

WLAC-TV
Nashville, Tennessee
October 1, 1968

Mr. Joy. We are more than pleased to welcome to WLAC Television and the State of Tennessee the Vice President of the United States, Mr. Hubert Humphrey.

Mr. Humphrey, may I say you have been preceded by a marvellous Ambassador, Mrs. Humphrey. We are delighted to have you with us.

Vice President Humphrey. Thank you. May I say also that ever since Mrs. Humphrey has been to Nashville, she has been spoiled. I have not been able to control her at all. She enjoyed her visit here immensely. I want to thank you, Mr. Joy, and the people of Nashville for their courtesy to my wife. We appreciate the opportunity of talking with you today.

Mr. Joy. We will get right down to business, sir. How would you rate your position with regard to the other candidates in the ten days and what is the outlook here?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, I really have no exact way of knowing. I have talked with a goodly number of my supporters and they feel encouraged. Of course, I would expect that they might feel that way. But we feel, and when I say we, I mean those who have supported me here and myself, we feel that we can carry the State of Tennessee. It will be a close contest, but it is a three way race and there are a lot of good Democrats here. I don't think the State of Tennessee will forget the work of the Democratic Party. It has been good to this State, Of course, Tennessee has been good to the Democratic Party. The State of Andrew Jackson just can't go Republican. I just don't believe it will. It just would not be right for the state Andrew Jackson and Kefauver and some of the other great men of the State.

Mr. Clark. We have been receiving numerous interpretations of your speech last night. Do you consider your stand on the bombing significantly different from what President Johnson has been saying since the Paris talks began?

Vice President Humphrey. Let me say first to you I have made no comment at all up until now. In the writing of that speech, most of which I personally wrote word by word, I told those that were associated with me to quit worrying about whether or not this was in line with the Administration's position; or whether or not it was going to please somebody over on the other side, that what I wanted was my position, that I am the candidate for President, and I will be the President, with the help of the people, January 20, 1969. I thought it was important that the people know where I stood.

Now, the Administration has its own position. Other people have a position. I thought it was important that I should state my position. Now, I would like to know what Mr. Nixon's position is. I would like to know what Mr. Wallace's position. And I felt that I made it very clear and I think that my statement speaks for itself. Just to make it very clear so that we don't have any misunderstanding, I said I would stop the bombing in North Vietnam. That was the emphasis of my statement. I would regard this as an acceptable risk for peace and in doing this, I would look very closely at the evidence, direct or indirect, deed or word, of communist willingness to restore the demilitarized zone between North and South Viet Nam -- in other words, to get their troops out of there and to stop the firing of their artillery over that area and in that area.

I said I also would reserve the right if North Viet Nam acted in bad faith to resume the bombing. I think it is very clear because of what I have said where my emphasis lies and I think also that Hanoi could, with very little difficulty, take action concerning the demilitarized zone.

That is all I am going to say. I have got a full statement. I think to say any more really confuses the issue because this gets to be almost like theology. If you change one word -- for example, in my statement, I changed one little word which did not change the meaning at all. But somebody grabbed hold of it.

So that is my statement and it is available to the public.

Mr. Clark. That means then that you would stop the bombing without any pre-arranged guarantee?

Vice President Humphrey. I have given my statement, let's leave it right where it is.

Mr. Clark. You don't want to comment about it anymore?

Vice President Humphrey. Not -- I have said where the emphasis lies. Let's just leave it right where it is.

Mr. Joy. Mr. Vice President, what do you think might be a side effect of this statement regarding the bombing. Do you think this might have some significant effect on the hecklers at your speeches during the campaign, those who are anti-war demonstrators and who are rather violent in their approach to their beliefs? Do you think this may subdue them somewhat for you to have made the statement?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, there are two kinds of demonstrators. There are what I call the sincere demonstrators, those that are worried about the war, that are really opposed to the war or feel very strongly that we have not done all that we could to bring this war to an end. Rightly or wrongly, that is the way they feel. Many of them are college students, many of them are housewives, businessmen. I met with Marriner Eccles, former chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, while I was in Salt Lake City. These are people of reputation, of good character, people that are concerned American citizens. I think those people will be somewhat pleased with what I had to say and what I had to say is what is in my heart, what has been in my mind. I felt I owed it to the public to make a coherent, concise statement on my views. I think those people -- well, first of all, those people don't cause you much trouble anyway. At most what they do is carry a sign, which is their right, to petition peacefully.

But in so far as the other group is concerned, which is a hand full, I don't think it will make any difference what I say. There is a group in this country that are determined to destroy my candidacy because I am Vice President, basically, not because I am a candidate, but because I represent the Government, and they are determined to destroy the Democratic Party because it represents the Majority Party in the country and therefore an instrument of government. And they are determined to really destroy the country. They have said they would like to burn it down and on the ashes build whatever they want to build. Those are anarchists and nihilists. They would protest about the size of tomatoes if they needed something to protest about. I don't think what I have said will deter them in the slightest.

But I do know, and I had an instance right here in Nashville where a lady sent me a note saying that she was very pleased at what I had to say, that they had intended to attend the meeting to at least indicate their displeasure with what they thought was my point of view, but she said they were going to attend the meeting now with pleasure.

Now, those are the people who have what I call legitimate Democratic dissent. We must never ever take offense at people who disagree with us. The only thing that I feel that is wrong about what some people call dissent is when dissent gets to be ugly, disorderly, and undemocratic, when those who are the demonstrators or the protesters are really provocateurs and agitators that seek to stifle free speech by shouting, harassing you, and making it utterly impossible for you to conduct a meeting and those that try to break up an assembly by bully tactics which really deny the right of freedom of assembly and those who have said that they are going to lie down in voting booths and provoke the police to drag them out. Those people are not Democrats with a small "d". They have an utter disdain for the Democratic process. And I think we ought to make it quite clear we are not going to stand for it. Democracy has a right to live and we must not let those who rally act in a thoroughly un-Democratic manner, in abusive, disorderly, sort of like hoo -- well, you know, like hooligans -- we must not let them destroy the Democratic process.

One of the things that I believe people who are civil libertarians like myself suffer from is that we are so tolerant of the other man's point of view that sometimes that tolerance goes to a point where we permit those who are really demagogues and really are the agents of provocation and disorder, to destroy the very thing that we are trying to save.

I could use an example. The Weimar Republic in Germany, after World War I, which was a democratic government and it never knew how to deal with Hitler and Hitler's storm troopers. They permitted them to go ahead and go ahead until they build up frenzy to destroy the Republic. Now, we must not let that happen in this country. In other words, a free society has a right to protect itself.

Question. How would you deal with these American versions of the storm troopers?

Vice President Humphrey. Well, this is one of the most difficult assignments. We have not worked out what I would call an appropriate method but I do think people who sponsor meetings might very well suggest to those who are going to try to break up meetings that they ought to leave.

Question. Do you feel there is an outside influence here with this group of people?

Vice President Humphrey. I don't have any way of knowing that. I don't believe in making false accusations. I know what I have suffered. May I say I am not talking about just myself. I think Mr. Wallace is entitled about his meetings. And when people come in and start throwing chairs and breaking it up I think it is wrong. Freedom of speech should not have the censorship of mob rule.

Question. I would like to get your opinion about the next four years. We see the Russian Navy expanding, we see Russia going into Czecho slovakia. Yet there seems to be a growing isolationism in this country, once Viet Nam is over, let's not get involved again. If you are successful in becoming President, how do you see this trend toward isolationism in the next four years? Do you see a balance of power going away from Russia?

Vice President Humphrey. I think one of the tragedies of the war in Viet Nam has been the frustration that has come with it which has in a sense encouraged a number of Americans to go sour on the world, so to speak, and want to withdraw. As President, I would certainly try to let the people know that we cannot withdraw from the world, that we cannot swerve away from our international responsibilities, that isolationism is slow death to become Fort Rest America and you are surrounded by a sea of hostility. You can't let that happen. We have a role to perform in this world, the role of cooperation -- as I have said, not to march alone but to march in such a way that others will follow. We must exercise the responsibility of leadership.

There isn't any doubt but what we are living in a very dangerous time and I think your question points to the danger. Actually, the dangers that we have seen in Europe recently are in my mind more serious than what we see in Southeast Asia, because every great war in which we have been involved has had its beginnings in that central Eastern European section or in the Mideast. The Soviet Union is very, very touchy these days. I think there is this power struggle which is going on within the Soviet Union. I am not quite sure what it is. I do know that it senses that its empire, so to speak, is beginning to come apart. The fresh breezes of freedom, a degree of freedom, have been blowing across Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union had to take steps, from its point of view to close the windows, pull down the shades once again. This is tragic. But it won't work. It will not work.

It is my view that Mr. Khrushchev changed the whole pattern of Communist power and of Communist control, that once he tried to de-Stalinize Communist Russia, that he set loose forces that no man in the Soviet empire will ever be able to control. Because you are beginning to see in Rumania, even though they are very careful, they are a strictly Communist country, nevertheless, they pursue an independent foreign policy. You have seen that in Yugoslavia with Tito. You saw the beginnings of it in Czechoslovakia and I don't think the Czechoslovakians are going to be completely subdued. The only real slavish state to the Soviets is East Germany. That is the only real one.

So that we have to look upon this area with great care of sensitivity. Now, that means that the next President of the United States must be a student

of Soviet affairs and of Eastern Europe. He must also be able to talk to the leaders in the Kremlin.

I believe I can do that. I have talked maybe more hours with Mr. Koysigin for example, than any living American with the one possible exception of the President and I believe I have had as many hours with Mr. K. as the President. I have had a long acquaintanceship with many of the leaders of the Soviet Union. I believe that they at least respect me even though they know my very strong anti-Communist feelings.

But this is a strong and powerful nation. We must deal with it with firmness on the one hand and with the kind of flexibility on the other. By that, I mean a willingness to try to find areas of agreement and to try to keep probing for areas of agreement.

We must realize also that the Soviet Union has moved into the Mediterranean and they have been trying to do this as a Russian people for 500 years. That is why the Middle East is one of the most sensitive areas in the world -- very sensitive. And the next President of the United States must clearly understand that the Middle East still is a cauldron of trouble and we have got to handle it most prudently and cautiously.

Question. Then you would not see any troop reduction in Europe in the near future --

Vice President Humphrey. Not unless they can be mutually reduced. I had hoped that we could have troop reductions in Europe. But I think we have to understand now that NATO serves a very vital function of defense on the one hand and of organized western policy for peaceful engagement on the other. We must not get back into just the strict old fashioned Richard Milhous Nixon Cold War philosophy. We have gone beyond that. We must be alert, we must be vigilante, we must have strength.

But that strength must also be one of confidence on our part, with a strong western Europe, a highly industrialized prosperous Europe, a powerful, strong, industrialized America, which on the one hand builds a shield of protection and on the other hand with confidence, with real confidence, probes around for the areas of understanding, such as for example, on the nonproliferation treaty to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Such as trying to find a way to freeze first and then reduce the offensive and defensive missile race that is underway. I addressed myself to that the other evening. I think this is one of the most serious business -- one of the most serious items of business in the next administration.

Question. Mr. Humphrey, I believe before the convention, you felt that civil rights would not be a major issue in this campaign. With the elections about five weeks from today away, what do you feel is the major issue in the minds of the American people with whom you have come in contact?

Vice President Humphrey. Civil rights legislation, I don't think, is a major issue. We have a large body of civil rights legislation now. And what we need now to do is to implement that legislation, find ways and means to make its impact felt without tearing the country apart. I think the real central issue in this country, not only in the campaign, is whether or not we are going to be able to progress in such a manner in our thinking and our action that we have one country, one nation, in which we really accept people for what they are and that we don't divide on the basis of intolerance, segregation, race and religion. In other words, are we going to have a fractured, segmented society, or are we going to have one country in which we really try to pull together and in which we try as a country and as a community to help those with pride -- to come up to a little higher standard, become self-respecting, self sustaining citizens.

Now, why do I say this in reference to the campaign? Because you have on the one hand Mr. Wallace, who makes an outright appeal on the basis of race. You have on the other hand Mr. Nixon, who is more clever. He rides out what he thinks is the present storm, turbulence over race relations and the federal government's activities. But he has extended, if not his right hand :

at least his left hand in some kind of agreement with Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, who represents not the progressive forces of South Carolina. He's not Bob McNair, Governor McNair. He's the backwash of the politics of South Carolina. Mr. Nixon made some kind of an understanding with him. I don't know the details of it. It's pretty fine print. But I do know Mr. Strom Thurmond says he's the Southern leader for Mr. Nixon.

If I were Mr. Nixon, I would be a little bit concerned about that, because there are many great leaders in the south. The south has a -- it has a -- I'd say there are two souths. There's the south of the midnight past, and then there's this new south, that is the dawn of this new day -- industrialization, a new and better education better human relations. I think the greatest promise of America, frankly, the greatest area of promise of America as the southland, because the people are good, strong, patriotic, devoted, and here they are ready to go to work, and it is a pity that someone would make an alliance with the south of the darkness of the midnight and think that was good for the country.

So I am going to put myself, my record right on the line. For 25 years, I have believed that this could be one nation. I have believed in equal opportunity. I have believed that it is good for this country. I have believed that second class citizenship is not good even for the first class citizens. It is one kind of citizenship only, first class citizenship for every person in America and we judge only on merit, not on their color or their race or where they live or how they spell their last name. We are going to judge them on merit and we are going to give people a chance to earn their way.

Question. Mr. Humphrey, we have a situation here in Nashville which is probably indicative of some kind of the problems your campaign has been having. The local United Auto Workers Union here in Nashville endorsed Wallace. I asked one of the top officials about this. They said their members were more concerned about being able to drive to work and go home safely than they are in Mr. Wallace's union ideas. Are you running into a lot of this on the law and order issues?

Vice President Humphrey. Mr. Wallace's law and order issue is the biggest phony since somebody printed a three dollar bill. The State of Alabama has the highest rate of murder of any state in the Union. Now, Governor Wallace was governor of that state. And murder is about the worst crime that can be committed. It runs a mighty good race at the top of the list of any crime. If I were Mr. Wallace and going to talk about law and order, I would get off that in a hurry. Because as President of the United States, he is not sheriff. The President of the United States is not the super chief. He is commander in chief of the armed forces. We are not going to have a national police force, I trust. I thought Mr. Wallace was for states rights. The very man that is talking about states rights and is downgrading the Federal Government all the time is talking about how when he gets to be President, he is going to have law and order. He could not even have law and order when he was governor. As governor of a state, he has total police power. Under our Constitution, the 10th Amendment, the police powers are reserved to the states, not the Federal Government. Here he is running all around the country, telling all the working people and people that are frightened, that he is going to have law and order and his state has the highest rate of murder of any state in the Union.

Now, on the Republican side, Mr. Agnew is the governor of the state that has the fourth highest crime rate in the union. My Vice Presidential candidate his state has the fifth lowest crime rate in the Union, And my state runs about 14th lowest. And my state runs about 14th lowest. So we're on the low side. If you really want to have somebody that has law and order, you'd better take Minnesota and Maine.

Now, I was the mayor of the City of Minneapolis. I gave my city law, no doubt about that. Everybody knows that. They know -- there isn't a living mortal in the State of Minnesota that is willing to stand up and challenge me on the basis of law and order, not one, or some of these other ridiculous charges that have been cast around. But for all the counterfeit nonsense I have ever heard is for the Governor of Alabama to go around talking about law and order and he could not even have it in his own state. So I think the workers had better get wise on this one. Then they had better get wise on something else. The State of Alabama has low unemployment compensation rates, its wages are lower. I regret this, because I love the people of the State of Alabama. I have never been treated better than when I was in Alabama. I think they are wonderful folks. But their level of education is very low. The working man does not get any law and order under Mr. Wallace and he does not get any wages. So he punishes his family both ways.

First of all, his family won't be safe, because if Mr. Wallace transfers the record of law and order from Montgomery, Alabama, to Washington, D. C., you are going to have trouble in this country. If he transfers the economic rate from his capital into Washington, D. C., you are going to have economic trouble in this country. So I think we ought to just write that one off.

Now, let's take Mr. Nixon. I don't know where he stands because first he lived in California and then he lived in New York, and both states have their problems if you want to take a look at where you live. He has never been in charge of anything to do with law and order. He was in a Republican Administration that had a very poor record on prosecuting of organized crime.

That administration has a record far superior in the prosecution of organized crime. Mr. Nixon says he is for law and order, yet his own Republicans voted against the money in the safe streets act to provide help to your mayor and to your county government and to your state government to improve your police departments, to get better equipment, get better training, get better police salaries. If you want law and order, you can get it. I will tell you how you get it. Get more police, better police, pay them better -- most of them are paid two thirds of a living wage -- train them better, give better equipment, and then don't have a candidate running for office which denounces the Supreme Court, which is the center of justice in this country and degrades Attorney General and downgrades him, who is the chief law enforcement officer in this country. I can't understand how you breed respect for law and order by condemning the two great institutions of this government that have the greatest impact on law and order, namely, the Supreme Court and the Department of Justice. So if Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace want to talk about law and order, I tell them to come on one of these T.V. shows. They are afraid to come on these T.V. shows. They won't come on with me. I want them all at the same time. Because they are really unwilling really to discuss these issues. They want to get in and dance around the fire. Well, I want to bring them right on in whate it is hot and we'll talk about law and order.

Question. It seems like Mr. Nixon says he is in no hurry to appear on television with you. Will you appear with Governor Wallace if Mr. Nixon says absolutely not?

Vice President Humphrey. I want them all. Let's have the American people hear us. Let's let them take a choice. If you are going to go out and buy a new car, you ought to take a look at all of them, don't take a look at a couple of them. We are talking about who is going to run this country, who is going to be responsible for leadership in this country. We are going to be talking about which President can best work with Congress. I think it would be a nice exercise to find out whether President Humphrey or President Nixon, or President Wallace can best work with Congress because you can't get anything done unless you can. Which one has really had responsibility for law and order and which one did the best job. Which one of these potential presidential candidates really can bring peace to Viet Nam? Which one can work with the Soviet Union to show down the arms race and still maintain our defenses on the one hand and negotiate with strength on the other. I think those are the questions. Which one can unite this country? Do you think Mr. Wallace can unite it with his kind of doctrine, Mr. Nixon who has made his arrangements with Strom Thurmond on the one hand and Mr. Agnew running around the country saying the things he does on the other? I don't think that's the way to unite this country. I intend to tell it like it is. I think people have to wake up, that a Nixon victory will mean recession, that the threat of Wallace means division, and my victory can mean a continuation of the prosperity we have had, a hope for peace in Viet Nam and at least a chance to bring this country back together again.

Question. With Mr. Wallace continuing to show an increase in strength in many of the polls and with our own indication here in this State that a great many -- a great amount of strength does rest with Mr. Wallace, how do you propose, what will your tactics and strategy be to get the people of Tennessee, for instance, and Kentucky to leave Wallace and decide to go for you? What do you tell them?

Vice President Humphrey. I am going to try to appeal to their sense of reason, fair play, and self interest. I think I will have to do that through media such as I am doing here. Sometimes it is very difficult to do it in a public meeting where you have a good deal of noise and you can't really get your message across. But just as I spoke on foreign policy, Viet Nam and arms control, I shall be speaking on law and order, on economic policy, social policy,, etc. I believe thatthe head of the household wants to protect his family. I want to say to that working man, you had better figure out how you are going to pay that mortgage when you have got a Republican recession. I want to say to the working man, you had better take a look at Mr. Wallace's unemployment compensation, his economic policies, if you have some trouble. Now, you can vote Democratic and you have got a better chance of having your job and of having your home than having your children go to school and go on to college and having the chance to live a good life than you can by voting for the other two candidates.

(Excerpt prepared earlier follows:)

INTERVIEW OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AND
GOVERNOR BUFORD ELLINGTON -- By Jud Collins,
Vice President in Charge of News, Station
WSM-TV, Nashville, Tennessee
Tuesday, October 1, 1968

GOVERNOR ELLINGTON: This is an exciting day politically for Tennesseeans. I think it is an exciting day for all Democrats in Tennessee. This has been a terrific day, I think. I hope that the Vice President is happy. We had a terrific reception at noon on the public square and in all the places that we visited. So I think our people are beginning to realize that Tennessee is going to be Democratic and we have the biggest candidate, so it's a great day for us.

MR. COLLINS: Mrs. Humphrey appeared on this program a few days ago, Mr. Humphrey, and obviously, she hasn't been with you in this campaign, but she has been with you in other campaigns in her career.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: She surely has and she told me about her appearance on this show. She was very pleased, as I told you, Jud. She came from Nashville, Tennessee, as I told her, spoiled, because everybody was so very nice to her, so kind. She was enthusiastic about the reception and I have had to express to the Governor and to Mrs. Ellington and to the people of Nashville our thanks for their kindness to Mrs. Humphrey.

I think she did a mighty good job for me politically, too. She answered all the tough questions. I saw her on the press conference and I only wish I could do as well.

MR. COLLINS: You gentlemen have just come here from a meeting of the State Democratic Steering Committee. What can you tell us about it?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I will be glad to reply. I thought it was a very fine meeting. There was enthusiasm. There isn't any doubt but what every member of the Steering Committee is going to work hard. We believe we can carry this state, which I consider one of the critical states. It is one of the border states. It is here where the Republican nominee, Mr. Nixon, is going to put a lot of his attention and effort. It is here where there is quite a contest between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Wallace. We have a good solid body of Democrats here where we can understand the importance of Democratic leadership and I think the people of Tennessee understand the importance of what it has meant to this state. So we expect to carry on and carry this state.

MR. COLLINS: Do you still feel that if the election fell today, Mr. Nixon would win?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, the election is not being held today. It will be held November 5. When it is held on November 5, we expect to win. I don't know what the polls are in these states at this time. I keep reading we are behind in some of the states and I am acknowledging that is true. But in some of the states where we are supposed to be behind, we are not behind. When the polls are good, we like it; when they are bad, we don't

like it.

But I really truly believe that with Governor Ellington here giving us his help and his leadership, with the many different groups in the Democratic Party really pulling together, and we sense that there has been a real meeting of the many segments of our Party into one common purpose, I think we are going to carry it.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Humphrey, Monday night on this station, we heard you detail some of the objectives in relation to the Viet Nam War. Let me ask you what you expect to be accomplished by this bombing halt?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, the whole purpose of everything we are going -- the negotiations in Paris, the diplomatic representations being made by Mr. Johnson now and what I have advocated, is to get peace. Peace isn't going to come quickly. It is going to take some time. But we want to start the process of peace.

As you may have noted, and I want to read this, I do it for a very simple reason. If I change one word, if my memory faults me for a minute, somebody says, oh, he is changing things.

We must always think of the protection of our troops. As President, I would stop the bombing of North Viet Nam as an acceptable risk for peace because I believe it could lead to success in the negotiations and a shorter war. That would be the best protection for our troops.

Then I went on to say, in weighing that risk and before taking action, I would place key importance on evidence, direct or indirect, by deed or word, of Communist willingness to restore the Demilitarized Zone between North and South Viet Nam.

Now, I place the emphasis here on stopping the bombing, but I have also noted that I would reserve the right if North Viet Nam shows bad faith to resume the bombing. And I have also made it clear that North Viet Nam or Hanoi could with very little difficulty take action concerning the Demilitarized Zone. That is supposed to be demilitarized.

What we are talking about is getting their troops out of it and preventing the DMZ from becoming an area of bombardment. That is something that ought to be done anyway. It is a violation of International Law and I believe my statement speaks for itself.

MR. COLLINS: Hasn't this been tried before?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Not exactly in this form. Let me put it this way: What I have said is my position. I haven't tried to equate my position with the Administration or with the critics. I didn't even put up the vice presidential seal when I made my broadcast. I said that I wanted to be introduced as the candidate for the Democratic nomination for President, Hubert H. Humphrey, not as Vice President, nor did I put up my seal. I did that for a reason. I wanted it very clear that what I was saying is my position. Now, if this happens to agree with some part of the Administration policy, well and good. If it disagrees, that is the way it has to be. I mean that is the way it is. If it

agrees with some position somebody else has taken, well and good. If it disagrees, then so be it.

I have my position. I would like to know what Mr. Nixon's position is, but I haven't been able to find it out yet. I find out a good deal of criticism, but I haven't found out yet what his position is.

MR. COLLINS: It has been reported to us that Mr. Nixon has just had a press conference in which he has made a statement, in effect, that says this would supply aid and comfort to the enemy -- I am paraphrasing what he said -- and by waiting until a new president is elected, North Viet Nam may get softer terms.

Now, do you have anything to say about that statement?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, I have. First of all, I would have expected it. I anticipated that, because that is all Mr. Nixon has said thus far about Viet Nam, that he wants an honorable peace. And he hasn't said how we can get one.

I made it very clear that I was speaking for my Administration as Vice President, that I was supporting the President in his efforts to obtain peace through the negotiators in Paris, that it was his voice that would be speaking for our country between now and January; it was his voice that would be heard at the conference table through negotiators in Paris and that I supported their every effort.

But I think Mr. Nixon's charge to me was best answered by the spokesman at North Viet Nam himself. Mr. Nixon knows the North Vietnamese at Paris didn't agree with his position at all. As a matter of fact, they weren't very complimentary about my position.

So Mr. Nixon can carry on his argument with the North Vietnamese. Until he says where he stands, until he gives us some view as to whether or not he backs off where he has been all these years -- he started off wanting a war in South Viet Nam, in Southeast Asia, and President Eisenhower had to pull the plug on him right quick. He has made various statements indicating he would escalate this war. I think we ought to know where he stands.

Now he has an argument going with the North Vietnamese. That is all right with me. I have made my position very clear and I think it would be interesting to know what his position is.

MR. COLLINS: The North Vietnamese have said there is nothing new in your statement. That there is always the answer of the demand for reciprocity.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I'm sure they have different points of view and I think they ought to settle it between themselves.

MR. COLLINS: Let me ask, back to the bombing halt, and I am not trying to get you to deviate from the statement that you read, Mr. Humphrey, but how would such a halt in bombing affect the military in Viet Nam that may be depending on tactical and strategic bombing?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think my statement made that very clear, that I said in weighing that risk and before taking action, I would place key importance on the demilitarization, the restoration of the Demilitarized Zone. And it is through the DMZ that the attacks have been coming from the North, plus the trails, the Ho Chi Minh Trail down through Laos. Those trails, of course, are not included in this and all the bombing that is necessary in the South to protect the troops are not included. I think this is a very safe statement.

But also, it is a statement that says let's get on with the peace. Let's take a few risks for peace. That is what it is really saying and I think that we ought to take some. And I think it speaks for itself.

MR. COLLINS: May I ask what reaction you have had as a result of making this proposal?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Excellent. Excellent reaction all the way across the country from people of different attitudes on Viet Nam. They think that it is a fresh approach, they think it is a responsible approach. And I am a responsible man. I weighed every word of this very carefully. And just between us, at about 3:30 in the morning, I told my advisers after they were wondering how would this group react and how would that group react, how would this man react, how would that one. I said, I am not interested in that. I am interested in stating what I have as my policy. Let's quit worrying about how somebody else is going to react. I can't outguess the Administration, the columnists, the newspapers, Hanoi. I just can't outguess them. What I am trying to do is what I think is right and what I would do as President.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Humphrey, have you been in contact with the President today?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: No, I have not. I hope I might see the President later on this week, but I have made no such plans.

MR. COLLINS: They're making more suggestions that you may resign as Vice President because of this apparent difference in policies. Have you ever considered this?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Not for a single minute. I have had some people suggest it to me but they were not elected as Vice President. I think I have a responsibility to serve as Vice President. I have been a Vice President that has tried to serve loyally and effectively the President of the United States and until that day of January 20, 1969, I shall do all that I can to be a faithful, loyal Vice President and on that day there will be a new President. I want that new President to be a Democrat and that means it has to be me. There will be a new team. There will be a new Administration. As I have said, we will reassess our policies. It doesn't mean that we junk the ones that we have; it is just that you take inventory.

I must say to you what I said to somebody else: I wouldn't take over the management of a firm from my best friend and from my brother or my father that I didn't take inventory. That is just prudent, cautious business practice. You have to take a look at what you have, what you receive, what kind of merchandise you have,

and how good it is or how bad it is. Then you start; then you take whatever steps of change that you may have to, that you may feel required to.

MR. COLLINS: Have you considered going personally to Paris to confer with North Viet Nam representatives about their attitudes, perhaps in connection with this proposal?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Not at all. We have two of the best negotiators that this country could possibly find in Paris, Mr. Harriman and Mr. Vance. I think they can take care of our interests very well.

MR. COLLINS: And have you talked with Mr. Harriman about that possibility?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: No, I have not. Of course, I see Mr. Harriman from time to time. He is a personal friend and a man in whom I have very great confidence. But I don't think it will be very helpful for a candidate for elective office, public office, to be going over to Paris or Viet Nam or any other place. I think we had better stay right home here.

As a matter of fact, I am trying to get the other candidates to tell me what they are for. If I can ever get them out of that rain of confetti and away from the hullabaloo and the circus atmosphere and parades, there might be something we can find out about what a man intends to do if he becomes the President.

There is one thing I am sure of with Mr. Nixon, if he gets to be President, he is going to have big parades. The confetti business is going to be good, the broom business is going to be good. I would like to know what he stands for. I'd like to know where he stands on matters that relate to Viet Nam, matters that relate to arms control. I'd like to know how he stands on fiscal policy. He says he is for jobs. I would want to know how he is going to get them. I would like to know what he intends to do on a host of things.

Today we generally get a statement that on these things, he has a moratorium. He has a moratorium on talking about Viet Nam, he has a moratorium on talking about certain matters of violence and law and order, on half a dozen subjects. Well, you can't have a government run by moratorium. It is one thing to duck the issues when you are a candidate, but it is another thing to duck them when you are President. The only thing I know you are going to do as President is what you are willing to say you are going to do as candidate.

MR. COLLINS: There are some who question our participation in the political affairs of Viet Nam. Let me ask you if we are similarly committed to the other countries or if you consider the United States committed to all the countries of the world in similar circumstances?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: No, I think we have alliances. As I have indicated in my statement, one thing we must be very sure of is that we don't have any doubt as to our commitment -- for example, in NATO. We live in a very dangerous world today, a very unpredictable world. And the alliances that we have, until

you change those alliances through the constitutional processes, you are obligated to keep them. I simply think that before we go into new arrangements, we ought to take a look at what's in our national interest, what seems to be best for us.

MR. COLLINS: Does this bombing halt suggestion tie in in any way with the International Peace Keeping Plan to which you referred last week?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: The International Peace Keeping Plan is related to trying to work out a means, a mechanism, as well as the resources, the men and supplies, to help stabilize conditions in areas of the world where there may be some danger to the world peace, where there is attack, where there is aggression, where there is such unbelievable violence that it could explode into a world conflagration. We have had some experience with peace keeping in Cyprus, we have had it in the Middle East, we have had it in the Congo. Those experiences, just to mention those three, have been relatively successful. I think we ought to build on it.

I don't want to see our country be looked upon as a sort of international fire department or rescue agency. I think that we need some partners.

More importantly, in many instances, I think that much of this can be done by the smaller nations who are not suspect, who are not looked upon as if they are trying to extend their sphere of influence.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Humphrey, let's depart from Viet Nam and the campaign for a moment for a question of personal interest and sort of an iffy question. If elected President, would you favor more FCC control over our broadcasting industry?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think what I would favor is that the broadcasting industry take a good look at itself. I know that there is a lot of competition for news, but the broadcasting industry tells those of us in public life that we are to act responsibly. I say with all sincerity and respect that the media has a public responsibility as well.

You know, we have what we call the Committee on Fair Practices in Campaigns. It at least tells people when you have been unfair. There may be a necessity in the broadcasting industry for it to do something about its own quality of performance, its own quality of programming. I think that is the better way.

I don't like to see the Government step in in any role of censorship. I believe that the Government does have some responsibility to see that a certain amount of public service time is made available, that certain standards are adhered to, and I don't know all the details of this, but I am afraid that if we become disturbed at the quality of programming and broadcasting and you start to turn to the Government to improving it, it may not be improved at all. It may be the beginning of very serious dangers in terms of censorship.

So my response to you, sir, is that I think the owners of these great broadcasting stations and networks are very decent Americans. They have to be. They are leaders in their field. They know

what's good and what's not good. I have felt, for example, that there has been too much violence portrayed on the screen. I will be very frank with you. I think it is very bad for our young people, where it shows that most everything is settled at the point of a gun.

Now, there is a balance. I like westerns myself, so I don't want you to close them all off. But there is a kind of balance which -- who knows best how to do that than people that are in the industry themselves? We have been able to do some of this with the movie industry. I just don't like government censorship. I guess that is the best way to put it.

MR. COLLINS: Would you in such an eventuality consider the appointment of a commercial broadcaster to the Federal Communications Commission?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I would not have any objections to that at all. I think the best kind of people that have been put on the Commission have been people that have been in business. I am not much for the theoretics and some of these things. I think I know more about some of the things I have worked in than some people that have written about it. In other words, you know the tricks.

MR. COLLINS: Senator Muskie is making some waves in the campaign now. He will be in this community on Saturday. Are you pleased with his part of the campaign?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: I think he is a wonderful man. I believe truly that in the capacity he will work for the Democratic Party.

Senator Muskie is the Vice President nominee. He is an intelligent man. He is a capable man, a man of judgment and prudence. He is experienced. My, he has a wonderful experience in state and local government and federal government. He knows a great deal about the cities. He is the author of the Model Cities legislation. He is on the Intergovernmental Relations Commission, so he can work with Governor Ellington, Mayor Briley, and others, so that he understands the relationships of Federal programs to state and local governments.

If I am elected, I intend to have Senator Muskie sort of as a super Cabinet officer to coordinate these programs and to work with the governors and our mayors and our legislatures so that we have a closer relationship between federal and state and local governments.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Humphrey, I know that both you and Senator Muskie have experienced harassment from hecklers and have experienced -- they have expressed some disagreement both from the Left and the Right. Is there a formula for dealing with such hecklers?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, I have been striving to find one. I want to say first of all that I think this goes beyond heckling. It is a kind of provocation. Even when you permit that, as did Senator Muskie, to the leader of the hecklers, to come up and say, take some time, state your case, it didn't do much good.

They were right back. These people are not for any particular cause. They are really just against society and they are against the institutions, they are against the candidate and the party, against the government. Now, I want to separate, I want to draw a neat line through it.

Over here is the great large body of young university students, housewives and others who are discouraged about the war or something else. They are legitimately dissenting. I mean they are unhappy with some things that are going on. Those people don't cause you, really, any trouble. They carry signs, they are not for you. They let you know what their point of view is. But they are willing to let you have a meeting.

Over here is another group that is highly disciplined, highly organized provocators, agitators, anarchists -- a handful. They like to use as much as they can this group of idealistic dissenters. But there is a great deal of difference. And we must be very careful to separate legitimate dissent which is vital for democracy from those who are the destroyers and the haters and the anarchists and the nihilists.

This crowd over here, they are just against. I think if the war was over tomorrow, they would still be against. It doesn't relate particularly to the war.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Humphrey, television then gives you a way to speak without being heckled. Is it necessary that you speak to audiences in person?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, I think so. I think people still like to see the living candidate. I really do. Not only that, but from my point of view -- maybe this is my own rationalization -- I get a lift out of seeing the people. I mean a man in American public life must be with the people. I think one of the dangers of the presidency is that you get secluded from the people. You begin to live in that compound called the White House. You begin to live along the Potomac. Washington is a beautiful city, but it is not the people of America. It is a city with its own character. I believe that a man in public life, particularly in a Democracy, must have a way of sensing, feeling what's going on amongst the people. And sometimes even by looking at them, you get an idea.

I know that as a Senator, I jused to find that it was absolutely imperative for me to get home to see my constituents, not only to reassure them of some of my views and all, but to get the strength that comes from them.

Those of us in public life really do get a certain strength from our audience. There is a rapport. And even sometimes while it is a monolog, it appears, it is really a dialog. You can tell by the way they react. You can tell by the nod of their head, the way that they look, whether or not you are in communication. Now, you can't do that at all on television.

MR. COLLINS: What's the problem about a television debate? If the involvements are worked out, would you consider a debate with either or both of the candidates?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Yes, I would consider a debate with the candidates. I think that the main candidates are myself and Mr. Nixon. I think we represent the two major political parties and as such, we should be the ones that get on and debate as a Republican and a Democrat. But Mr. Wallace is a dignificant force today. He obviously has strength. I think that it would be to the public interest if Mr. Nixon, Mr. Wallace and myself could be on an open, nationwide television circuit or network, with each of us presenting our case and cross-examination by each of us and questions from the audience. I think it would be wholesome, I think it would be informative, I think it would be unusual. And I think it would be helpful.

Now, I don't want just one debate, because there is a variety of topics. I think we ought to have an agreement on four or five topics. There ought to be a series of about five of those debates. And after that, you pretty well cover, you have by that time pretty well covered the issues. Then the people will be able to at least get some idea.

Now, we always don't look the same on television that we seem to look outside; we don't always react the same. But at least our ideas would be there, our words would be there in the presence of the other fellow.

Also, I think that makes for a more, well, more mannerly debate. When you are sitting like the three of us here and we've got an argument, we are going to be just a little more cautious, careful, about what we say. We are going to be a little more respectful. Why shouldn't that be the way it is with the American people? They deserve respect.

MR. COLLINS: We have about 30 seconds. Let me depart from the heavy conversation that we've had and ask if you would care to make a prediction on the World Series?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Oh, well, I will tell you. How did I put that once? I said -- I come from Minneapolis, the Twins, who are an American League team. As an American Leaguer, I take a national point of view and as a National Leaguer, I take an American point of view.

I think it will be a terrific series. I would like to see Bobby Gibson and McLain pitch against each other. But it will be something to remember. I hope I can go.

MR. COLLINS: We want to thank Vice President Humphrey for sharing his time with us today.

Also in our studio we might mention that former Ambassador George Ball was here, Mayor Briley, Congressman Fulton, and others.

- - -



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