

Text of an Interview
with
Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

November 17, 1967
Saint Paul Hilton
Saint Paul, Minnesota

The World Press Institute
Macalester College
Saint Paul, Minnesota

Q. We were told that our conversation would be off record, but as we can't make any competition with Wire Press, I would like to ask you if we can't take something on record and something that you really think may be off record, you can tell us.

A. Yes, I think so. If I feel that something is not to be used, I know you'll respect it, and I'll tell you.

Q. (Max Hastings, United Kingdom). The Vice President has all the disadvantages with none of the advantages of being a member of the Administration. Mr. Nixon said to us when we suggested whether Bobby Kennedy might be Vice President, and I asked him whether he thought Bobby Kennedy wanted to be Vice President, and he said, "Of course he does. Any struggling young man wants to be Vice President." What would you say are the advantages of being Vice President?

A. Well, I wish Mr. Nixon wouldn't keep encouraging everybody, first of all. But here's the way I put it. In our constitutional system, the office of Vice President under the Constitution doesn't have a great deal of power or authority, but it is a significant office in more recent days because of the very many heavy burdens that the President has to carry under our system. And therefore, the President can, if he wishes, and it's strictly his own decision, allocate or allot certain duties to the Vice President. This has happened because of necessity, and I think in our instance, that is, President Johnson and myself, because of the very close working relationship through many years in the Senate and through the years of the Vice Presidency and

his Presidency, I said to a group of my friends in 1964 that I'd rather have five minutes with the President in the White House than to have three hours or three days out front parading around or hoping to get into the White House. This is another way of saying that you are very close in on the decision making processes and you have an intimate contact with the Chief Executive who, under our system, has tremendous responsibility and great power. The office of Vice President gives me the role as presiding officer of the Senate, a very distinguished body of legislators, but by statutory law, I am Chairman of the Space Council, which is a big assignment and one, to me, which I find very engaging and interesting. I would even say exciting because, while I am not a scientist, I am keenly interested and have been all my life in science and technology, and as Chairman of the National Council on Aeronautics and Space, I come in contact with every aspect of our space program...the civilian peaceful aspects, the defense aspects, the international cooperation, all the new developments that are taking place. I head that program, so to speak, by law, not by Presidential decision, but by law. I am also Chairman now - this is a new position or responsibility by act of Congress last year - Chairman of the Marine Sciences Council relating to oceanography, what we call marine resources and engineering development. This Council, chaired by the Vice President, coordinates all of the activities of the government of the United States in the field of oceanography, the development of the ocean resources, a study of the ocean for its products, mineral, fuel, food, the relationship of the ocean to our security, and it's really quite a fascinating and demanding responsibility.

Then I have other things. Now, by law...these have all happened within the last few years...I chair the Peace Corps Advisory Council. In other words, my job is to work with the Director of the Peace Corps in formulating policies and programs and regulations concerning our Peace Corps, which we think is one of our better contributions to the world scene.

Likewise I am deeply involved in the Poverty Program as a member of the Economic Opportunity Council, which is on the civilian side of government somewhat similar to the National Security Council on the security and military side. I preside at these meetings and the Cabinet officers are there. Now I get many other duties. For example, I am the Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, coordinating all of the government's programs in the field of youth, the education, the recreation, the health, job training programs, relating to our young people, so when you say, "What about the Vice Presidency?" I say it's a very busy job now, and it is to me an exceedingly demanding and at times creative position. I get a chance to give a lot of input when I sit with the Cabinet officers and try to help coordinate their activities, when we have a dialogue and there is a good deal of new thought that comes out of this, just as we do in the Congress of the United States.

Q. Don't you at times feel that you are acting as the fall guy for the President?

A. Not particularly. I consider myself a part of the team. It's a sort of marriage.

Q. But sometimes the Vice President seems to get an awful lot of nasty chores.

A. You get some of the lesser important chores on occasion, but let me say they are pretty important even when they are lesser important. There can only be one President in this country, and the one thing the Vice President needs to learn quickly is that he is not President, that he has very severely limited constitutional responsibilities. He has some specific statutory responsibilities and authority, and he has a good deal of other things to do that the President delegates him to do in the President's name, so I've grown to like the position, and might I add that I get around the country a great deal. I think it can be said that I serve as the eyes and ears and the sensory apparatus, so to speak, for the Administration. I've been in 49 of the 50 states; I've been in over 500 American communities in the last three years as Vice President. I talk to the rich and the poor, to business and labor, to the college students and to the farmers. I get around. I work about 18 hours a day, and at least six days a week and sometimes seven. I travel abroad. I represent my country on occasions abroad, as you know. I've been to four continents now and 30 countries since I've been the Vice President. I will be doing some more traveling, I am sure, before the end of my term, so it's good. It's an important position, and in our priority schedule, it's No. 2. That's pretty good.

Q. Thank you.

Q. I'm Mohamed from Kenya, Africa. Would you like to see the American political position in Africa stay the same after the next Presidential election, or would you like it to be changed?

A. Well, a foreign policy is adjusted to what we think, from our point of view, are our needs and our observations as to the needs of other parts of the world. There can be a new emphasis; there can be changes; or it can go along the same way. The direction of our foreign policy now is the one that I agree with. I think that most of the attention to our foreign policy is given to the struggle in Southeast Asia, in Vietnam, but this is not the only thing we're doing. For example, we're doing more today in the Alliance for Progress than we did at any time. We're giving more attention, may I say, right now to Africa than we have at any time. Not maybe giving as much as you would like or I would like, but more than we have been giving. We're giving a good deal of attention to our relationship with Europe right now in terms of the non-proliferation treaty, the Common Market, the Kennedy Round, the tariff agreements, the new adjustments in NATO. Now these are not competing headlines with the war that's going on in South Vietnam, and our hope is, may I say, if there was any change we had, the change would be that we could bring this struggle in Vietnam to an end so we could get on with the business of peaceful development.

Q. But, Senator McCarthy, as Chairman of the Foreign Affairs, I mean...I asked him last time when he was here how much they do in fulfilling their foreign policy in Africa, and as a matter of fact he said they have implemented nothing from what they want to do in Africa.

A. Well, he's just wrong.

Q. In which case I asked him, I mean...President Kennedy said America wants to help; Africa wants to accept, but the policy seems to be away from that context.

A. Not at all, sir. As a matter of fact, I would say that speaking...I served in both of these Administrations. I was Majority Whip of the United States Senate; I was Chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the United States. I've been very intimately connected with it. We are putting about twice the investment, monetary-wise, in Africa now that we did four years ago, in terms of money. We've sent some of our good ambassadors. We happen to think the African states are doing pretty well, that they don't want to be inundated by American personnel. We have a substantial contribution of Peace Corps there. We have a very large Food for Peace program. We do feel that one of the great needs in Africa is to work with the nation states on their commodity programs where commodity prices fluctuate too much to leave any stability in their economy. We've had heads of state of more African states come to the United States in the last two years than in the preceding 20. We've been giving a great deal of time and attention to it. We want to give more. And again, may I say that sometimes we have to keep in mind that you don't force yourself on other people. You know, it's what they want, and we have a limit to the amount of money that we have available. Our foreign aid program is not decided by the President, and I might say in reference to the Senators, that they didn't help us very much. They cut a billion dollars out of it...one billion dollars out of the foreign aid program. One billion dollars, and they didn't do it with the help of the President, nor my help. We think it was a tragedy that they cut that amount out. We think.... Yes, sir?

Q. I'm David Wang from Taipei. I have one question. Can you foresee any possibility that Red China will abandon its expansionist policy in the near future?

A. Only if and because it is having such internal difficulties, and because, as I said today, and I believe you were present in the room...if you were not, because we are trying to exercise in Asia today the same sort of policy that we once applied in Europe insofar as we are concerned, hopefully in cooperation with other nations. It is our view that you have to buy some time in this situation, and you try to subdue, or...you try to contain, that's the word, to contain this expansionist military policy so that it doesn't spill over and so that it doesn't involve other countries. Hopefully, buying time with the hope in mind that a new generation of leadership will come into power and people will learn the lessons the hard way. We think, for example, our relationships with the Soviet Union are on a much sounder basis today. There is no particular angry rhetoric between our two countries anymore. We have obvious disagreements of policy and purpose on occasion, but the Soviet Union speaks respectfully of the United States, we do of them, and they know that we have power; we know that they have, and we both, I think, feel a sense of responsibility to maintain a degree of peace in this world. That's what we hope will be the case in Asia.

Q. And do you think if Communist China is contained in what it is today, then on Mainland China there will be a change internally?

A. I don't want to be misunderstood. I don't know whether there'll be any fundamental change in terms of the political structure, but I do think it's possible, and we have reason to believe from other experiences that the attitudes and the policies of the leaders of a country do change. For example, I think it's entirely possible that the China of a decade from now may be a China that wants to engage more in world trade, in peaceful conversation, that is willing to live in

peaceful co-existence, provided it doesn't get the habit of being able to have some of its appetite satisfied by aggression, and therefore we feel that to check the ideological expansion, to check the militancy that sometimes spills over into forms of aggression through other Communist regimes, that this is in the cause of ultimate world peace. Now, I guess that's about the best I can tell you. We don't have any prophetic vision on this. We just are having to learn from what experiences we have, but our policy is not to isolate China, not to exacerbate the situation, not to provoke her, but rather to hopefully develop a system of mutual cooperation in the free countries of Asia so that militant Asian Communist policy, or Asian Communism as it headquarters in Peking, does not have successes through aggression, and that we help develop national security and national development in the neighboring states so that the periphery of China has viable, strong, independent, free nation states that are able to resist subversion on the one hand, and in collective security to provide for the common defense. We think that this will be in the interest of the Chinese people. I don't think the Chinese people want any wars, and I think they need trade. You know, we've tried to open up some cultural exchanges, and I think you have to approach it that way. Ultimately it would be the hope, I suppose, of all people that you could have friendly, cordial relations, normalized relations, so we've suggested the exchange of doctors, the exchange of literary people, of artists, of people in the cultural field, of writers or journalists. We say this is the way you start to learn to live together. Thus far the policy of Communist China is No, but let's keep at it; maybe they'll change. ... Yes, sir?

Q. My name is Hidetoshi Yashimoto, from Japan. Mr. Vice President, you said you don't want to exploit China.

A. No.

Q. So can I understand you are to meet ... there are really two Chinas...

A. Yes, yes that's right. There surely is, and we have a mutual defense agreement with Taiwan, with Nationalist China.

Q. Yes, sir, and I would like to ask another question. We have the Security Treaty between America and Japan and we have to renegotiate or rewrite the term of this treaty in 1970.

A. That's correct.

Q. Of course this issue is a dormant issue, but I want to know your opinion about that security. Should we renegotiate just the term of the treaty or rewrite the treaty to introduce some nuclear weapons?

A. Well, we have some feelings about this. Of course, we are advocating a non-proliferation treaty on nuclear weaponry. In other words, no further expansion of nuclear weaponry. We do think that it's to the mutual advantage of the United States and Japan to have this mutual defense treaty. What the terms of that treaty are are always subject to renegotiation, but I'll be very candid with you. If the Japanese do not want that treaty, why we wouldn't try to force it on anybody. We're paying the lion's share of the cost of defense all around the world and there are a number of people, as I have indicated here today, that are beginning to think we're paying too much. But I believe that the visit of Prime Minister Sato recently was very productive from both points of

view. I mean, they discussed the Okinawa situation, they discussed the Bonin Islands. I think they came to the best understanding that we've had with the Japanese. Furthermore, we think that Japan has a very important role to play in Asia in terms of its economic and political development, a tremendous role, and maybe a much more significant one than the United States, because you're Asian people and you're there by geography, by tradition and history. We also believe that it's good for nations to try to carry their own fair share of their own national defense. You have some constitutional problems which are yours, and I don't think that we ought to start to rewrite your Constitution. We did some of that once and it appears now to me that when nation states gain their strength again and gain their economic power, so to speak, that the time is at hand to have those nations exercise their independent judgment, hopefully in cooperation with others. We want to be a friend. We want to be a partner in an alliance. We would like very much to continue the mutual security treaty between the United States and Japan, but I want to make it perfectly clear, as I've said to your Ministers before, and I meet with them. I know Mr. Miti, your Foreign Minister, very well. He's an old friend, as a matter of fact, and I've said, "You know, if you don't want it, if you want to pay the full cost of your own defense, why that's your privilege." We think it's better if we work together, and that your contribution, very frankly, can be most important, because if you can help in Japan with, like in Indonesia.. let's just take one country, with investment, with technical knowhow, with economic development as you're doing in the Asian Development Bank with a magnificent effort on the part of Japan, you will be contributing to the security of Southeast Asia and of Asia as much as any defense treaty, so we think it's all a part of the same thing.

Q. Mr. Vice President, do you see any likelihood of a split in the Democratic Party in 1968?

A. Not of any substantial kind. Democrats sort of like to fuss and feud around until the Republicans pick a candidate. We don't want them to have all the headlines.

Q. You don't think if Senator McCarthy ran against Mr. Johnson in the primaries in March that he would have any impact on Democratic Party solidarity?

A. No. I don't know what he's going to do. He hasn't consulted me. He's my friend and we've worked together for years here. We hope to continue to work together. You know, the opposition as we see it is the Republican Party, and Abraham Lincoln once said about the Democrats...he said they're like cats...they always seem to be fighting, but when it's over, there seem to be more cats.

Q. I'm Nilo de Souza Martins from Brazil. In your speech today you said that during the traveling in Indonesia, Malaysia, the Prime Ministers said they had hoped the United States wouldn't leave them alone.

A. Abandon Asia.

Q. Yes, and you suggested also that this is in the Philippines and in Latin America and some places in the world. My point is, these are speakers speaking only by government, and many times these countries, as in Brazil or Argentina or Indonesia, the people is not really represented by their government, and in this case I would like to know, you have made commitments with governments but not with the peoples.

A. Well, it's difficult, as a man that's been in public life, to go around and take a referendum with the people all the time. We have to work with governments. Sometimes the governments are representative, sometimes they're not. We don't select them. In Malaysia, however, the government is elected and if you have as good an election in Brazil as they have in Malaysia, you'll be a mighty fine Democracy. There isn't any doubt about who elected that government. The people elected it. Now in Indonesia, of course, they're getting over the effects of Sukarno's period and the PKI and there has been no connection, and you're dealing there with the government, but I think you would be interested to know, since you're a press man, I want to just tell you a little experience. I went to Europe not long ago and I remember being in Belgium, and I remember there were pictures in the American newspapers on the day I was in Belgium. I placed a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, which is a normal courtesy that a friend would do. There was a handful...we knew who they were...there are two Communist parties in Belgium, both small in numbers, the Russian-oriented party which made no problem for us, by the way, anyplace in Europe, in case you're interested, and then there was the Chinese Communist-oriented party, the party that had the infiltration or the direction of the Chinese Communists, such as we have, such as you have in Latin America in some instances. Now that crowd was well organized and militant, and there were about, in the whole country there are about 400 members. They had approximately 75 of them out Sunday morning when I went to place a wreath on the tomb. About 20 or 25 of them decided to pitch some eggs. They didn't hit me...they didn't even come close, but that was the news story. It was a tremendous story here in the United States.

There were pictures of it and everything. Of course, I went from that place to church, and going down the street there were thousands and thousands and thousands of Belgians waving American flags and cheering out of their apartment windows and standing in the street. This didn't make it, you know. There wasn't very much there that I guess they sort of expected that.

Now I went to Indonesia. For 20 years the Government in Indonesia, at least for 10 of those 20 years, has preached a doctrine of bitterness towards the United States. They've burned our...stoned our Embassies, the mobs have. They were, I am sure, not representative of the people again. They burned down our libraries; they broke relations with the United States and with the United Nations, or didn't completely break it but they made it very difficult for our Ambassador. I think two years or two and a half years ago it would have been impossible for me to go to Indonesia, literally impossible. In fact, less than two years ago our Ambassador was being guarded in the Embassy and the gates were broken down and rocks were hurled through the windows. Now, what happened when I went into Central Java...Djakarta. Djakarta is the birthplace of the PKI. It is a heavily infested...they call it the heavily infested communist area of Indonesia. I went on in there to visit some work projects, irrigation ditches that were being cleaned and fixed up by the poor people there. They're very poor. When I came in in the morning there was no government organization because they didn't even know what my itinerary would be. We were told we would have to be a little careful for security reasons, so we went on in and we drove some 40 kilometers in cars. There were no troops along the way to guard me, and when we came in there might have been 200,000 or 300,000 people in that 40 kilometer distance, and when we came back at 4:00 o'clock that

evening, my friend, there were over a million and a half people standing on those roads and during the day they'd been there saying, "Murdekha, freedom, America, thank you, America." And they were not organized. There is no political party that got them out, and the government doesn't have that much control to be able to order people out, and they just swarmed around us. Now, I think the people were very friendly, and we don't have a lot of Americans over there. In fact, I think in many countries we have too many Americans. I believe that we ought not to overlay too many Americans in these countries. But they are appreciative, and I'll tell you why they're appreciative. We haven't done much for Indonesia, very little lately...given them a little food, very little assistance in spare parts, but they're appreciative because they just got rid of something.

Q. Yes, three hundred thousand communists they killed.

A. I guess they did that. I didn't have anything to do with it. They took care of their own problems.

Q. Your trip was possible this time because they killed 300,000 communists.

A. Well, they must have had a reason to want to do it. I think that people that have lived under serious oppression oftentimes do revolt, and why they did it, whether they should have done it, I don't stand in judgment of that. I do know that they were under an oppressive regime and a regime of exploitation that made their country a shambles and a poorhouse and they revolted.

Q. (Max Hastings, UK) Could you not make the same defense for Negroes who riot?

A. No, because there's a difference, because they have a different way of expressing themselves. There is a free way of expressing themselves. They have the right to vote; they have the right to petition; they have the right to express their grievances through peaceful processes and there is no suppression of that at all.

Q. Why do you think they revolt?

A. Why do I?

Q. Yes.

A. Oh, I think some of them revolt because they are agitated into it. Others do it sheerly out of frustration. I think there is some of that, but most of the Negro riots that have taken place in the country have been the product of the leadership of a very small handful of black militants that do not necessarily represent the entire Negro community. As a matter of fact, the surveys that have been made in our Negro communities in America show that they want more police protection, not less. That's the interesting thing. They're all the time talking about police brutality, certain spokesmen, but when they went to Baltimore, to Philadelphia, to Chicago and New York and surveyed our own American Negro community, not...I mean they themselves, like the NAACP and others, what did they find? They said that they are the first victims of crime. They're the first victims of the riot. They're the first victims of the violence, and they said give us more police protection, not less, and I believe that what we need to understand in America is this, for my friends from overseas: We know that our Negroes have been oppressed and many of them have been the victims of injustice.

There isn't any doubt about that. But we also know that we're correcting it, and I might say in all candor to my friends that if each nation in the world will do as much to protect their minorities as this nation is doing, it will be a much happier world. There are many kinds of persecution, religious persecution, political persecution, racial persecution, racial oppression, tribal warfares. You know, there are all kinds of things, I mean, but today we are making a determined effort in this country to redress the imbalance. We have a sense of guilt on the one hand and a deep commitment to expanding the areas of opportunity. I've been involved in this fight all my life. I passed, as the Mayor of Minneapolis, the first Fair Employment Practices ordinance. I led the civil rights fight in this country even when Negro spokesmen didn't stand up.

Q. Most people believe there will be more riots next summer, sir.

A. Could be. You've had some in England. I don't know what reason you had.

Q. Yes, sir. That was a long time ago.

A. They had some in Stockholm, and they don't have many Negroes there. They had more trouble in Stockholm last summer than they've had for years. They had some in Berlin and they've had some in Moscow. There seems to be a general turbulence in the world.

Q. So don't worry too much.

A. It concerns me because I don't like violence, but more importantly, what I think we ought to be concerned about is correcting the conditions that lend themselves to any kind of anti-social behavior, and

I don't think we ought to just be engaged in what we call programs of riot prevention. Let me put it another way. We ought to do the right thing in the world, even if there weren't any communists, and we ought to do the right thing in America even if there were no Negro problem. There isn't a Negro problem in America. There's an American problem.

Q. (Laughter by questioner.)

A. It's a problem that affects the entire community, and when you're poor, it doesn't make any difference if you're white or black. If you're poor, you're poor, and when you have a poor school and a poor teacher, you're the victim of poor education. There are more poor whites than there are poor blacks in the United States. There's more rural poverty than there is city poverty by far, much more. The only difference is that you fellows cover the cities more. You don't get out and see all the rural poverty. Now we've got to do something about that, but we're doing something. We have reduced the number of people in this nation living under poverty conditions. We have extended the franchise. We protect the right to vote. We're doing something about it. For the first time white men were convicted by an all white jury in Mississippi. We're beginning to do things, and the important thing about democracy is not that it's perfect, but that it works toward perfection. Your friend Churchill said it's the worst possible form of government except all others, and I think that's the interesting thing about this. So I come to you by saying it's the steps we're making that count...not the fact that we've finished the journey. We haven't finished the journey, but we're learning. And too many of our fellow Americans and too many of our fellow white men think that all you have to do is to be kind. That isn't the answer. You have to treat people

as equals. You have to be willing to accept them. Now, we've passed all kinds of laws about equality, but the question is have we changed our soul and our spirit so that we really do believe in equality? I think this is beginning to come, and I'm proud of the fact that it's beginning to come. And this is the most reassuring thing about our younger generation. I want to keep our younger generation involved in this struggle. I regret that they've become led off so much in the Vietnam issue because there's so much to be done here at home. The way to build world peace, you know, is to start building the conditions that are conducive to peace in your own country.

Q. That is the resolve in the sense of helping the younger generation, being expected to divert their attention to the color problem when you see most of the money being channeled overseas to the war in Vietnam.

A. Of course, that is not true. That's another thing, see.

Q. I don't think so.

A. Well, what you think and what's true is a lot of difference. For example, at the present time in our federal government alone, our federal government, we're channeling \$25,800,000,000 into the area of poverty and people who live in what we call income levels under the poverty income level. \$25,800,000,000...how much did we do four years ago? \$7 billion. We've more than tripled it.

Q. How much did you do before that please?

A. Well, in the meantime our total amount of money spent in Vietnam is about \$22.5 billion, and I don't think that you ought to try to equate things. We had to spend a lot of money in the World War years that we

didn't spend anything on any of these poverty programs, and we had a lot of poor people. And, by the way, after Korea, you know many people will say if we didn't have the war in Vietnam we'd just do all of these wonderful things that many people talk about. I served in Congress during those years. I did my level best to try to get social security benefits expanded, federal aid to education. I introduced the legislation and fought my heart out for it. You know what happened? We didn't get anything. We reduced the taxes. The war was stopped. We reduced the budget. We didn't expand education opportunities. We didn't pass any civil rights bill. We didn't have medicare. And, as a matter of fact, the American people just sat back and said, "The war's over; let's save money."

Now, what I've told my young militant friends is, now when this struggle's over, and it's going to be, I want to know what kind of signs you're going to be carrying when I say follow me. We're going to have to increase your taxes; we're going to have to spend the money for schools; we're going to have to rebuild the cities, and I'll tell you what some of them are going to say. They're going to say, "Oh, wait a minute. I had my day of being a radical. I'm settled down now. I'm married and you be careful now. Don't you tax me. Let them take care of themselves. I've gone through this."

Now I want to make sure that we have a continuing spirit of action and activity or of militancy for social progress. We'll have it if you give us a chance. I'm no less militant today than I was 20 years ago. Not a bit. As a matter of fact, one of the things that I might mention to you is that the programs that we fought for for years have become a law and a fact, and some of my liberal friends don't know what to do. They've sort of lost the cause. You know I don't think it proves

you're less liberal to succeed. Really I don't. I introduced the first bill on medicare...May 17, 1949. It was introduced by Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota. I was the co-sponsor of it all of my career in the Senate, and now it's a fact, and last year we had 4.5 million people that received benefits under medicare, and a program that every liberal spoke on in every forum in America for years. Every single forum...is a law. And now that it's a law they say, "Well, what have you done for me lately?"

Q. I am Cetin Ozbayrak, from Turkey. Is there any possibility for you to run for President as a candidate of the Democrat Party in 1968?

A. Not for me, sir.

Q. How about 1972?

A. That's too long to predict.

Q. Will you run with Mr. Johnson next year?

A. If I'm asked, I haven't put the proposition to him. The Convention, by the way, makes that selection, along with the recommendation of the President.

Q. Do you think he can take somebody else except you?

A. That's up to him. I might say about this being a candidate for Vice President is sort of like being the girl that lives down the street in the neighborhood. You don't seek out the fellow. You wait to be called.

Q. My name is Oloph Hansson, Swedish. I don't know anything about civil rights, but do you think that it would be wise for America to

limit their commitments in the world to cases where you can get support from your allies? I mean, cases when you have to use troops, force, the Army forces?

A. Well, I am sure that if there were any aggression in Europe that our allies would be very happy to have our troops there. I haven't any doubt about that at all. As a matter of fact, the minute that we mention that we want to pull away one company, they have meetings in all the parliaments and the chancelleries, saying, "Now what are you trying to do? Weaken NATO?" There isn't any doubt....

Q. You mean just of Germany, sir?

A. No, no. I'm not speaking just of Germany. I'm speaking of Great Britain and I'm speaking of France, and I'm speaking of Germany and I'm speaking of Belgium and Holland. And rightfully so. I believe that we ought to bear our fair share of this responsibility. But we have some allies other places than Europe. You see, we have two oceans that border on us. One is the Atlantic and one is the Pacific, and we are as involved in the Pacific as we are in Europe. No more, no less. We're not just brothers and sisters of Europe. We're brothers and sisters in the world. We have some allies. One of those allies is Australia, and it's a very good one. Another one is New Zealand. We have the Anzac Treaty. We have some other allies. We have Taiwan. It isn't a very big country, but it's an ally and it's a good country... Nationalist China. We have another ally down there...Thailand. We have some other allies. We have a mutual defense pact with South Vietnam and we are a member of SEATO. Now the fact that some people don't keep their...are unwilling to fulfill their commitments under a treaty doesn't relieve us of the burden of fulfilling ours. There were treaties

in Europe that were forgotten in 1939 and 1940, and there were treaties that were ignored in 1933 when Mr. Hitler decided to tear up the Versailles Treaty. There were all kinds...you can't judge what your action ought to be on that. And I want to say, I venture to say that if we were to announce tomorrow morning that we no longer had any commitment to Berlin, that there would be quite a furor in Europe. But we're not going to do that...don't misunderstand me. We have our commitment and we're going to keep it, so our friends in Europe don't see the Asian picture the same way that we do, and I'm not being critical of them. I understand their preoccupation with their own immediate problems. I fully understand it, but I want to say this for my Social Democrat friends, that we are the people above all...I am a Social Democrat...we're the people above all who ought to understand the menace of totalitarianism. They're the first to suffer the pain and the brutality of totalitarianism. We ought to understand that and to the everlasting credit of the Social Democrats in pre-war Europe, they did understand it. To the everlasting credit of the Labor Party in Britain, it did understand the menace of Hitlerism. And to the everlasting credit of the AFL-CIO in the United States, it did take a stand when others did not. So we can't always worry whether or not somebody agrees with us, as to whether or not our policy is right.

I mention a day that Abraham Lincoln, when he sat with his Cabinet on the Emancipation Proclamation, he asked them for their advice as to whether or not he should free the slaves. The vote was 8 to 1 "No". He said, "The Ayes have it." He was the one vote. When we told Mr. Khrushchev that he ought to get those missiles out of Cuba, we didn't have so many thinking that we ought to do that either, and when we went into Korea, we didn't have everybody thinking that we ought to

do it either. As a matter of fact, there are more foreign troops in Vietnam today helping the South Vietnamese than there were foreign troops in Korea under the aegis of the United Nations. It was a very unpopular war. I was one of Truman's few supporters in the Congress. I know. A very unpopular war, but it was the right one to fight. If you have to fight a war, that was the right one.

Q. Mr. Vice President?

A. Let me get to somebody else here.

Q. My name is Raymond Smuts. I'm from South Africa. I have read that the population in Saigon in recent years has increased drastically to the point that it is overpopulated at the present, and that the conditions are very poor. What is the South Vietnamese government doing toward the problem?

A. There isn't any doubt but that the population has rapidly increased. A number of refugees have come into the city. There is reasonably good employment, however, in Saigon, primarily because of the war activities. It's a very busy city. As a matter of fact, what Saigon needs is to be maybe a little bit more mobilized for the war. The countryside is having more of the war than Saigon is. But again, everything in perspective, there is obviously a much better situation in Saigon today than there was a year ago and two years ago. The refugee problem in Vietnam is a very serious problem, as it was in Europe as the Army spread through Europe and uprooted people, but fortunately there is a real effort being made by many countries, may I say, to help in this refugee problem. Many of our European neighbors are doing

great work in Vietnam in the humanitarian field, in hospitals and refugee work and feeding and agriculture, and this I consider to be a very important part of the overall effort. You know, many times we have people say, "Well, nobody else is with you in Vietnam." That's not true, of course, because there are some very important people. We think the Australians are very important, you know. We love them. We think they're very brave and very good. They're our kind, we like them, in the sense that they stand up for their freedom. We think the New Zealanders are great. We like our friends from Thailand and the Philippines and the Koreans. We like them. We think they're good people, and the others that are there helping in that struggle. They need us and that's a great thing...when you need each other. There's nothing better. We also think that when the Germans put in a hospital ship, as I saw for example at Da Nang, that that's a very important contribution. We think that when other countries put in food programs and technical assistance programs, for example your country, Nationalist China, has one of the best technical assistance programs in agriculture in Vietnam teaching them how to better farm. We think that, for example, when a delegation went from the Diet in Japan to help in some of the humanitarian programs and the refugee program, we think it's very important. Because this struggle in Vietnam is not a military struggle alone. You can win every military battle and lose the whole war. You've got to win the people. You have to help develop their government. You have to help develop their economy. You have to help reinstitute local government. You have to take care of education and the health needs, and all of the people that are contributing to that are very valuable allies in this struggle, and might I just add that we'd

like to see the struggle over because we're prepared as a government to even help North Vietnam. We've said so. It's a matter of public policy, and our problem is that if you can find any way to get Mr. Ho Chi Min to come visit with us about it, we'd like to settle the war. That's the greatest contribution that somebody can make. If you can just get somebody to sit down and talk about how to settle this war. That's what we want to do.

Q. Sir, I am Jorge Bethson, from Argentina. Do you think that it would be possible by the participation of some of the Latin American countries to win the war?

A. I don't know. That would be their decision. We've not asked for it, and I don't think that South Vietnam has asked for it. Just off hand, my own view is that many of the Latin American countries have such great problems at home that they're struggling with that possibly their greatest contribution to a world of peace and freedom and security is to really develop their own countries.

Q. Do you have an offer from Guiana to bring...?

A. For some police training, I think. I don't know what the response to that has been. I know, for example, of late Malaysia said, the government of Malaysia said they were going to reinstitute a program of the offer of assistance in Vietnam for rural development... not troops, but rural development. That's terribly important, very, very important, because one thing that Malaysia has done better than almost any country I've visited, as good as any country, I'll put it that way, is their national rural development program. A very, very

successful effort. Now if they could help teach the Vietnamese how to do that a little better than it's being done, I think it would do a great deal to stop the success of the Viet Cong and bring the war to a more speedy conclusion.

Q. I am Fausto Ponte from Mexico. I have two questions, sir. The first question is, do you believe without Che Guevara the guerilla movement in Latin America is more weak now than before? That question.

A. Let me get that again?

Q. Without Che Guevara, is the guerilla movement weaker now than before?

A. I would think that his leadership lends strength to it, and I would imagine without that leadership, at least temporarily, that it would be somewhat weaker. However, these movements are not dependent on just one man. I think it is fair to say, however, that the Havana Conference of about a year and a half or two years ago that directed the Communist Party to conduct wars of liberation and the guerilla movement in Latin America, that that force and that activity is still under way, but my own view would be, personal view, with no knowledge other than just a personal view, that Che Guevara was an extremely able revolutionary and guerilla leader. With his death, I would imagine momentarily the movement might be weakened, but maybe not over the long period of time.

Q. The Latin American people believe that the United States foreign policy is one for all countries and no one for each country. What is your point of view about this feeling?

A. Well, we look upon Latin America as a region, but also as individual countries. For example, our relationships with the Republic of Mexico are bilateral and yet they are also multilateral. By that I mean you are a member of the Organization of American States, so are we. You are involved in the Alliance for Progress, so are we, but Mexico has its own foreign policy. It recognizes, for example, all governments. It has a strict policy of non-intervention. We respect that. We think that Mexico makes a very good contribution to stability and progress in Latin America, so we have a United States-Mexican relationship wherever we can. At the same time, we try to find those areas where we can work on a broader base, the multilateral. For example, in Central America, we have a relationship with a country like El Salvador, a small country, or Costa Rica, or Guatemala or Honduras. Nevertheless, what we're most interested in, or equally interested in, I should say, equally interested in is the Common Market approach of the countries of Central America. We're interested in the Central American Bank and its operation. We're interested in Central American integration, and we like to do what we can working through their offices to promote that. This doesn't prevent separate relationships. For example, our relationships with Panama are different than they are with Costa Rica, and yet, wherever we can, we like to get the regional approach, and the reason for that is that you can get more done out of the resources that are available, and you know that in Central America a great deal has been done to rationalize their industry, to improve their educational structure by specialization, where you have a school of agriculture in one country and a medical school in another that serves all of the people of the entire region. So it isn't one or the other. Wherever possible, for example, we have a certain special relationship with a

country like Chile, and yet Chile has a very important role to play in all of Latin America. Same would be of Brazil, so they are both bilateral and multilateral.

Q. Do you think that the Alliance for Progress is achieving this purpose?

A. It is making progress. I would like to see it make more. The population growth in Latin America has in some instances outstripped productivity growth. I think the Alliance for Progress will ultimately be judged not only by the economic progress that it's made, but by the political institutions that are developing, and I want to make it quite clear, my country is interested not only in economic progress but also in the development of institutions of representative government...viable political institutions. Therefore, we like to concentrate on both, but we have a particular responsibility under the Alliance for Progress to make our fair contribution to the economic and social development of the country. We also feel that under the Punta del Este Charter, the Charter of Punta del Este, that the countries in Latin America have an obligation to try to develop representative institutions of government. Now it's been difficult, and in some instances there has been little or no progress, and actually retreat, but in the main, I think it's fair to say that Latin America is better today than it was five years ago. I think that it's better because of the Alliance for Progress, and as you know, the recent meeting of the Presidents of the Republics at Punta del Este resulted in a rather large commitment from our country again and the other countries for special work under agriculture, health and education, and my government has now set aside \$900 million more for these special programs, despite the fact that we're cutting back in

some areas. In the Latin American area, the Congress of the United States approved this very significant and heavy outlay of funds for our contribution.

Q. Mr. Vice President, under the ground rules we agreed to, your staff has asked us to cut this. I wonder if we might ask for a group picture as one last favor, sir?

A. Yes, sir. Thank you very, very much.

END

NOTE: This part followed the interview and appears to begin in the middle of a statement being made by the Vice President:

....but when you say, do you want Mr. Johnson or Mr. Romney, it's Johnson. Do you want Mr. Johnson or Mr. Nixon? It's Johnson. Do you want Mr. Johnson or Mr. Percy? It's Johnson. You want Mr. Johnson or Mr. Reagan? It's Johnson. You want Mr. Johnson or Mr. Rockefeller, sometimes it's Rockefeller, sometimes it's Johnson, but there's one thing you can be reasonably sure of. The Republican Convention is not going to nominate Rockefeller, because 50% of the delegates to the Convention will be carryovers from the 1964 convention, which was a Goldwater convention. A study of American politics shows you one thing, that going to conventions where you select presidents is a business. I studied as a Masters Degree in politics, in political science, the history of political parties from 1960 to 1940 of people going to conventions, and the average is that over 50% of the delegates that attended the last convention, the previous convention, will attend this one. Over 50...sometimes as high as 80. They make it their life's work to be a convention delegate in the political structure. So it takes a long time to turn a set of attitudes in a political convention, and sometimes this is why a political party nominates someone. It isn't always the true reflection of the body politic. And our Republican friends have a peculiar propensity for being able to select the wrong man. You know, Harry Truman once said, "Never underestimate the stupidity of the Republican Party." Now sometimes we overestimate it and we rely on it too much. I think the Republicans are going to have a lot of trouble between now and their convention, and I'll tell you why. They've got a lot of strong willed men that are seeking the nomination,

and by the time that they get through cutting each other up and being brainwashed and shifting positions, it won't be a choice between a saint and a devil. It'll be a choice between a Democrat and a Republican. It'll be a choice between President Johnson and a Republican nominee, and let me tell you, they won't be knights in shining armor. They'll be humans, and then the public has to make up its mind...do you want President Lyndon Johnson as he is, all that he is and all that he isn't, or do you want Mr. X? And then it gets to be not down to the choice of the perfect man that you'd like. You know, I want to tell you fellows something. None of us would ever get married, ever have a woman that would take us if they had to be judged on the basis of, is this really what I want. And I doubt there'd be many women that would find a husband...it's ultimately you make choices between people. My wife always tells me, you know, when I get mad about politics, get angry, and I say I don't like it and I don't know why this happens to me, and she says, "There was really no popular demand that you be Vice President. You volunteered. They didn't have any big Draft Humphrey movement in America for you to become Vice President. Anytime you want to quit, you can quit."

Thank you, gentlemen.



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