain. And I do not think the Soviet will be too happy about that.

MR. CHILDS: In this connection, Mr. Vice-President, what you have just been saying, do you think Congress will heed the advice of the President in his State of the Union Message and remove some of the barriers to trade with the Communist bloc countries?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think it should. I believe that it was a courageous and a much-needed statement on the part of the President. I believe that this will strengthen our nation's security. I believe that it will strengthen our hand in diplomatic relations. I believe also, may I say most candidly, that it will strengthen our peace offensive in terms of trying to bring the struggle in South Vietnam to a conclusion. It will show good intent and I think good judgment on our part.

I therefore would urge, if I would be permitted to do so at any time, with any member of Congress, that they support the President's request, not merely because the President made it, but because I think it is in our national interest.

And as you know, Mr. Childs, I have long supported this point of view. And I am happy to say that most of the American business community supports this point of view. A study was made by the United States Chamber of Commerce, as I recall, on trade with the eastern European countries. And it was found

that trade, at least in limited areas, was in our national interest, and above all in the interests of better communication and understanding between these parts of the world.

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Vice-President, do you feel that a sufficient amount of money has been allocated to the goals of the Great Society in the outline for the future that was set forth by the President in the State of the Union Message?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, I do, Mr. Agronsky. That is, within the limits of what I believe a country can take, and at the same time to fulfill its international commitments; and our international commitments are not only in South Vietnam -- and I want to emphasize that. I hope that we will never lose sight of the world picture and be caught up only with a sort of a concentrated attention upon the area of Southeast Asia.

While Southeast Asia is uppermost in our thoughts today, we have obligations world-wide. And therefore our defense budget in the projected budget runs to about \$58 billion. And only a small portion of that, frankly, goes into the South Vietnamese or into the war in Vietnam.

We have commitments to better than 45 nations around the world. We have foreign aid commitments and so forth.

Now, when we come to the domestic programs -- we have commitments to our own people, and those commitments are being generously fulfilled, may I say, first of all with unprecedented

domestic
success

prosperity. And I will say that. While there are many programs that produce good results, there is nothing that beats prosperity. It does have a way of answering a large number of problems.

Number Two -- we are adding approximately \$3 billion -- well, about \$3.3 billion, or about \$3.5 billion additional funds over and above the fiscal '66 budget to the Great Society programs. And much of that money, as you know, will be directed to the urban areas, where many of our problems, social and economic problems, are to be found.

RIOT PREVENTION

MR. AGRONSKY: You yourself were the first to point out some weeks ago your enormous concern that there would be a repetition of another Watts, for example, in the Negro areas of our cities, unless a sufficient amount of money were put into these urban problems. Do you think that that will give us a sufficient amount?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: That, plus the rise in our gross national product, and the increased economic activity of our country, Mr. Agronsky. We are going to approach the \$700 billion figure this coming year. Unemployment will

be down considerably below the 4 per cent level, which is really a very low level. We will expand our programs of manpower training and education, which will get at the whole matter of the unemployability of people.

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Vice-President, there are many more

things we would like to ask you, and we will continue the questioning in a moment.

- - -

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Vice-President, there have been a number of pieces written about the concern of your staff about your image today. How do you feel about your Vice-Presidential image?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, it is fourteen-and-a-half pounds lighter than it was, let me say, about three months ago.

Mr. Agronsky, I have a very high honor that has been given to me to be Vice-President of the United States. And it seems to me that what I should be doing, and really what I tried to do, is to fulfill the duties of that office to the best of my ability and to try to bring a little more sense of acceptance of the importance of this office and of respect for this office to those -- to the American people.

I am really not very worried about the image. My wife loves me, my friends tolerate me, the voters gave the President a tremendous vote of support, and he took me along with him. And I was always able to get elected in the State of Minnesota. And if things go from bad to worse, we still have the family drug store.

MR. KALB: Mr. Vice-President, I wonder, sir -- the war in Vietnam seems in a way to have moved into the moral fiber of this country in a number of areas.

During the last election the question of a professor disagreeing with our Vietnam policy was a major issue in New Jersey, and there is currently an issue involving Julian Bond in the State of Georgia.

I wonder, sir, do you feel there is really any moral concern on this? Can a man not be true to his duty in a state legislature and profoundly disagree with this country's foreign policy?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, my personal view is that the right of dissent is a sacred right, and I think we ought to remember what John Stuart Mill once said, and I can only paraphrase it -- that one of the reasons that we ought to protect the right of dissent is that the dissenter may turn out to be right.

I do not think that the dissenters in this instance will be right, nor are they correct. But I want to forewarn now or warn every American that one of the most precious freedoms that we have is the right to be different -- yes, even the right to be obnoxiously different.

There is an overwhelming support in this nation for the President and his policy in Vietnam. No one is happy about a struggle such as this -- because Americans are not a war-like people. That is, the vast majority of them are not. And the American people know they have taken on a tremendous obligation when they assumed the mantle of world leadership, particularly

for the free world.

So I would suggest that we have some forbearance and patience. The truth is that much of the opposition has, to our efforts in Vietnam -- has taken -- well, it has subsided, and there is a legitimate opposition, and there is some that is rather foolish and hard core, I would say, doctrinaire. But I do not think a man ought to be denied a seat in any legislative body because he disagrees with any policy of the government.

MR. CHILDS: Mr. Vice-President, some of the reporters who were with you on your Asian trip complained that you never briefed them on what you were doing with heads of government. What about your dilemma when you go on these diplomatic missions for the President?

VICE-PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I think it has been somewhat explained even in my performance here today, Mr. Childs. I do not feel that I can speak freely and openly to every reporter about discussions with heads of state or there will be no frank discussion between a Vice-President and the heads of state. I feel that my obligation is to my country and back to the President of the United States, and let him judge what we have done.

MR. AGRONSKY: Gentlemen, I am really sorry, but our time is up, Mr. Vice-President and thank you, sir, for being here to FACE THE NATION.



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