

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

# TRANSCRIPT

All copyright and right of copyright in this transcript and in the broadcast are owned by CBS. This transcript may not be copied or reproduced or used in any way (other than for purposes of reference, discussion and review) without the written permission of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

## FACE THE NATION

as broadcast over the  
CBS Television Network  
and the  
CBS Radio Network

Sunday, October 27, 1968 - 6:30-7:00 PM EST

GUEST: RICHARD M. NIXON  
Republican Candidate for President

### NEWS CORRESPONDENTS:

Martin Agronsky  
CBS News

David Broder  
The Washington Post

John Hart  
CBS News

DIRECTOR: Robert Vitarelli

PRODUCERS: Sylvia Westerman and Prentiss Childs

NOTE TO EDITORS: Please credit any quotes or excerpts from this  
CBS Radio and Television program to "Face the Nation."

PRESS CONTACT: Ethel Aaronson - (202) 296-1234

1 MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Nixon, President Johnson today accused you  
2 of making ugly and unfair distortions of American defense po-  
3 sitions and of his own peace-making efforts. Do you feel that,  
4 despite your own moratorium against it, the peace negotiations  
5 have now been brought into the political campaign?

6 MR. NIXON: I certainly do not, because I made it very clear  
7 that anything I said about the Vietnam negotiations, that I  
8 would not discuss what the negotiators should agree to. I  
9 believe that President Johnson should have absolute freedom of  
10 action to negotiate what he finds is the proper kind of settle-  
11 ment. And, under the circumstances, no one on the outside  
12 should say that he should agree to this or that. That would  
13 mean that the enemy would wait for the presidential candidate  
14 to be elected rather than negotiate with the President we've  
15 got.

16 ANNOUNCER: From CBS New York, in color, FACE THE NATION, a  
17 spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with Richard M.  
18 Nixon, Republican Candidate for President. Mr. Nixon will be  
19 questioned by CBS News Correspondent John Hart, David Broder,  
20 National Political Reporter for The Washington Post, and CBS  
21 News Correspondent Martin Agronsky.

22

- - -

23 MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Nixon, the President obviously feels that  
24 when you raised the possibility, though you said you did not  
25 believe it yourself, that the peace negotiations were being

1 linked to an effort to elect Hubert Humphrey, that the  
2 President clearly feels that, in raising that, you yourself  
3 ended your moratorium on bringing peace negotiations into the  
4 political campaign. How would you respond to that?

5 MR. NIXON: I would respond to it by pointing out that the  
6 President reads the newspapers, as I do, and there has been a  
7 great deal of discussion -- in fact, there was a UPI report  
8 from Washington indicating that there was a lot of speculation,  
9 that there were insiders on the White House staff who were at-  
10 tempting to work out some sort of a settlement and that the  
11 President was going to be used for that purpose. It would  
12 seem to me that I was being quite responsible in nailing that  
13 and making it clear that I did not share the views of those  
14 that thought the President would use these negotiations po-  
15 litically. Incidentally, I don't. I think President Johnson  
16 wants to bring this war to an end. I think he would like to  
17 have a bombing pause, providing it isn't going to cost American  
18 lives, that it will save life rather than cost it. I don't  
19 go along with those that think that he is going to play politics  
20 with this. I made that statement and I would think the  
21 President would be thanking me rather than attacking me.

22 MR. BRODER: Mr. Nixon, you referred, in that original state-  
23 ment, to unnamed top officials, and now you say White House  
24 insiders. Who are you talking about?

25 MR. NIXON: "Oh, I am talking about the people within the White

1 House staff who are supposed to be privy to the various negotia-  
2 tions that are going on. I am not going into any details with  
3 regard to the men that are involved. I am only referring to  
4 the reports that have been made. I am not going to make any  
5 charges against any of Mr. Johnson's personal staff. It is  
6 apparently quite well known that they do support Hubert  
7 Humphrey, perhaps more enthusiastically than he does.

8 MR. HART: Mr. Nixon, you have repeatedly, in your campaign,  
9 said that you would not do or say anything to pull the rug out  
10 from under Mr. Johnson during the negotiations. And this week  
11 you accused Mr. Humphrey of having the fastest and loosest  
12 tongue in American politics, saying that he is unable to mind  
13 his tongue while negotiations are going on. Two days after you  
14 said that about Mr. Humphrey, you revealed that part of the  
15 negotiations Mr. Johnson was now engaging in concerned a  
16 possible cease-fire. Well, if you were President, would you  
17 consider that revelation a kind of rug pulling?

18 MR. NIXON: I would if it were a revelation but, as you certainly  
19 know, Mr. Hart, from reading the papers and listening to CBS  
20 News, the cease-fire had been talked about for weeks before.  
21 Everybody knows the reports out of Paris, from Mr. Harriman and  
22 the rest, the two things -- they were talking about the possi-  
23 bility of a bombing halt and a possibility of a cease-fire. I  
24 was only repeating what I had heard on CBS and read in the  
25 papers.

1 MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Nixon, I wonder if we could end this whole  
2 discussion on raising this business of connecting the peace  
3 negotiations with the election of Mr. Humphrey by asking you  
4 this: Why, if you didn't believe it, did you raise it at all?

5 MR. NIXON: Because it seemed to me that, with all the specu-  
6 lation that was going on, the speculation that there was about  
7 to be a bombing pause and that it would be negotiated for po-  
8 litical reasons, that it was important for the man most  
9 intimately involved, I would be the man I suppose who was  
10 supposed to be harmed by a bombing pause, although I am not  
11 sure that is the case. It was important for me to nail it once  
12 and for all. After all, if the President is going to be able  
13 to negotiate a settlement here, the enemy must not get the  
14 impression that he has to negotiate for political reasons. That  
15 reduces his ability to negotiate. And, incidentally, talking  
16 about this loosest tongue thing, that John Hart referred to a  
17 moment ago, with regard to Mr. Humphrey, he has said that he  
18 is for a bombing pause without conditions at one time, with  
19 conditions at another time. He was for the Vietnam peace plank  
20 at one time, against it at another time. If that kind of  
21 vacillation that I think creates in the minds of the men in  
22 Hanoi the impression if they will only wait they may get a  
23 better deal from the next man, and that is why I have been  
24 consistent throughout. I have made it clear that, as far as I  
25 was concerned, President Johnson was our President, he is the

1 man that must negotiate at this time, and that I would support  
2 him, provided he negotiated a bombing pause on the very basis  
3 that he said he would insist upon.

4 MR. HART: Mr. Nixon --

5 MR. BRODER: Mr. Nixon -- excuse me.

6 MR. NIXON: Either one.

7 MR. BRODER: In your radio speech for tonight you say that you  
8 will support the President if he decides that a bombing halt  
9 would speed peace and save American lives. And, yet, not very  
10 long ago you were criticizing Mr. Humphrey for saying that he  
11 would also risk a bombing halt under these exact same stipula-  
12 tions.

13 MR. NIXON: Yes, but, Mr. Broder, you will remember that Mr.  
14 Humphrey -- it depended on which news release you read. The  
15 first wire release that came out, the first release that came  
16 off the AP wire said that Mr. Humphrey was for a bombing halt,  
17 period. Three hours later, through a backgrounder they in-  
18 dicated there would be certain conditions. And, then, through-  
19 out Mr. Humphrey's discussions since then, on one day he has  
20 been for a bombing halt, period, and on other occasions he  
21 said he is for a bombing halt provided it isn't going to cost  
22 American lives.

23 MR. BRODER: Well, reading --

24 MR. NIXON: My point is that I think we ought to be consistent  
25 on this, and I think President Johnson has been consistent. I

1 have been consistent. Mr. Humphrey ought to get in line and be  
2 with his President for a change.

3 MR. BRODER: Well, reading back through some of your recent  
4 statements on this subject, I noticed in an interview in  
5 Pittsburgh, on September 8, you said -- and I quote you -- "I  
6 have constantly said we must keep the military pressure on,  
7 that is why I, for example, would oppose a bombing pause, as we  
8 make clear to the enemy that we want to negotiate." Does that  
9 represent a change of viewpoint on your part?

10 MR. NIXON: Oh, not at all. The whole purpose of that state-  
11 ment is to make clear, as I had made clear, if you had read  
12 the whole speech, and I am sure you did -- what I was pointing  
13 out is that we had to have a negotiated end to the war. The  
14 bombing halt is the major card we have to play in order to bring  
15 the enemy to negotiate on some kind of terms. You don't give  
16 it away by simply saying, "Well, I will have a bombing halt,"  
17 then hoping the enemy will negotiate. That means you may not  
18 get a negotiation. I think President Johnson has been  
19 absolutely correct in saying that he will not have a bombing  
20 halt unless we get something in return. That is the position  
21 I tried to take in Pittsburgh and that is my position now.

22 MR. HART: May I replay a word, if I can remember correctly  
23 what you said earlier, and that is that in regards to the  
24 cease-fire provision, there has been speculation on CBS News  
25 and UPI -- and this is what you were quoting as a speculation,

1 is that correct, what you said this evening?

2 MR. NIXON: Yes, as far as my own recollection is --

3 MR. HART: All right. Well, then, what you said later, if you  
4 will permit me to go on, was that you had confirmed that these  
5 reports were true. Now, this is the first time any public  
6 official, certainly, or any person of your stature, had con-  
7 firmed that a cease-fire was connected with the current nego-  
8 tiations; and that goes back to the point of my original  
9 question, which was would this not underline or would it, in  
10 your mind, undermine any kind of negotiations with Mr. Johnson,  
11 by confirming that this was part of it?

12 MR. NIXON: Let me make one thing very clear. We have to  
13 separate President Johnson from people within the White House  
14 staff and others who may represent a different point of view,  
15 because it is common knowledge that there are some -- that  
16 President Johnson has divided opinion on this particular matter  
17 within his administration. That has been reported also on CBS  
18 News, as I am sure you know. But in this particular instance  
19 you will find that President Johnson has always insisted that  
20 the bombing halt is a separate matter. However, the cease-fire  
21 is something that I would assume the administration would also  
22 want, if they could get it.

23 MR. HART: Well, now, you confirmed that, sir. You said that  
24 you had confirmed that those reports were true.

25 MR. NIXON: Well, I think the reports were true. In the

1 administration there has been discussion of a cease-fire, and  
2 that confirmed what all the reporters had been writing pre-  
3 viously. It confirmed the fact that reporters had reported  
4 the truth.

5 MR. HART: Fine. Well, then --

6 MR. NIXON: There is no question about it.

7 MR. HART: -- my question is is that confirmation, if you were  
8 President, would you consider that to be some kind of rug  
9 pulling, if you were in the middle of negotiations?

10 MR. NIXON: Absolutely not because, after all, who has backed  
11 the President in this particular instance? I have. I am not  
12 the one that has even suggested we should have a bombing halt  
13 without conditions, that is Hubert Humphrey. I have been the  
14 one saying that the President is absolutely correct in saying  
15 we shall have a bombing halt, provided it is going to result  
16 in saving American lives rather than costing American lives.  
17 That is a sound position. I back him up and I only wish that  
18 Hubert Humphrey now would button up his lip and stick with the  
19 President on this.

20 MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Nixon, to take another facet of the  
21 President's remarks today, he objected to your contention that  
22 the United States was not maintaining clear superiority over  
23 the Soviets in nuclear weapons. As you know, his Secretary of  
24 Defense, Mr. Clifford, has said that we are maintaining parity  
25 with the Soviet Union. Do you have information that indicates

1 that the contention of the President and the Secretary of  
2 Defense is incorrect in this area?

3 MR. NIXON: Oh, I don't know whether they are incorrect, but I  
4 do have information backing up what I said. And, incidentally,  
5 my information comes directly from the Senate Preparedness  
6 Committee. You may recall -- and this was also widely reported  
7 on CBS and in the various newspapers represented here. The  
8 Senate Preparedness Committee, of which Senate Stennis is the  
9 Chairman, and the members include men like Senator Jackson  
10 and Senator Symington, who are highly recognized as defense  
11 experts, they said just in the latter part of September that  
12 it was quite clear that the Soviet Union in certain areas --  
13 and I am quoting them exactly -- "had now surpassed the United  
14 States in certain nuclear capabilities." They pointed out, as  
15 I did in my statement, that we were still overall ahead, but  
16 they also pointed out that the Soviet Union was making alarming  
17 gains in this respect. Now, if the Senate Preparedness  
18 Committee, controlled by Democrats, with leading Democrats all  
19 unanimously signing it, says that, then I think we ought to  
20 pay attention to it.

21 MR. AGRONSKY: Gentlemen, we must interrupt here, I regret. We  
22 will continue the interview in a moment.

23

- - -

24 MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Nixon, this is a long question but I think  
25 the only way I can put it to you, is to make it long to make it

1 fair.

2 MR. NIXON: I am used to long questions.

3 MR. AGRONSKY: All right, sir. The New York Times, in editorial  
4 yesterday, made two serious allegations against your running  
5 mate, Governor Agnew. The Times said, and I quote, "His  
6 association with the Chesapeake National Bank involves clear  
7 and repeated conflicts of interest. It would seem highly  
8 improper," the Times goes on, "for the Governor to continue as  
9 a director and stockholder." It notes then, when Mr. Agnew  
10 was asked about his relationship with this bank, two years ago,  
11 when he was in his gubernatorial campaign, that he had explained  
12 he inherited the bank stock from his father. The Times then  
13 observes it was subsequently learned his father had died a  
14 year before the bank opened, that, in fact, Mr. Agnew had pur-  
15 chased the shares himself. And it concludes, "Mr. Agnew has  
16 demonstrated he is not fit to stand one step away from the  
17 Presidency." What is your comment on these allegations?

18 MR. NIXON: I don't think my answer needs to be quite that long.  
19 And, incidentally, Martin, I do appreciate the fact that you  
20 did state the whole case, as you did. Now, the New York Times  
21 is a great newspaper. David Broder used to work for the Times.  
22 The New York Times has on its masthead a statement, "All the  
23 news that's fit to print." This is the lowest kind of gutter  
24 politics that a great newspaper could possibly engage in. It  
25 is not news that is fit to print, and I will tell you why.

1 These charges are stale. They were made two years ago, when  
2 Governor Agnew was running for Governor. They were answered  
3 then. The charges are inaccurate in one major respect, with  
4 regard to the fact that, as the Times claim, that Governor  
5 Agnew owned the property while he was Governor. That was not  
6 the case. A retraction will be demanded of the Times legally  
7 tomorrow. The retraction will be, I am sure, printed by the  
8 Times, back with the corset ads or the classifieds, toward the  
9 end of the week when nobody will pay any attention. Now, let's  
10 look at the facts. Governor Agnew was nominated for Vice  
11 President three months ago. The Times has the largest and best  
12 paid staff of any newspaper in the country. One week before  
13 the election they come up with this last minute charge, and I  
14 think that, under the circumstances, the Times owes an apology  
15 to its readers, an apology to the American people. If they had  
16 this information, why didn't they bring it up sooner. It seems  
17 to me that this is certainly something that is below the belt  
18 politicking. It certainly is not worthy of a great newspaper  
19 like the New York Times. Let me make one other thing clear.  
20 Governor Agnew has demonstrated in this campaign that he can  
21 do what Harry Truman said a man had to do in politics. He  
22 said, "If you can't take the heat, get out of the kitchen." He  
23 has taken a lot of heat. Governor Agnew, like all candidates --  
24 I have made some mistakes, he has made some mistakes. And when  
25 he makes them, or I make them, I think we try to get up and say,

Phone (Area 202) 628-4266

1 well, we admit them and we try to correct them. But he is a  
 2 strong man. He is a man that, I am very proud, stood up at the  
 3 time his city, Baltimore, was being burned, and said, "Look,  
 4 we are going to rebuild our cities, but we don't have to burn  
 5 them down in order to rebuild them." He was criticized by  
 6 some of the all-out civil rights people for that statement. I  
 7 agree with him on that statement. I think we need that kind of  
 8 strength and that kind of firmness. And this kind of libel by  
 9 the New York Times doesn't help the American decision-making  
 10 process.

VARD & PAUL

11 MR. BRODER: Just a clarification, Mr. Nixon. You referred to  
 12 the fact that he did not own the property while he was --  
 13 during his term as Governor. Are you referring to the owner-  
 14 ship or membership on the board of directors of the bank that  
 15 they referred to there, or is this another transaction that you  
 16 are referring to?

17 MR. NIXON: I am referring, Mr. Broder, to the property re-  
 18 ferred to in the editorial.

19 MR. AGRONSKY: The editorial refers to the shares that are  
 20 owned.

21 MR. BRODER: The shares that are owned and membership on the  
 22 board of directors of the bank.

23 MR. NIXON: Let me make one thing very clear. A retraction will  
 24 be demanded legally tomorrow, and I think it will speak for  
 25 itself. And, as far as the legal matters are concerned, I am

25 K Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002

1 not going to do anything that might injure Mr. Agnew's case  
2 with regard to the times. Incidentally, I hope he doesn't  
3 have a case because I am sure the Times is a great newspaper  
4 and will retract. I would also point out, Dave, that Ben  
5 Franklin, one of the more respected reporters, three weeks ago  
6 wrote this whole story and said that scores of reporters were  
7 digging into Agnew's relations here and had not been able to  
8 find anything that was particularly useful from a political  
9 standpoint. I am rather surprised that the editorial board of  
10 the Times didn't read their news stories.

11 MR. BRODER: On the subject of Mr. Agnew, I know you have de-  
12 fended him repeatedly and backed him up when he has come under  
13 criticism from the press and have insisted in a number of  
14 interviews that he is an asset in your campaign. Yet, in two  
15 days of covering you this last week, when I must have heard  
16 you make a dozen speeches, I did not hear you mention his name.  
17 Is there some reason for that?

18 MR. NIXON: No, there is no reason for it. I suppose that a  
19 presidential candidate doesn't even mention his own name. I  
20 don't go out and say "Vote for Nixon." I go out and talk about  
21 the issues. But let me make one thing very clear: You may  
22 recall, Mr. Agnew's name was first raised in a conversation I  
23 had with you. You were the only man in the press corps who  
24 even thought that he might be selected as Vice President. I  
25 had been watching him for a long time. I watched him during

1 his campaign. I think he has handled himself well, and I am  
2 very proud to be on the ticket with him. He is going to make  
3 a fine Vice President, and I think the fair-minded members of  
4 the press are going to think more of him as they see him stand  
5 up under pressure.

6 MR. HART: Mr. Nixon, early in this campaign Senator Strom  
7 Thurmond said that your views on law and order, one of the  
8 major issues in this campaign, were similar to those of George  
9 Wallace. Later, at a news conference in the Disneyland Hotel,  
10 you did not take an opportunity to impudiate Mr. Thurmond's  
11 statement but restated your own position as well. Is it your  
12 intention that Mr. Thurmond's unchallenged statement offer hope  
13 to voters of George Wallace, that they can see in you what they  
14 find in Mr. Wallace?

15 MR. NIXON: Let me get one thing very clear. My position with  
16 regard to the Wallace candidacy is clear. It is not I who is  
17 trying to get George Wallace the national television exposure,  
18 Hubert Humphrey is trying to get him through a three-way debate.  
19 I recognize that if that should happen, that it would mean that  
20 George Wallace would have a hand in naming the next President  
21 of the United States.

22 MR. HART: Well, is Thurmond wrong?

23 MR. NIXON: And as far as Thurmond is concerned -- I will answer  
24 -- as far as Thurmond is concerned, I made it also very clear in  
25 that press conference, as you may remember, because I think you

1 asked the question -- I made it very clear that Senator Thurmond  
2 on Meet the Press, your rival program, had made it clear that  
3 he completely disagreed with me on civil rights. As far as  
4 this problem of law and order is concerned, I am for law and  
5 order, Hubert Humphrey is for law and order, George Wallace is  
6 for law and order. How we would do it would be quite differ-  
7 ent. And as far as my program is concerned, I am the only one  
8 of the candidates who has laid out a precise program for  
9 stopping the rising crime and for reestablishing freedom from  
10 fear. That is the difference between Nixon and Wallace.

11 Wallace is against it, I am for it. That is the difference.

12 MR. HART: Now, in Atlanta you did say that you and Wallace  
13 were against some of the same things, in a regional broadcast  
14 to the South.

15 MR. NIXON: Yes.

16 MR. HART: You have also said in the South, and in other places,  
17 that you would not enforce or encourage desegregation by the  
18 use of denial of federal funds. Are you concerned, Mr. Nixon,  
19 that some people might think that you and Wallace agree on the  
20 matter of desegregation?

21 MR. NIXON: I am only concerned that the people understand what  
22 is the law and what my position is. The law says specifically  
23 that funds shall not be withheld from a district for the pur-  
24 pose of creating racial balance. The laws says that funds shall  
25 be withheld from a district which does segregate. I believe

Phone (Area 202) 628-4266

1 that the Office of Education should carry out the law and not  
 2 go beyond it. That is why, for example, on the matter of  
 3 segregation, desegregation, I don't think funds should be de-  
 4 nied to a district on the bussing issue. I am against bussing.  
 5 I do not believe that it serves education to pick up children  
 6 that are two or three years behind children in another school  
 7 district and haul them for a half hour across town to another  
 8 district. I am not for that kind of compulsory integration.  
 9 I am against segregation and no funds should be given to a  
 10 district which practices segregation. But I do not believe  
 11 that funds -- that the federal power should be used, as the  
 12 law specifically points out, for the purpose of creating  
 13 racial balance.

WARD & PAUL

14 MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Nixon, to turn to another issue, you said on  
 15 a radio speech this week that the United States must maintain  
 16 clear superiority over the Soviets in nuclear weapons and in-  
 17 dicated that a nuclear weapons buildup would be necessary in  
 18 this area, in naval nuclear power and all that sort of thing.  
 19 Now, experts estimate that this would cost somewhere in the  
 20 neighborhood of tens of billions of dollars. Hubert Humphrey  
 21 today estimated it would cost at least \$50 billion. Now, you  
 22 are calling, at the same time, for major economies in federal  
 23 expenditures, in repealing the surtax after the war, increasing  
 24 Social Security benefits, where would the money come from?

25 K Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002

25 MR. NIXON: Let's begin with where we are going to get the

1 money. First of all, there is going to be at least a \$15 to  
2 \$17 billion increase in revenue because of growth of the  
3 economy. Second, I believe we are going to have savings,  
4 savings through the new kind of programs that I have indicated  
5 that will probably amount in the neighborhood of \$4 and \$6  
6 billion. We now come to \$21 billion.

7 MR. HART: Is that per year?

8 MR. NIXON: That is per year, yes. That is in terms of consoli-  
9 dation in agencies and so forth and also some programs, particu-  
10 larly in the poverty area, like the Job Corps that I think  
11 should be dispensed with. And, finally, as far as the cost is  
12 concerned, I have costed out all of my programs. I am quite  
13 aware of the fact that I might be the next President. I know  
14 that my first job is going to be to prepare a budget. My total  
15 increase, as far as all spending programs are concerned, would  
16 be approximately \$10 billion a year. And I should also point  
17 out that Hubert Humphrey, when he talks about what his program  
18 would cost, he really isn't much of an expert. He is a man who  
19 already has come out for programs that would add \$70 billion  
20 to our total spending. If you want to start, the Kerner  
21 Committee report would cost \$15 billion, his new Marshall Plan  
22 to the cities would cost \$30 billion, his new program that  
23 would bankrupt the Social Security System would cost another  
24 \$15 billion, and the other miscellaneous programs would cost  
25 \$15 billion more. I am simply pointing this out, that the

1 major difference perhaps between a Nixon presidency and a  
2 Humphrey presidency is that he has been known as a big spender,  
3 the most expensive Senator. He would be our most expensive  
4 President. I would not be. But I am going to see to it that  
5 the United States remains first, as far as our defense is con-  
6 cerned. And we can do that, not at a cost of \$50 billion, we  
7 can do that at the cost that I have indicated.

8 MR. AGRONSKY: You don't think that to achieve the nuclear  
9 superiority that you seek would cost \$50 billion, is that it?

10 MR. NIXON: Martin, let me make one thing very clear. I am  
11 not talking about the nuclear superiority that we left at the  
12 time that Eisenhower left office, nine-to-one in certain areas.  
13 What I am talking about is simply an overall superiority which  
14 is essential for this purpose, not for the purpose of waging  
15 a war, but for the purpose of defense, and overall to make sure  
16 that the next President will be able to negotiate, as he must,  
17 from a position of strength and not from weakness. That is  
18 what we are talking about. This isn't going back to the awesome  
19 superiority we had before. But we have to remember we are in a  
20 race. The other side is running, we are walking. We have got  
21 to be sure we stay ahead.

22 MR. AGRONSKY: Well, sir, I wish we could continue. Unfortu-  
23 nately, we have run out of time. Thank you very much for being  
24 here, Mr. Nixon, to FACE THE NATION. A word about next week's  
25 guest in a moment.

Phone (Area 202) 628-4266

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

- - -

ANNOUNCER: Today, on FACE THE NATION, Richard M. Nixon, Republican Candidate for President, was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent John Hart, David Broder, National Political Reporter for The Washington Post, CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky led the questioning. Next week, at our regular time, Senator Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota, will FACE THE NATION. FACE THE NATION originated, in color, from CBS New York.

- - -

WARD & PAUL

25 K Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002

STATEMENT

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

WASHINGTON, D. C.

OCTOBER 27, 1968

Mr. Nixon's statements tonight on "Face the Nation" contained several deliberate misrepresentations and evasions on several central issues of this campaign.

I. Mr. Nixon has deliberately distorted my position, stated in Salt Lake City on September 30, on a possible bombing halt of North Vietnam.

What I said -- and what Mr. Nixon knows I said -- on national television, for all to see and hear, was this:

"As President, I would stop the bombing of the North as an acceptable risk for peace because I believe it could lead to

success in the negotiations and a shorter war. This would be the best protection for our troops.

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 Vietnam. "

2. Mr. Nixon said that he was actually defending President Johnson last Friday when he said he (Mr. Nixon) did not believe reports that the President was conducting the Vietnam peace negotiations as a "cynical, last-minute attempt" to "salvage" my candidacy.

He did not then, nor did he tonight, identify the source of any such alleged reports. The fact is that, earlier in the same day, Nixon staff members -- characteristically unidentified -- had alleged that Administration officials were urging peace moves to help my candidacy.

An anonymous Nixon spokesman was cited as saying that Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford; Ambassador Cyrus Vance, our negotiator in Paris; Joseph Califano of the White House staff; and George Ball, former Ambassador to the United Nations, were the men in question.

Mr. Nixon knows that there is no substance to these first, second and third-hand allegations. I charge that he was simply using the old Nixon tactic of unsubstantiated insinuation which he has used in so many campaigns. The tactic: Spread an unfounded rumor. Then say you don't believe it. If Mr. Nixon has evidence that the President or any member of this government is playing politics with the peace negotiations, I call on him to spell it out now - - openly.

3. Mr. Nixon refused to respond directly to the question of whether or not his proposals for additional military programs would add up to the additional \$50 billion cited this morning by the New York Times. Instead, he said that

"My total increase, as far as all spending programs are concerned, would be approximately \$10 billion a year. "

He then pulled out of thin air the charge that my proposed programs for the cities, for job training, for education and other urgent domestic needs would cost \$70 billion. Then, he cited figures -- adding up to \$75 billion -- for my various proposals.

He cited as \$15 billion the cost of putting into effect the recommendations of the Kerner Commission. I ask him to substantiate that figure. He cited as \$30 billion the cost of my Marshall Plan for the cities. Had he bothered to read the details of that plan, he would have learned that its basic financing would come from private capital, and that public expenditures to establish its principal mechanism -- an Urban Development Bank -- would come to less than \$1 billion. He cited as \$15 billion the cost

of increased Social Security benefits, as proposed by me, and alleged that my proposals would bankrupt the Social Security system. Mr. Nixon knows that my proposal was actuarially sound, would not bankrupt the system, and would cost \$4-5 billion in its first year. He then charged up \$15 billion as the cost of "miscellaneous" Humphrey domestic proposals. I ask him to identify and specify those proposals.

4. Mr. Nixon indicated that he would, if elected President, do away with the Job Corps -- one of the most successful programs undertaken in recent years to help underprivileged young people become productive, tax-paying citizens -- and other such unspecified programs. Since its inception, the Job Corps has trained 135,600 young people who are now in school or earning their own way. At the very moment, Mr. Nixon called for abolition of the Job Corps, George Foreman, 1968 Olympic Gold Medal winner,

was receiving that Medal in Mexico City. Mr. Foreman publicly at the awards ceremony, gave all credit for his success to the Job Corps, of which he was a recent graduate.

Thursday,

5. On 7/11, Mr. Nixon charged that the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations had created a "security gap" which would become a "survival gap" unless vast new military expenditures were undertaken.

On Face the Nation,

Mr. Nixon did not substantiate his charge. He knows the following to be true:

Our nuclear retaliatory forces are largely made up of Minuteman missiles buried beneath the ground, and Polaris missiles at sea.

We have 1000 Minuteman ICBMs now, as opposed to 28 when Mr. Nixon left office;

-- We have 41 Polaris submarines with 656 missiles, now, as opposed to 3 submarines with 48 less powerful missiles, then;

-- and we continue to maintain our superiority over the Soviet Union in long-range heavy bombers.

The secure Minuteman and Polaris missiles -- and those bombers -- are the cornerstone of our sure defense.

We are the strongest, most secure nation on earth, and that security is undermined only by irresponsible statements like that of Mr. Nixon, which erodes the confidence of our allies, and tempts our enemies to miscalculate.

This is a true "survival gap."

I say that Mr. Nixon has shown once again that he has no understanding of the facts -- grim facts -- of the nuclear age, and of the arms race.

6. Mr. Nixon charged on Face the Nation that only he had offered a specific program in the campaign to create civil order. Mr. Nixon did offer a four-point program -- three points of which are already in effect. He neglected to say -- although he certainly knew it -- that I had presented a detailed and specific program to the American people in a half-hour network television broadcast, and that my special task force on order and justice had issued an 84-point program. That Task Force was headed by Dr. James Wilson, Chairman of the Department of Government at Harvard University.

In Mr. Nixon's television interview this evening, as in his statements of the past several days, he has deliberately distorted the facts and made unsubstantiated allegations.

If he has any basis for his charges, I call on him to delineate it publicly. If he does not, I ask him to withdraw his statements. Finally, I call on Mr. Nixon to have the courage to meet me in open debate before the American people to set the record straight. Mr. Nixon should know that I will not let him get away with these hit-and-run accusations in this campaign. They should be answered and the facts put on the record.

# # #

554-1218

STATEMENT BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

*Washington, DC*  
OCTOBER 27, 1968

Mr. Nixon's <sup>statements</sup> ~~appearance~~ tonight on "Face the Nation" ~~was~~  
~~marked by~~ <sup>contained several</sup> deliberate misrepresentation<sup>s</sup> and evasion <sup>5</sup> ~~on his part~~ <sup>concerning</sup>  
on several central issues of this campaign.

~~SECRET~~ <sup>has deliberately distorted my</sup>  
1. Mr. Nixon ~~charged that there was confusion concerning~~  
~~expressed in Salt Lake City September 30~~  
~~the content of my position on a bombing halt of North Vietnam.~~  
possible

What I said---and what Mr. Nixon knows I said---on national television,  
for all to see and hear, was this:

"As President, I would stop the bombing of the North as an acceptable  
risk for peace because I believe it could lead to success in the negotiations  
and a shorter war. This would be the best protection for our troops.  
~~Before~~ 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 am."

2. Mr. Nixon said that he was ~~###~~ actually defending President Johnson  
<sup>sent to Friday</sup> (Mr. Nixon) ~~the~~  
~~earlier this week~~ when he said he did not believe reports that President  
~~was conducting the Vietnam peace negotiations to serve my candidacy.~~  
<sup>as a cynical, last-minute attempt</sup>  
~~to "salvage" my candidacy.~~

He did not then, nor did he tonight, identify the source of ~~###~~ any such alleged  
reports. The fact is that, earlier in the same day, <sup>Nixon staff member</sup> a statement was issued  
<sup>characteristically</sup> in Mr. Nixon's name <sup>had alleged</sup> alleging that ~~unnamed~~ Administration officials were urging  
~~peace moves to help my candidacy.~~ Later, <sup>an</sup> anonymous Nixon spokesman, was  
cited as saying that Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford; Ambassador Cyrus  
Vance, our negotiator in Paris; Joseph Califano of the White House staff;  
and George Ball, former Ambassador to the United Nations, were the men in  
question.

characteristically  
unnamed

Instead he said that "my total increase, as far as all spending programs are concerned, would be approximately \$10 billion a year."

Mr. Nixon knows that there is no substance to these first, second and third-hand allegations. ~~#####~~ I charge that he was simply using the old Nixon tactic of unsubstantiated insinuation which he has used in so many campaigns. The tactic: Spread an unfounded rumor. Then say you don't believe it. If Mr. Nixon has evidence that the President or any member of this government is playing politics with the peace negotiations, I call on him to spell it out now ~~openly~~ <sup>directly</sup>.

3. Mr. Nixon refused to respond <sup>directly</sup> to the question of whether or not his proposals for additional military programs would add up to the <sup>additional</sup> \$50 billion cited this morning by the New York Times. ~~Instead, he~~ <sup>He</sup> pulled out of thin air the charge that my proposed programs for the cities, for job training, for education and other urgent domestic needs would cost \$70 billion.

Then, he cited figures---adding up to \$ 75 billion--- for my various proposals. He cited as \$15 billion the cost of putting into effect the ~~Recommendations of the Kerner Commission, Report~~ <sup>To my knowledge,</sup> ~~has been made~~ I ask him to substantiate that figure. He cited as \$30 billion the cost of my Marshall Plan for the cities. Had he bothered to read the details of that plan, he would have learned that its basic financing would come from private capital, and that public expenditures to establish its principal mechanism---an Urban Development Bank---would come to less than \$1 billion. He cited as \$15 billion the cost of increased Social Security benefits, as proposed by me, ~~#####~~ and alleged that my proposals would bankrupt the Social Security system. Mr. Nixon knows that my proposals <sup>were</sup> ~~were~~ actuarially sound, would not bankrupt the system, and would cost <sup>\$4-5 billion in its first year</sup> ~~over a~~ ~~year~~ period. He then charged up \$15 billion as the cost of "miscellaneous" Humphrey domestic proposals. I ask him to identify and specify those proposals.

4.

Beyond this, Mr. Nixon indicated that he would, if elected President, do away with the Job Corps---one of the most successful programs undertaken in recent years to help ~~###~~ <sup>underprivileged young people</sup> citizens become productive, ~~and other such unspecified programs.~~ tax-paying citizens. Since its inception, the Job Corps has trained 135,600 young people who are now in school or earning their own way.

4. On Friday, Mr. Nixon charged that the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations had created a "security gap" which would become a "survival gap" unless vast new military expenditures were undertaken.

On Face the Nation

At the very moment <sup>Mr. Nixon</sup> he called for abolition of the Job Corps, George Foreman, 1968 Olympic Gold Medal winner, was receiving that Medal in Mexico City. Mr. Foreman publicly, at the awards ceremony, gave all credit for his success to the Job Corps, of which he was a recent graduate.

-4-

referred to the  
Mr. Nixon also ~~used~~ that America's nuclear arsenal <sup>is nuclear weapons</sup> be returned to the "awesome superiority" that the United States possessed when the Republicans left office in 1961.

This is a complete misstatement of the ~~perilous~~ perilous security position of the United States throughout the late 1950s.

At the time President Kennedy took office in 1961, the overwhelming bulk of our nuclear strike forces -- upon which we depended for deterrence of Soviet attack -- were still vulnerable to a ~~surprise~~ surprise Soviet nuclear attack.

This was so even if, as Mr. Nixon claimed, we had a "nine to one" superiority in certain unspecified "areas." Our vulnerability was plain for all to see.

This was a true "balance of terror," in which we had no assurance that we could survive a surprise attack, and still inflict destruction on the Soviet Union in return.

I say that no responsible man can suggest a return to those perilous times.

Today, the situation has changed completely. *Mr. Nixon did not substantiate his charge. He knows the following is the true:*  
Our nuclear retaliatory forces are largely made up of ~~the~~ *is the true:* Minuteman missiles buried beneath the ground, and Polaris missiles at sea.

We ~~now~~ have 1000 Minuteman ICBMs now, as opposed to 28 when Mr. Nixon left office;

--we have 41 Polaris submarines with 656 missiles, now, as opposed to 3 submarines with 48 less powerful missiles, then;

--and we continue to maintain our superiority over the Soviet Union in long-range heavy bombers.

These secure Minuteman and Polaris missiles -- and those bombers on airborne alert -- are the cornerstone of our sure defense. They are the true "awesome superiority" --- enabling us to survive any attack by an aggressor or aggressors, and destroy them in return.

We had no such assurance in 1960.

Even if, as Mr. Nixon alleged, the Soviet Union is now

superior in one other another extraneous area of nuclear  
-- again unspecified --  
weaponry, the fundamental facts of our security are unaltered.

We are the strongest, most secure nation on earth,  
and that security is undermined only by irresponsible statements  
like that of Mr. Nixon, which erodes the confidence of our Allies,  
and tempts our enemies to miscalculate.

This is a true "survival gap."

I say that Mr. Nixon has shown once again that he has  
no understanding of the facts -- grim facts -- of the nuclear  
age, without which no man has the right to present himself  
as a candidate for President.

and of the arms race.

6.

5. Mr. Nixon charged on Face the Nation that only he had offered a specific program in the campaign to ~~combat~~ create civil order. Mr.

Nixon did offer a four-point program, <sup>points</sup> ~~three-fourths~~ of which <sup>is</sup> already in <sup>effect</sup> ~~existence~~. He neglected to say ~~---although he certainly knew it---~~ that I had presented a detailed and specific program to the American people in a half-hour network television broadcast, and that my special task force on order and justice had issued an 84-point program. That <sup>1</sup> task force was headed by Dr. James Wilson, chairman of the department of government at Harvard University.

In Mr. Nixon's television interview this evening, as in his statements of the past several days, he has deliberately distorted the facts and made unsubstantiated allegations.

If he has any basis for his charges, I call on him to delineate it publicly. If he does not, I ask him to withdraw his statements. Finally, I call on Mr. Nixon to have the courage to meet me in open debate before the American people to set the record straight.

~~Tonight's broadcast~~ Mr. Nixon should know that I will not let him get away with these hit-and-run <sup>accusations</sup> ~~misrepresentations~~ in this campaign. He will have to answer ~~for them.~~ <sup>They shall be answered in the facts put</sup> ~~me~~ on the record.



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



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