

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY ON KWGN TELEVISION'S SPEAK OUT '68 PROGRAM.

Video taped June 26, 1968 at KWGN studio, Denver, Colorado.

Presented over KWGN Television, 9:30 p.m., June 29, 1968

Panel questioning Mr. Humphrey consisted of:

Gene Amole, KWGN, moderator.

Lawrence Larsen, Denver Post, reporter.

Richard Tucker, Rocky Mountain News, reporter.

Program length: 29 minutes.

MR. AMOLE

Good evening again. I'm Gene Amole and this is Speak Out '68. As we've told you earlier, we are delighted to have in our studio for tonight's program, the Vice President of the United States of America, Hubert Humphrey. Mr. Humphrey, as you know, is a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. And we are very grateful to him for allowing us to take a part of his very valuable time to answer some questions. To assist in asking those questions, we have Dick Tucker of the Rocky Mountain News and Leonard Larsen of the Denver Post. Mr. Larsen, your first question.

MR. LARSEN

Yes. Mr. Vice President, with the democratic convention only six weeks away, can you tell us what kind of a platform you would like to see written on Viet Nam....the platform statement.

MR. HUMPHREY

Well, first of all the platform committee as you know has not yet been selected...only the chairman has been appointed. And

I do believe if you believe in an open convention, you really ought to let the people that are going to come there have something to say about that platform. Not only something to say about it, but they ought to write the platform. I have asked first of all the chairman of that committee, Congressman Boggs, to hold open hearings on the platform.....all aspects of the platform. In fact, if possible to go right out into the different cities of America with a....at least a subcommittee of the platform committee, to hear the voice of the people and to listen to the views of the people. On Viet Nam, I would hope that we could have a platform plank that would look to the future, that would express genuine public and, of course, political party support, of our efforts to gain a political solution to the struggle in Viet Nam.....a negotiated settlement that is genuine peace...to backup our negotiators at Paris, Ambassador Harriman and Ambassador Vance. I don't believe it would be particularly helpful to try to relive the past. There are people that have all kinds of views about this. Some people think we ought to have done more. Some people think we ought not to have been there at all. Some people believe that what we've done is right. It's all....they call themselves doves or hawks. Some people think we ought to have the wisdom and silence of an owl on these matters. I think what is important is to learn the lessons...to learn some lessons out of Viet Nam as to the extent of our commitments around the world. Also, to recognize that violence at home or abroad does not permit

healthy social, political, economic development.

MR. LARSEN

Will you contemplate putting your views on Viet Nam before the platform committee?

MR. HUMPHREY

Yes, I surely will. And I have expressed those views pretty well here. I do believe that the United States of America when it makes a commitment, and it ought to be selective, I want to be clear, on those commitments, should fulfill them, because our word is a very, very important part of the safeguard to peace.

MR. LARSEN

On Viet Nam; do you detect a mood in our country that is shifting away from our policy now.....the policy of containment and the policy of regarding Southeast Asia in the domino theory?

MR. HUMPHREY

Well, the domino theory, Mr. Larsen, was a phrase that I doubt had all the logic to it that it seems to indicate by that capsuled phrase. It really makes a good headline but it doesn't necessarily make good policy. Sometimes you have difficulty making policy to suit headlines, or visa-versa. What I think the American people would expect out of this costly struggle in Viet Nam is that in Southeast Asia there would be a development socially and politically and economically that would be in a regional basis where there could be really the pooling of the resources of those countries for vast programs of human betterment. We seem to be getting that now in the Mekong River where dams are being constructed like in our own TVA and in our own Columbia River System. We're seeing the development of that in the Southeast Asian conference that was held at Bangkok about a year and a half ago on the whole subject of education as it

relates to all of Southeast Asia. There's the possibilities we see in the role of Indonesia now with Malasia, with Thailand, with Laos and Viet Nam and the Phillipines.....Indonesia being the fifth largest nation in the world. So there are some positive developments taking place here that I think are very encouraging. But what I do worry about is that we've spent so much time arguing, bitterly at times, over the...this abcess, this infected thumb of Viet Nam on the palm of Asia...and on the hand of Asia.... that we've forgotten the rest of it. Now, there's going to be a day of peace in Viet Nam. I think the beginnings of that peace are now evident in the discussions taking place in Paris.....if we have the patience and the persistence and the perserverance that is required for the adjustments that are necessary to gain peace. It's going to test our method a great deal....test our patience. I think we are on that road. I don't mean to be overly optimistic. I think it's just a development that indicates that something new has happened that is constructive and positive. Now let's get our focus of attention then on what kind of a world are we going to be living in in Southeast Asia....what kind of a world will it be after Viet Nam? And that requires us to think in terms of economic redevelopment there...regionally, cooperation, and Asians doing much for themselves. If there's any one thing we may have overdone in these post-war years it's that we have tried to do maybe too much. I don't believe that we ought to not be involved in the world. Don't misunderstand me. I believe America has a responsibility in the world. A great

responsibility. But this is 1968, not 1948 or 1958. And we really should be now talking about the kind of a world that we're going to be living in 1972, '76, in the years ahead. And in that kind of a world, I see a Japan and an India and an Indonesia and an Australia, the Phillipines and the others there of significant power, strength and wealth and population, developing their own kind of consensus....of peace keeping in Asia. They have a great stake in the peace there. And we ought to encourage that, not to have it designed in Washington, but to encourage it in every way that we can....thereby to minimize our own direct involvement. And then finally let me say that, and you're hearing what I think ought to be in a platform....let me say that we need to look a little bit ahead. How do you get ahead of a crisis? We generally go around putting band-aids on the wounds. How do we get out in front for a change? Let's take a look at that part of the world and see how our economic assistance program...our technical assistance program, our diplomacy, our exchange program, our commercial programs, our trade programs, can help these parts of the world develop and to grow and to build their own vitality. Let's get out in front a little bit. And how can we strengthen the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations?....so that we're not called upon to unilaterally be the guardian of other people's freedoms. I think we have a responsibility here. But I don't think it's ours alone. I think that we have to think now of a world of 1978 rather than a world of 1948....a world of 1968 rather than

1958. And sometimes we get bogged down so much in the past that we never get a chance to get a look at the future.

MR. AMOLE

Mr. Vice President, assuming that it would be possible to get these nations you've mentioned in a cooperative spirit for their own self protection and their own benefit, would this not bring them into an ultimate confrontation with Red China and possibly mean a reinvolvement of our own?

MR. HUMPHREY

Well, first of all these nations are right now in a period of coming together. Regionalism is now a fact in Southeast Asia, as it is in Africa. I just as you know was in Africa this year and saw the East African economic community....saw the West African states joining together in common enterprises. Regionalism is the way that the leaders of free nations now approach many of their more difficult problems. It's like we here in the United States are approaching our difficult problems by cooperation between government and private enterprise. All levels of government and private enterprise, knowing that none of us alone can do it. So the beginnings of regionalism are there. The Asian development bank is there, and it's operated by Asians and it has its headquarters in Manilla in the Phillipines. These things are taking place. Now you say will they have a confrontation with China. My own view is that standing alone, like Benjamin Franklin once said, "We either hang together or hang separately"....but standing alone they tempt the aggressive instinct of some of the leaders...the

present day leaders of Communist China. Standing alone...but working together in consortion or concert they put up a pretty good wall of resistence. They build internal strength and they present a shield of security. Also, I believe that time is on the side of humanity with China. For example if I'm privileged to serve as President of this country, I would want to take a good hard look at our policy with China. And I have... for example, the president of the United States, President Johnson, has suggested what he calls bridge building to China. You're speaking now of the admission of China into the United Nations?

MR. LARSEN

MR. HUMPHREY

No, I haven't gone that far. I say that we ought to take a good hard look at it....what we're doing here...some of the things I think we ought to do. We ought to make sure China is not isolated from the world. We ought to have a policy of engagement so to speak, with China. Not military engagement but peaceful engagement....trade. It's really ridiculous not to trade, for example, with foodstuffs with China. To trade, you build some understanding. Exchange of men like yourself, journalists, editors, doctors, cultural exchanges. Surely we ought to try to encourage China to become a more responsible and a more friendly member of the family of nations. Now, much of this could be done by the Asian neighbors themselves. When we come to the matter of China and the United Nations, this too ought to be up for careful consideration. I don't think one makes a quick judgement on that until he consults with neighbors,

allies,.....you don't try to make a policy as broad as that one on a moments....really on a question and answer program. But let me say this. I don't think we ought to go in with blinders. What I do think is important is that instead of exercising.... instead of insisting on a policy of isolation, we ought to... at a minimum have a policy of containment of Chinese aggression, military aggression on the one hand....an engagement and reconciliation on the other hand.

MR. AMOLE

Has Red China given the administration any indication at all that it would be willing to enter into any kind of trade agreement?

R. HUMPHREY

No, It has not. But that doesn't mean that we should not at least venture the idea and put forward the thought. You know, we had this kind of relationship for a long time with the Soviet Union...back in the 20s and the 30s. It appeared that, well in fact we did not recognize the Soviet Union until Franklin Roosevelt became president of the United States....and it was a highly controversial matter. But look what time has done. I think it was Adlai Stevenson that once said, that there wasn't any problem that he knew of that what the sharp and cutting edges of it could be in a sense rounded and ground off if you've permitted it to have the patience and time to work on it, particularly with thought. And it's my view that we simply cannot be stuck in the cement of yesterday. I don't know whether everything that I've suggested here is what will work. I do know that we need to try some things. We have to do it

prudently. But let's venture....let's try. It's perfectly obvious that problems of this world are not subject to military solutions. Now we need our strength. We must have a sense of security. But our strength should be a shield behind which we are secure on one hand, and on the other hand around which we can work with a degree of safety and security to encourage effective international development. I think our foreign aid programs for example need to be much more directed toward banks like the world bank and the inter-American development bank, the Asian bank, the African bank...African Development Bank. Why? These banks have good management. You're not in the position of being the banker and making all the loans yourself, and thereby engendering the dislike of the man that can't repay his loan. I have found that the inter-American Development Bank, for example, has an excellent record of repayment on loans. I have also found that when we make the loans, the United States directly to another country, we have a lot of political trouble making collections. Now if you can get an InterAmerican Develepment Bank with 20 or more nations making their deposits in that bank and buying capitol stock, with that bank doing the job that has to be done in economic development, isn't it better that that go on rather than we pay all the bill and <sup>HIRE</sup>~~hire~~ all the managers and do all the loaning and have to do all the collecting and you generally end up not having many friends. So there's a new period. See, there was a time when nobody else could do this because the world had been

bankrupt out of world war two. But now Western Europe is prosperous. Japan is prosperous. Australia is prosperous. Other countries have begun to develop capitol. Now it's time for them to pool that capitol, and it's time for them to take on their ever-greater share of this responsibility with us. And we with them. In other words we don't want pox Americana. We don't want a world made stamped with a sign on it saying, "Made in the USA." What we want is a world in which....well I think John Kennedy put it, "World that's safe for diversity." Woodrow Wilson said, "Safe for democracy." What I say is a "world that is liveable." A world in which we know that war is an obsolete method of settling international disputes...and a very dangerous method of settling them.

R. AMOLE

Your opponent, Mr. McCarthy, has said that too much of the decision on Viet Nam is one example and on Cuba on another... was dependent upon too much military information or too much decision within the military. Would you agree with that? It sounds to me like when you want to rely less and less on the military that's what you're saying.

R. HUMPHREY

Well, it's a mix that you rely on. First of all, I do not agree with that. I positively do not agree with it. And I say with all respect to my distinguished colleague that the decisions that he is talking about were decisions that were made many, many years ago. The decision on Viet Nam wasn't made by Mr. Johnson. We'd had an involvement in Viet Nam since the days of President Eisenhower up through President Kennedy and that involvement has continued up, up, up. And I don't recall my

colleagues saying much about that during this time. The military was very active in that time. The military has become involved in Viet Nam in recent date because of the severity and the intensity of the aggression from the North. And I want to make it quite clear that when there is violence, when there is aggression, we cannot meet it just with social workers. As much as I have respect for social work for the peaceful work of building the economic and social development of the country any more than when there is violence in your community that the only thing that you depend on is just somebody that says we ought to be good folks. We have to have law and order to have social progress at home and we have to have a minimum of violence in this world to have social progress. Nations have found that out. I think that this is one of the reasons that today the Soviet Union is acting ever more responsibly in the world, because it has found out that war is just too dangerous a business if you want real social progress. Nations that have had all kinds of military struggles have found out that you have to put down the violence....I mean that have had rebellions within them, have found out that you have to put down the violence before you can really make social progress. I do not agree with Senator McCarthy's statement on that. I want to say that some of the most peaceful men that I've known have been generals. I think that General Eisenhower was a very peaceful man. Now let me say that Bob McNamara of the Department of

Defense was an exceedingly peaceful man. And I think that Clark Clifford, the present secretary of defense, is one of the most peaceful men I've known and one of the men most dedicated to peace that I know. As a matter of fact, most of the so-called hawks that I've heard don't have uniforms on. Generals know the tragedies of war. While they are disciplined in the techniques and tactics of war they, maybe more than anybody else know the tragedy of it. And they don't speak of it lightly. I think one of the great things about America is that we had a General Marshall who was a great secretary of state as well as a great general and was the author of the Marshall Plan for economic rehabilitation of Western Europe. We've had an Omar Bradley...a General Bradley. I know General Bradley...never have been a more peaceful man, I think a more kindly man than Omar Bradley. We've had other generals in this present day that are very, very peaceful men. So I Don't believe that you can go around and say that the military has had a disproportionate influence. But the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief, gentlemen, and the two secretaries of state that I've known, and worked closely with.... Secretary McNamara and Secretary Clifford....are every bit as peaceful as anybody I've ever known, and their influence has not been for more war....their influence has been to try to limit the struggle....to hold down the degree of violence...to bring this war, this struggle in Viet Nam for example to where we are right now....to the conference table. That decision was made by

the President but it was made by the President with the advice and counsel of his secretary of state, his secretary of defense, his ambassador to the United Nations and the National Security Council on which I serve. And I don't know a single member of that cabinet including the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler, who is not a belligerent man...he is as peaceful a man as you will ever find. I know of no single member of that council that did not support the president's decision to limit the bombing, to take that unilateral action of deescalation and to go to Paris and to open the conferences.

MR. TUCKER

You've talked about the social progress to be made after the war is over. Do you see any kind of a timetable...any indication where the Paris talks are leading or when they will develop?

MR. HUMPHREY

No I don't. I would hesitate to put a timetable on the victory of peace just as I hesitate to put a timetable on the end of the struggle in the past in Viet Nam. Some people have come back and said I think in six months it will be over and they've proven to be wrong. This I do know though. We are determined as a nation and as a government to pursue relentlessly and patiently with all the honor, and even at sacrifice, this course in which we are presently set in Paris. This has been the objective that President Johnson has had and that the Vice president has had all the time. Our objective was not to find an answer to the problem of Viet Nam on the battlefield. We

have sought to get this conflict on the battlefield to the conference table ever since president Johnson has been in the White House and John Kennedy before him. I sat with these men when I was majority whip and I know what we tried to do in Laos and we've done in other parts of the world. I remind you that what we've done in Cyprus....it was this government that was able to bring some peace to that troubled island. I remind you that in the Middle East a little over a year ago that it was President Johnson who ~~was~~ sent a message to Mr. Kosygin ....and that message had a great deal to do with preventing any escalation of that struggle over and beyond the small powers that were involved.

MR. LARSEN

Your suggestion the other day for a cease fire in Viet Nam.... was that suggestion a product of the combined thinking that you have referred to....the Joint Chiefs...the Secretary of Defense?

R. HUMPHREY

No, that was my suggestion. But let me say it has been in the policy considerations of our government for a long, long time. I think you will recall that about a year ago this past February, U-Thant of the United Nations made a proposal of what he called a "stand down". I mean, where you are, stop the firing, don't move and see if we couldn't get some talks going. We accepted that proposal. That was a kind of a cease fire. My proposal was not particularly new, certainly. It was a re-emphasis of what we believe is one of the ways to

make the peace talks move along in a better environment and move along more rapidly. There is another way. And that is just gradual de-escalation and this is another proposal that we make...gradual de-escalation. For example, President Johnson's San Antonio formula....just to refresh our minds, total cessation of the bombing in the North provided that the North Vietnamese did not take advantage of that situation by escalating the war in the South. In other words not to add more forces, not to escalate. Now that proposal still remains and the government of the United States made clear as the President did in his message on March 31st, that we're prepared to make that major quantum change in our posture in Viet Nam if we get any kind of of reciprocity, any meaningful reciprocity out of North Viet Nam.

MR. AMOLE

But Mr. Vice President, almost as soon as you made the recommendations Xuan Thuy, the North Vietnamese Chief negotiator rejected it immediately, and it appears from figures that we saw just today that the infiltration of South Viet Nam by North Viet Nameese is at an all time high. So does this not discourage you in the prospects for some type of negotiated peace in Paris.

MR HUMPHREY

It tells me what I think the American people should have known for a long time and what I have know for a long time as a member of the cabinet....that the North Vietnamese had been pouring over the years thousands and thousands of people into South Viet Nam...that they are engaged in aggression. I happen

to believe that our military situation in South Vietnam is good enough and strong enough to withstand any attack that is made there. There is many reasons for it. The Army of the South Vietnamese is a much better army now than it was a year ago...it's better armed, it's better trained and quite frankly the government in South Vietnam is a stronger government...it's a stronger based government than it was a year ago....So there are many factors that offset this present report that you have. I want to say also that there are those in this country that urge that we take some drastic steps. I think the important thing right now is to remember that there is a new development called a conference in Paris, and we must not let that conference be broken up by the kind of psychological warfare that the North Vietnamese waged through Communist propaganda...nor should we get intemperate, petulant and hasty in any kind of a reaction that we have to reports that may come from Saigon or someplace else. Your President and your national Security Council watch these developments very carefully. Now I'm not going to say what will be the outcome. I'm not a prophet. And I don't think it helps the negotiators in Paris for me to speculate on this. I'll just say this, that Ambassador Harriman and Ambassador Vance have been reporting regularly to your government...the President...that our position is what it was and will continue to be, namely that we seek a political settlement a negotiated settlement and we feel that the

developments thus far at Paris are at best encouraging. I don't want to be overly optimistic but the fact is that the talks are continuing and when men are talking and are in contact, despite what they say for the public....and the North Vietnamese say many things for the public....there may be some straws in the wind that indicate that there's something else going on.

MR. LARSEN

Well, is this the only encouraging aspects as far as you know that the talks are continuing, or are there some identifiable gains in the discussions there?

MR. HUMPHREY

My good friend, if I were to comment on that I would be doing a great disservice to the negotiations. I think that one of the things that the candidates have to remember in this election year is that it's difficult enough to negotiate with the Communists without any sideline quarterbacking, guesses, prophecies, predictions from those of us who are seeking the attention of the public. The President made a great sacrifice politically .....~~we~~<sup>he</sup> withdrew himself from politics in order to concentrate his attention on peace. I want to be able to make whatever contribution I can to that same great cause.

MR. AMOLE

Thank you Mr. Vice President. We would like to use more of your time to discuss other issues.....

MR. HUMPHREY

I thought we were just getting started.

MR. AMOLE

....such as the Kerner report and some of the things ~~are~~ that are going on in our cities but we can't I'm afraid take any more of that time. We thank you very much for coming to our studio during a very busy campaign swing to meet with our press

in Denver. This is Mr. Dick Tucker of the Rocky Mountain News.....

MR. HUMPHREY

We didn't let Dick in...Gee whiz, I wish we could go on.

MR. AMOLE

.....and Leonard Larsen of the Denver Post. And again, thank you very much sir. We'll be back with part two of Speak Out 68 after this message.



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)