



news release

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE • PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION • 2600 VIRGINIA AVE., N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037 • 202/333-8750

For Immediate Release
September 19, 1968

For Further Information:
Ev Munsey, ext. 201
DC-485

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY TO ENGAGE IN TRANS-ATLANTIC TV DISCUSSION

Washington, D.C., Sept. 19 -- Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey will appear on a special edition of the British Broadcasting Corporation's (BBC) television program "Panorama."

The show, a leading current affairs program that is aired weekly on BBC-TV, will be broadcast at 8:00 pm, British Standard Time (3:00 pm, EDT) on Monday, September 23.

By satellite, the Vice President in the studios of WTOL-TV in Toledo, will be questioned by four prominent Europeans in the BBC studios in London.

The questioners will be:

- * Christopher Mayhew, a member of Parliament and former minister in the Labour government who resigned in a dispute over the British role east of Suez.
- * Jean Jacques Servan-Schreiber, of Paris, author of the best-selling and controversial book, "The American Challenge," which foresees eventual total economic domination of Europe by the United States. Mr. Servan-Schreiber, a former Gaullist deputy ran unsuccessfully against Francois Mitterand in the last French election.
- * Theo Sommer, the deputy editor of the Hamburg newspaper, Die Zeit, will represent Germany. Mr. Sommer is a member of the Johnson Institute of Strategic Studies.
- * Kamil Winter of Prague, the editor of news and current affairs for Czechoslovakian television. The program will be moderated by Mr. Robin Day, "Panorama's" regular anchor man.

#

WTOL-TV Toledo Fleven
Cosmos Broadcasting Corporation
September 23, 1968

Mr. Day. This is Robin Day, London and with me here questioning Vice President Humphrey, who is now in Station WTOL-TV, Toledo, Ohio, are the following Dr. Theo Sommer from Germany, Deputy Editor of the influential weekly, "Die Zeit. Mr. Jean Claude Servan-Schreiber from France, a prominent Gaullist and a former member of the French Parliament; Mr. Kamil Winter, from Prague, who is head of news and current affairs on Czech television, at the time of the Russian invasion, Mr. Charistopher Mayhew, British Labour, M.P. and former minister in the Wilson Government.

May I say good evening, Mr. Humphrey.

Vice President Humphrey. Good evening, good evening.

Mr. Day. Or, rather, should say good afternoon. We can see you very well now.

Vice President Humphrey. Thank you.

Mr. Day. May I say this? You look very happy, but may I ask you first of all, what has gone wrong with your campaign?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, not a thing has gone wrong with it. It is like most everything else; It takes a little time to get started. We have just finished a very vigorous Democratic Convention and have had very little time to get our campaign underway. I am happy to tell you, though, that the most recent results in the polling public opinion seem to show us on the upward trend, and I would rather have the trend going with me up when I am going up the line than have the trend going against me when I am going down the line.

Mr. Day. Mr. Humphrey, if I may say so, you have a long way to catch up. Our British papers in Britain here show that Governor Wallace is going ahead much quicker than you and taking the votes from you.

Vice President Humphrey. Oh, my goodness, you had better speak to the editors. They are not exactly on target. The truth is that we are doing quite well now, that there is a very good spirit in our campaign that that in the important states with the electoral votes -- remember, we have an electoral system here, not popular vote -- that in the electoral states, with large electoral votes, we are coming up rather well. For example, the most recent poll shows me leading in the State of Michigan, which is one of our large states, shows me even with Mr. Nixon in Texas, shows me ahead in the State of North Carolina, shows me leading in the State of Missouri, shows me behind in the State of Wisconsin.

Now, those are the most recent polls that have come out this week. So I feel rather encouraged.

And the Wallace vote is essentially a protest vote. I believe that much of that will dissolve in the general election when people get into the ballot box.

Mr. Day. Mr. Winter.

Mr. Winter. Mr. Humphrey, do you think that polls will prejudice the voters, especially those who are not decided?

Vice President Humphrey. I think that Mr. Wallace draws his main strength from the voters who have a racist bias and who are primarily concerned about the simple answers to complex questions. He appeals on the issue of law and order, even though his own state has one of the highest rates in the country; he appeals to the basis of race and racial prejudice, even though the pattern in America

...to the goal of improved race relations.

I think that Mr. Wallace is a temporary phenomenon and that he is not a lasting political fact.

Mr. Day. I think the question that Mr. Winter was seeking to ask there, Mr. Vice President, was this, does the fact that the polls have been showing you doing badly, won't that influence undecided people to get on the Nixon or other bandwagon?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, let me just take a good look with you at those polls. I am sorry I misunderstood Mr. Winter's question. We have had nine nationwide public opinion polls since May of this year. In six of those, I have been leading and in the last two, I have been behind, in one of them, about even. We have, however, begun to close the gap. In the Gallup Poll, there was an improvement in my rating of about four to five percent over the most recent poll prior to this one. In the Harris poll, we are down about two points. But we still are not very far behind Mr. Nixon.

I do not consider this very serious, may I say, because where we have our weakness is essentially in the Midwest and the number of electoral votes there is not very large.

Mr. Day. Mr. Servan-Schreiber?

Mr. Servan-Schreiber. Mr. Vice President, I would like to put a question to you. Your candidacy here in Europe looked a bit like having taken you by surprise. The statements that you made differ quite a lot from what President Johnson said on some important points. Does that mean that as Vice President and a member of your government, you have one policy, and that being a candidate, you have another one. I'm talking about Vietnam or about the Middle East.

Vice President Humphrey. Yes.

No, on the Middle East, my difference with the Administration is essentially on the subject of Phantom Jets as a part of the defense structure for Israel. I believe that what is needed in the Middle East is, of course, arms limitation, rather than arms build up. But if that build up is occurring in one side, I think that it is in the interests of the balance of power in the Middle East that Israel have the modern weapons to defend herself. That is why I have said as a candidate and I say it in any position -- citizen, Vice President, or candidate -- that I believe that Israel ought to have the right to acquire the necessary instruments of self defense.

Now, on Vietnam, I support our Platform, the Platform of the Democratic Party, which is flexible, to be sure, which citess many more areas of agreement amongst Americans than disagreement. Regrettably, what makes the news are the areas of disagreement. I do not find myself in basic disagreement with the Administration. On the contrary, I think that the Administration is seeking a political settlement of this struggle in Vietnam. That is what I have always thosought.

I do say, however, that if this Administration under President Johnson is not able to find a means of achieving peace in Vietnam between now and January 20, 1969, and if I am elected the President and come to office on January 20, 1969, that the highest priority of my administration will be to find a way to bring this war to an honorable conclusion without sacrificing the safety of South Vietnam or without repudiating what we have stood for in that area.

MR. Day. Dr. Sommer.

Mr. Sommer. Sir, if you know what you are going to do on the 21st of January next year about Vietnam, why don't you say so today and what is it that you would do?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, Mr. Sommer, Dr. Sommer: first of all, nobody knows what the situation will be in Vietnam on January 20, 1969, any more than anybody could have predicted that in May of 1968, we would be at the negotiating table in Paris: any more than anybody could have safely predicted that there would have been the Tet Offensive in January and February of 1968. You just don't have any sure information, any positive, accurate information that can give you gifts of prophecy. Therefore, as I have said, when I become President, I will reassess the entire situation in Vietnam and will take the action that that situation requires.

I will assess and reassess the ground situation, the political, the diplomatic situation, and will do what is needed at that time.

Mr. Day. Mr. Servan-Schreiber.

Mr. Servan-Schreiber. In the meantime, have you considered resigning your office of Vice President as suggested by one of your leading supporters, Senator McGovern, so that, as he put it, you would be free to take your own line and as others put it, you would no longer appear to be the prisoner of LBJ?

Vice President Johnson. Well, first of all, I am not the prisoner of LBJ. Whatever you may want to accuse the President of, he has not captured me. I have a respect for him and I have had a close working relationship with the President and am proud to have been Vice President and proud to be Vice President of this country. So, number one, I am not a prisoner.

Number two, I have never been a man that has been known to be hesitant on speaking my mind. I do think it is fair to say, however, that as a Vice President, you have a different role in government of the United States, at least, than you do as a Senator.

Well, now, I was a Senator for 16 years. You have no particular disciplines upon you, even requirements of loyalty to party or loyalty to conscience. As a Senator, you speak your mind. I should say that you do have loyalty to conscience. As a Senator, you are a fully independent man.

As a Vice President, you are a member of a team. You cannot have two voices speaking from the Executive Branch, you can only have one.

Mr. Servan-Schreiber. Does that mean, Mr. Humphrey, if I may just interrupt, does that mean you are not urging on the President at this moment any change of policy in Vietnam?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, I do not discuss on public television my personal relationships with the President or any personal advice that I might give him. You do not operate a government that way, particularly one that has the responsibilities that this country holds in the world today.

I think it is fair to say, however, that men of independent judgment and of strong conviction from time to time have differences of view. The President does not want around him yes men; he wants men around him who will speak their mind. But ultimately, the decision has to be made by the President.

Abraham Lincoln once said in his Cabinet that there were eight nays and one yea, and the yeas have it. By that, he was the President.

Now, a President looks for counsel and advice and then must look to his own heart and conscience and mind for the decision.

One other thing I should say to you is that I have had no particular difficulty in supporting our administrations policy. I feel that what we have tried to do is to prevent the success of aggression. We have tried to preserve some degree of stability in Southeast Asia, which we have done. That part, I think, has worked quite well. And finally, we have tried to give the people of Southeast Asia a chance to chart their own course and to develop their own lives. I think that is good.

Mr. Day. Mr. Winter?

Mr. Winter. Do you think, Mr. Vice President, that if the President ordered a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam, this would help your election campaign?

Vice President Humphrey. If the President were to halt the bombing of North Vietnam, what I want it to help is the discussions in Paris. I believe that the halting of the bombing should be related entirely to whether or not this will lend itself, this action will lend itself toward substantive discussions in Paris and towards an cease fire and ultimately towards peace in Southeast Asia. I do not believe the President of the United States will or should take any action relating to the military situation in Vietnam that is directed towards effective politics in the United States. Let's do here what is right for world peace and what is right for national policy.

Mr. Winter. Mr. Vice President, may we move on away from the national campaign itself to some of the aspects of Vietnam policy? You said in your acceptance speech in Chicago, I remember, that the policies of tomorrow need not be limited by the policies of yesterday. Now, everyone took that as an implication that you would change. But can you not give us a little more indication of the difference of your approach, even if you can't indicate policy changes?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, I am sure that all of us would want to have a degree of flexible, flexibility and enlightenment about tomorrow. What I said is just the simple truth, that you can't have policies that were designed some 20 years ago continue to be effective if they are no longer useful.

Now, I don't know which ones that we would abandon. The world situation would have to determine that.

For example, only a few months ago, here in the United States and in Western Europe, we were all talking about the detente with the Soviet Union. Why, when I was in Europe in April last year, 1967, there was a small love feast going in. Then came the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Now, how could you predict that? There was a whole new situation that came upon us. So what appeared to be, for a time, less necessity for strong NATO defenses, now we find that there is a great necessity for strong NATO defenses. Events determine policies, as well as policies fashioning events.

Now, what I have said is that I will reassess all of the situation that faces us world wide -- not just in Vietnam -- and we will try to tailor or adjust our policies accordingly.

For example, I believe there ought to be a much closer working relationship between the United States and Europe. I think I can help make that possible. I believe it would be good if Britain entered the common market. I would try to encourage that. I believe it is good that we have regional development; I would try to encourage that. I'm simply saying that I am a man of tomorrow. I do not want to be locked in as if I am prisoned by the past.

Mr. Day. Before we question you about those very interesting comments on Europe, Mr. Humphrey, may we see if we have any more questions on the Viet Nam issue before we move to that.

Dr. Sommer?

Mr. Sommer. Mr. Vice President, you said events determine policies. Sometimes men determine policies.

Vice President Humphrey. Yes.

Mr. Sommer. I would like to put the question to you: Do you believe that the minimum consensus exists in the United States that is necessary to achieve the honorable peace you were talking about, and if so, what concessions are you willing to make to achieve that honorable peace?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, our platform has pretty well stated, first of all, that we believe that there should be a cessation of bombing when that does not seriously impair the safety of our troops.

Mr. Sommer. How do you know whether it does?

Vice President Humphrey. That is a decision to be made by the President of the United States after he has surveyed the entire military and political situation.

Also, we must keep in mind that the decision of bombing may very well, within itself, be protective of lives. If it lends itself, if it should lead to a cease fire or if it should lead to an act from Hanoi which would de-escalate the war. This is a decision that must be made by the commander in chief. That is why our constitution places that responsibility on the President.

Now, let me say one other thing: I do believe that, from my own personal observation, that the Army of South Vietnam is improving, that its combat effectiveness is much better. It is being better equipped with modern weapons and receiving much better training. It is also combat tested. There are about 800,000 Vietnamese in those armed forces today. That would be equivalent to about 17 million Americans on the basis of population.

As that Army of South Vietnam becomes more effective, I would, as President -- and I am talking about what I could do if I were President. It will do very little good for me to pretend or play president between now and January 20, because I am not. You only have one President at a time.

But speaking now after January 20, if I were the President, I would assess the military capacity of the army of South Vietnam very carefully. I would encourage the government of South Vietnam to take on more responsibility for its own self-defense, and I would thereby try to enter into discussions with the objective in mind of a reduction of American forces, reducing our combat forces, but at the same time, not reducing them at the expense of the troops that remain or the safety of South Vietnam.

Now, this adds up to one thing, that I believe that in the year 1969, unless unknown things happen or developments that we cannot foresee now take place, that we shall be able to reduce the number of American forces in Vietnam without jeopardizing the security of that country. I hope by then that we can have a cease fire.

And by the way, if Europe will join us, and I speak very candidly to my friends, particularly my Social Democratic friends in Europe, if you would join us in calling upon North Vietnam to accept a cease fire, to at least accept the restoration of the demilitarized zone, the DMZ, we could get on with this peace.

I would rather have a chance to talk rather than fight and talk. And what --

Mr. Day. We must get in a question here.

Mr. Mayhew. Mr. Humphrey, I think I may say as a Social Democrat's reply, I don't think we dissent from that at all. But if I can say so, listening very carefully on your statement on Vietnam, there is nothing you said which the President might not have said himself. When we asked you to begin with where you differed from the President, you made two points: First Vietnam and you have not specified any difference there and second, the Phantom Jets to Israel. May I make a question on this point?

It is very hard for some of us here --

Mr. Day. Could we speak on Vietnam one moment, Mr. Mayhew, because otherwise, the Vice President won't know where he is or anyone else. Just keep on Vietnam for the moment.

Vice President Humphrey. Wait a minute, don't keep off here. You said number one, I specified two areas where we disagreed. I said one, we have a point of difference in the matter of the Phantom Jets. I said on the second, it would do very little good for me to try to play President between now and January 20, that it was rather difficult to predict what could happen between now and then, that I had hoped that the President might be able to achieve success in negotiations in Paris, that if he did not, I said that I would do my best within the authority of the Office of the Presidency to bring this war to an end.

Now, how? Well, when the time comes, we will spell it out. In the meantime, I don't think we ought to be giving Hanoi any encouragement that they are going to get a better deal out of the next President than they are going to get out of this one. What Hanoi needs to do is sit down and discuss things and negotiate. We are prepared to do so. We are prepared to stop the bombing this afternoon if we have any indication whatsoever from Hanoi that it will lead to substantive discussions and they know it and I think it is time the world knows it.

Mr. Day. Mr. Humphrey, may I ask you a question to take us into some other aspects of foreign affairs?

Vice President Humphrey. Very good.

Mr. Day. That is this: After the ugly experience of South Vietnam, is America moving away from foreign commitments and the idea of foreign involvement toward a new isolationism, perhaps which will affect us in Europe?

Vice President Humphrey. I hope not. There are such voices being raised in this country, and if we permit ourselves to be driven by emotion and prejudice and passion, that could happen. But I believe that the American people will be more sensible than that

if they receive strong leadership, which some of us are trying to present to them.

John Kennedy once said that peace and freedom do not come cheap. We have surely learned that we live in a dangerous world, and to try to withdraw from that world I think makes it more dangerous.

Mr. Day. Mr. Servan-Schreiber?

Mr. Servan-Schreiber. Mr. Vice President, I was very happy to hear tonight and for the first time that you talked about Europe. We have through the press no declaration on your part, about your thoughts about Europe and a European policy. I would like to ask you, Mr. Humphrey, will your policy, if you are elected President, be the same as that followed by the traditional Democratic policy in the United States, that is, the traditional policy started by Roosevelt and JFK and LBJ, or are you prepared to consider that things have evolved in this part of the world to such an extent that some new reappraisal should be made of American policy toward Europe? This is what we Gaullists are hoping very much from you or from any candidate of the United States.

Vice President Humphrey. Well, first of all, I regret very much that you have not heard from me about my attitudes about Europe, because I addressed the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco on my attitudes on European policy. I thought the American press had better news services than you seem to indicate.

Mr. Servan-Schreiber. We have had no report.

Vice President Humphrey. Well, I am going to see that they are properly reprimanded.

Mr. Day. Good. Take your chance now, Mr. Vice President. This is the best one you will get.

Vice President Humphrey. I shall send you a copy of my remarks there, because it was directed about what I consider to be the very special interest that we had in our relationships with Europe, but not exclusive of the rest of the world.

Now, to my Gaullist friend, Plain talk is very helpful. I might suggest to my Gaullist friend that he take a good look across the channel and permit Great Britain to become an active participant in the Common Market. Europe needs to be united. This building up of the old pattern of nationalism at the expense of international cooperation is not going to help build a stronger free world. I do not believe that Europe ought to be dominated by the United States, politically or economically. I believe that we should be partners, equal partners. But I believe that partnership should include a united western Europe, at least, including Great Britain.

Mr. Servan-Schreiber. But this is just the problem, sir. I'm sorry. This is the Gaullist friend here. This is the Gaullist friend talking, sir.

Vice President Humphrey. Yes, sir.

Mr. Servan-Schreiber. This is the main problem. If you consider that it is just Western Europe carefully related to Great Britain, it won't be Europe. We still consider that there is no Europe without the Eastern countries joining.

I know that today, talking about this is probably some illusion but we still consider that even after this Czech crisis. We must continue our policy of detente with the UniUSSR and with Asian countries and try to help them get their own freedom and build united Europe with us.

Mr. Day. What about that, Mr. Humphrey?

Vice President Humphrey. Our policy -- my -- speaking for myself, I believe that we must continue to build toward better relationships with the western European countries. I have always felt this and I feel the lead on this should be taken on this, sir, by the European countries and the United States to be an active participant. I applaud that lead which has been taken by the lead that has been taken by Western Germany. I think, for example, that Mr. Willy Brandt of the Federal Republic has done extraordinarily well in this. I do not think that in spite of the tragedy of Czechoslovakia, we should forego the hope and indeed the practice of trying to build better relationships, economically, culturally, politically, with Eastern Europe. In fact, I want to make sure that the United States continues, finds a way to continue to the negotiations that were about to get underway on offensive and defensive missiles. I want to see the nuclear non proliferation treaty ratified here by the United States Senate. I do not want to close my eyes to the realities of Soviet power and what I consider to be a very tragic and despicable act of Soviet imperialism. But nevertheless, I think the older era is coming to an end. I do not want to see the restoration of the cold war. I prefer to see NATO strengthened in its defenses and to be made a political instrument for peaceful engagement in Eastern Europe.

Mr. Sommer. Mr. Vice President, as a German, I would just be applauding two totally irreconcilable views, that of Willy Brandt and that of General DeGaulle and I would like to ask you, in the situation we have now after Prague, would you favor that Western Europe goes ahead, building Western Europe even without General DeGaulle or against General DeGaulle? Within NATO or on what other Western European place that is available?

Vice President Humphrey. All of us are fallible and mortal. None of us are infallible and immortal. Time takes of most every thing. I happen to believe that the patterns which have been set in Western Europe -- of the Common Market, of NATO, of OECD, the Council of Europe, the many other international instruments which you have designed -- lend themselves without doubt toward a kind of federal union in Europe. I believe that a United States of Europe is not merely a fond hope. I think in the long run, it will be a reality and it is a necessity.

Now, I hope that all countries can cooperate. But if you don't mind, this is one problem that I wish you Europeans would settle by yourself. And you do not want the United States, and fightfully so, to be your mentor, your boss and your dominating partner, why don't you just sort of settle this housekeeping problem and we'll try to cooperate/

Mr. Day. That is a very good suggestion, sir. Will take note of this for tonight.

Mr. Mayhew. Mr. Humphrey, those in Britain who disagree with this pattern and don't want Britain to join the Common Market -- I'm not one of them myself -- have been putting forth the idea that we ought to form a free trade area with yourself and perhaps Australia and New Zealand, possibly the EFTA countries. What do you think about this idea? Is this a starter?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, Mr. Mayhew, that has been given a good deal of thought here in the United States. It is my view, speaking personally, now that it would be better if our friends and neighbors in Western Europe would open their doors in the Common Market to Britain and to EFTA.

Now, I don't think this is going to make it easier for the United States as a competitive partner. In fact, it will make it more difficult for us in some ways, temporarily. But I believe it builds for a stronger Europe, and ultimately, as our Gaullist

friend said a moment ago, it permits a real unification of Europe, at least economically and culturally, hopefully with better political understanding.

Mr. Day. Mr. Winter.

Mr. Winter. Mr. Vice President, I have a question which is in a way concerned with your former activities in the disarmament question.

Vice President Humphrey. Yes, Mr. Winter.

Mr. Winter. That, and this may well influence even the political situation in Central Europe, now. Would you be in favor of realizing something like the Rapaski plan, the plan for an atom-free zone in Europe which might ~~work~~ change in the political prospects of Central and Eastern European states?

Mr. Day. Like Czechoslovakia?

Mr. Winter. Like Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Day. Give you a better chance for your freedom.

Vice President Humphrey. Well, may I say, it is my judgment that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty is a forward step from the Rapaski plan, that it goes much further. It stops the spread of nuclear weaponry and nuclear weapon technology throughout the whole world. And I think that is the sensible way.

Now, 80 nations have signed that treaty, and I want my government, through the constitutional processes of the U. S. Senate, to ratify that treaty. This is one of the issues I have with my Republican opponent in this campaign. Mr. Nixon says take it easy. He wants to take another look. He wants to slow down. He uses the invasion of Czechoslovakia as an excuse. I think that is not relevant. As a matter of fact, if anything, what has happened in Czechoslovakia is all the more reason that we ought to try to slow down the arms race.

Mr. Winter. I agree with that, but the Rapaski plan in certain things goes farther than the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Vic

Vice President Humphrey. Will you just refresh my memory a bit?

Mr. Day. Atomic forces on the grounds of, the territory of the central European States.

Vice President Humphrey. Yes. In other words, this was directed I gather, at Germany as well as the Warsaw Pact countries. Those are all matters for consideration. I don't think we close the door on any of these matters. But what I think we do is try to take what we now have in hand.

It has taken almost three years to negotiate the non-proliferation treaty. I'm suggesting that we go ahead with it.

Mr. Mayhew. Mr. Humphrey, you said that it was up to us in Europe to deal with some of these problems. But take the problem of a possible Russian threat to West Europe and they are threatening Germany daily, citing their alleged right to intervene because of German militarism. What is America's position now with regard to her guarantees to Austria's neutrality, the freedom of West Berlin, and indeed, West Germany? Has it changed?

Vice President Humphrey. Not one bit. As a matter of fact, I'm quite sure that what we're seeing here is the traditional pattern of the Soviet Union's reactions when she has committed a great crime against humanity. She feels a sense of guilt, and I hope shame. She always reverts back to a propaganda war on Germany.

She feels that she can remind the peoples of Europe of the tragic days of Hitler and thereby, once again, arouse fears and passions that will becloud the issue.

I think we ought to understand that. This is an old pattern of the Soviets and it is a regrettable one.

Mr. Mayhew. Mr. Vice President?

Vice Vice President Humphrey. Can I --

Mr. Day. Please finish, Mr. Vice President.

Vice President Humphrey. May I just say that Europe should understand that our commitments under NATO and our commitments to Berlin and our other commitments remain intact and firm.

Mr. Day. Dr. Sommer?

Dr. Sommer. Mr. Vice President, Ambassador Kennan has just suggested that the United States put 100,000 American troops into West Germany and keep them there until the Soviets withdraw from Czechoslovakia. Now, I don't know whether that might not be a very tall order. My question is wouldn't you favor increasing the American contingents in West Berlin at this moment just so the Russians don't get any ideas?

Vice President Humphrey. We'll do our part. Can I be equally candid, as you have been?

I think it's time for our Western European allies to fulfill their NATO commitments as well as ours. Let's not be looking to the United States on these matters. You can't tell the United States on the one hand that you're trying to sort of preempt the field, that you look like you're trying to be too much of a boss in Europe, and then, when the crisis comes, to say, hurry up and get over here and save us.

Now, I don't mean it quite that abruptly, but quite candidly, some of our Western European allies have not fulfilled their NATO REQUIREMENTS AND COMMITMENTS AND THEY HAVEN'T done so since the beginning. Germany has done very well. But some of the rest of them haven't. And I don't want to be critical, but I think it's your time.

Mr. Day. Put, Mr. Vice President, your Gaullist friend is rubbing his hands with glee.

M. Servan-Schreiber. Yes, because I was just thinking that even as you have no one in NATO countries that had any commitments to Czechoslovakia, and you know our theory is always the same, I think if Czechoslovakia had had a few atomic bombs herself, there would have been no invasion of Russia, because no one would have taken the risk and she would have defended herself in the means that we understand that she should,, she should defend as a nation.

I quite agree with you, the United States should have no such commitment in Europe; Europe should take its own fate in its own hands.

Vice President Humphrey. Oh, I didn't say that. No, I said--

M. Servan-Schreiber. Eastern countries should do the same, too. That is why I don't believe in any way this non-proliferation treaty. I think the Czechs should have atomic bombs and they would be free.

Mr. Day? What about that?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, may I say that the spread

of atomic bombs is not the way you solve the world's problems. The way you solve the world's problems is through negotiation and diplomacy and through the absence of the use of force. Wherever we use force, we find that once you start it, it is very difficult to stop it. We're finding that in Southeast Asia, as have other people.

Mr. Day. I quite agree.

Vice President Humphrey. I must say that the proliferation of nuclear weaponry worries me all the more from what I have just heard. For example, that had Czechoslovakia had them, my friend says she might have used them. Well, once you start that, you--

M. Servan-Schreiber. No, I didn't say that. I said that Russia would never have attacked her. They're quite different.

Vice President Humphrey. Oh, I see. Well, may I point out that that is only conjecture. I'm not at all sure. I hope you're right. But it seems to me that what we ought to be engaged in, if I might try to lend a constructive note here to my part, is how do we slow down this arms race? How do we stop this incredible expenditure of men and resources in an arms race which really doesn't lend itself ultimately to much more security? Because what really happens is the superpowers price everybody else out, and the world gets drawn up into two military camps in which the factor of danger keeps rising. I think that the next President of the United States must direct his attention above all things else to how we can de-escalate the arms race, reduce the military tension.

Mr. Day. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Mayhew wants to raise a question about the arms race in the Middle East.

Mr. Mayhew. Well, yes indeed. You see, Mr. Humphrey, if I may say so, you began by stating what is in fact an escalation of the arms race in the Middle East. Now, we in Britain think we're very pleased to see the U. S. Government succeeding in its aims of reaching some kind of agreement with the Russians about the provision of arms in the Middle East. We also would question your suggestion that Israel is the weaker military party today. We also notice that the government of the U. S. is not prepared at the moment to sell phantom jets to the Middle East.

Vice President Humphrey. That's correct.

Mr. Mayhew. I'm asking very frankly, Mr. Humphrey -- you see, we have read ex-President Truman's memoirs about the immense pressure put on him when he was a candidate for the presidency by the Zionist organization in the U. S., whom you were addressing when you promised Phantom jets to Israel.

Vice President Humphrey. Oh, I promised them long before that; long before that.

Mr. Mayhew. I ask you, however, you and Mr. Nixon, what has made the same promise, whether the power of the Zionist lobby in the U. S. is really constructive as far as getting peace in the Middle East is concerned?

Vice President Humphrey. The Zionist lobby had nothing to do with my point of view on this at all, or with my statement. My statement was made last July and the Zionist meeting was held in the month of September. No Zionist called on me.

I'm not a Zionist, I'm an American. I'm not a Jew, I'm a Christian, I'm a Protestant. Zionists in the United States are also Americans. There are other Zionists in other parts of the World. I just happen to believe the Soviet Union has been once again

engaging in a military buildup in the Arab States, and I think that what is needed in that area is an arms control agreement. But as long as the Arab States refuse to negotiate a treaty with Israel, as long as the Yarring mission is not a success, as long as the six points of President Johnson's message of July 19 is not accepted as a means of some negotiation for peace in the Middle East, I believe that what is really needed for protection of peace is a kind of balance of power, where both sides realize that attack would be disastrous to the other one. That is why I have advocated what I have done.

By the way, I did not advocate Phantom jets as the ultimate. I advocated it as the last thing we should do. I have advocated that we should try to find a way to slow down the arms race, that we should find a way for a negotiated settlement in the Middle East, that there should be an end to the state of belligerency in the Middle East. That is the emphasis that I placed.

Mr. Day. Dr. Sommer.

Dr. Sommer. I would like to get back to the non-proliferation treaty for just a moment. Many in Germany basically agree with your views, but they feel that at this moment when Czechoslovakia has been raped by the Soviet Union, it is psychologically impossible to sign this treaty and I wonder whether your argument isn't too facile? My question is could you really think of a single country that would go nuclear if the treaty were not signed during the next three or four months or even during the next 12 months?

Vice President Humphrey. I was speaking, sir, of the U. S. That is where I hope to have some influence at this particular time. I hope that Germany, the Federal Republic, will also take some action, but that is up to you. We were the instigators. We were the inspirers so to speak, of the non-proliferation treaty. I believe it's in the interest of world peace. I think it is in our national interest, to put it bluntly to you, sir. I think it is in the interest of the Federal Republic as well.

I do believe that if we fail to ratify this treaty, that if it lingers along and languishes in the Senate, it may very well be like the Versailles treaty. It may very well never be signed. If the United States doesn't sign it, you can rest assured that that will be the beginning. If the U. S. doesn't ratify it, I should say, you can rest assured that that will be the signal for a number of other states who today have the technical capability to produce nuclear weapons to do so.

Now, we have five nations presently with nuclear power. I think that is more than enough. I think that is far too dangerous. I believe the Paruch plan to 1945 was the beginning of sense. Regrettably, it was not accepted by the Soviet Union. I think now it is absolutely imperative that we put aside temporary hysteria and take a look at the long-range needs of humanity.

We're either going to halt this arms race or we're going to halt humanity. Now, let's wake up. We've simply got to come to grips with the problem.

Mr. Day. Mr. Humphrey, we've been talking about violence and disorder in the world. May we ask about the violence and disorder which uncomfortably exist in your own country? May I refer to the rise in support for George Wallace, the Third Party candidate, and may I ask this: Is it not a fact that tough, repressive policies of the kind he advocates are in fact what millions of Americans want today, including some of your erstwhile strong supporters, labor-union voters?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, sometimes, when you take a superficial look and you listen to the loudest voices, you would

be led to believe that, sir. But I don't believe that is the case. Every indication that we have is that the American people are fed up with violence, to be sure, and disorder, but they also believe there has to be some redress of the inequities. There has to be an attack upon the injustices and inequities which exist in American society. They are not incompatible. As a matter of fact, civil order and civil justice are inseparable. I don't believe that you can have a pattern of repression over a long period of time without having a nation divided to a point where there will be conflicts. What I think you need is to encourage respect for law; at the same time to punish the lawbreakers, to suppress the violence, but in so doing, place equal emphasis upon suppressing the inequities. In other words, getting rid of the areas of deprivation, or illiteracy, of poverty, of slumism which affects an affluent society like ours.

My argument with Mr. Wallace is on the following basis: he primarily talks about law and order, yet he has been governing a state that has one of the highest rates of crime in the nation.

Mr. Day. On the subject of slums and deprivation and poverty, has America got her priorities right? For instance, could not less be spent on the moon race, which, judging by the weekend news, you appear to be losing, and more on America's own cities?

Vice President Humphrey. Don't pass judgment too quickly on whether we're losing the moon race. We have an amazing recuperative capacity, as Europeans ought to have learned out of two wars. I think we have the capacity to do what needs to be done. If we think it's vital to get to the moon first, I think we can make it. You may very well have to have some adjustments of priorities. We haven't thought that was the most important thing. As a matter of fact, we thought it might be more important to put a man on his feet right here on earth than it is to put a man on the moon. But we're going to do both. But we're not in a race with anybody. We're developing our science and our technology here to a point where our friends in many parts of the world speak of the technological gap that exists between America and the rest of the world. We have an excellent space program that is related not only to the moon, but related to our industry, related to our medicine, related to our excellence in education, our higher education. We're going to continue that. Now, our priorities --

Mr. Mayhew. Mr. Humphrey, Humphrey -- I just --

Mr. Day. Just a minute, Mr. Mayhew. May I just explain, we've got five minutes. I'm going to ask each of our guests here to put one final question to you -- for your answer.

Mr. Servan-Schreiber?

M. Servan-Schreiber. Sir, I want to put a question to you about the image of the United States of America throughout the world. The United States are a very great country and we, the French, we know that you're probably our best friends, as a Gaullist, I wish to say here very loudly. But why is it that your country should give a bad image of it? Why is it that you don't have better public relations abroad? Why is it that you do all the things that should not be done when you deal with most of foreign affairs questions. Do you intend to change it?

Vice President Humphrey. I'm sorry for that if you feel that is the case. I'm afraid in some instances, you may have a view that is at least reflected in some of the things that I read. Regrettably, what seems to make news these days is not good work, but mistakes and evil, war and strife, violence and disorder. But I can tell you, having traveled about this great nation, that most of our people are doing well, working hard, paying their taxes, sending their children to the universities. Most university students are hardworking, good students. 54 per cent of the families in this nation have a son or daughter in a university.

We're doing great things here. We have ten million people in the last five years walk out of poverty into self respecting productive lives. We're doing fabulous things in the fields of education. That is the image that I want America to have. And I want America to have. And I want America to have an image of caring about other people through what we have done so. Regrettably, maybe everybody hasn't understood it that way.

Mr. Day. Mr. Winter, far final question from you.

Mr. Winter. Do you think, Mr. Vice President, that in consequence of what has happened to Czechoslovakia, the question of Communism will get to be a major issue in the election campaign in the United States, and if so, what stand are you going to take?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, there will be those that will try to frighten the American people again with respect to Communism. There aren't many Communists in the United States and the ones that are here are very ineffective. In fact, they do the Communist movement more damage than good. We recognize that there are ideological difficulties and differences between our way of life and the Communist way of life.

We also recognize that there are ideological differences amongst the Communist nations. In other words, the monolith of Communism no longer exists, as Czechoslovakia itself has proven. So we're going to take what I call a mature look, a responsible look. We recognize that there is competition. We recognize that we live in a dangerous, unpredictable world. But we are not going to think with our blood. We're not going to act out of passion. We're going to look at all of these matters with reason and with hope, keeping our guard up, being ever alert, but at the same time being ever responsive to every possibility of building bridges of understanding and cooperation.

Dr. Sommer. Sir, in the world of today, Europe is in a way an American constituency. I would like to ask you, why should Europe prefer a President Humphrey to a President Nixon?

Vice President Humphrey. Because Hubert Humphrey, all of his public life, has had a deep and continuing interest in what I would call the Atlantic partnership, in the relationships of the U. S. with Europe as a relationship of equals, not as superior to inferior, not as the dominant force to the inferior force, but rather as working partners. I happen to believe that our common culture gives us an opportunity not only to benefit ourselves, but to help all of the rest of the world.

If we can work together, we can do so much for everybody, including ourselves, if we just try to work out a better international relationship.

Mr. Day. One last quick question.

Mr. Mayhew. My very quick question is a big question we really haven't answered: why should Americans vote for President Humphrey rather than President Nixon? Why shouldn't President Nixon agree with almost anything you have said tonight?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, of course, he doesn't. The reason is that President Humphrey is a man who looks to the future. Mr. Nixon is one who has resisted almost every social change that has taken place in this country: the care of elderly, federal aid to education, the labor laws that have permitted our workers to bargain collectively. He has been against these things. He has been essentially a cold war warrior over the long period of his life.

I have been one that has dedicated my life to arms control, to disarmament, to international understanding and cooperation. I am a progressive and liberal in politics. I believe in national security, but I think our best security comes in international cooperation with the U. S. being able to fulfill its role of leadership.

Mr. Day. Vice President Humphrey, thank you very much, indeed. We hope that your inability to see us in Toledo, O., hasn't made it too much of an ordeal for you. We enjoyed it very much. And you are smiling now as you are always ~~reputed to~~ smile, and we thank you very much indeed.

Vice President Humphrey. Thank you. It has been quite an experience.



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