



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

FACE THE NATION

as broadcast over the
CBS Television Network
and the

CBS Radio Network

Sunday, April 23, 1972 -- 11:30 AM - 12:00 Noon, EST

Origination: Pittsburgh, Pa.

GUEST: SEN. HUBERT HUMPHREY
Democrat of Minnesota

REPORTERS:

George Herman, CBS News

Don Oberdorfer, The Washington Post

Michele Clark, CBS News

PRODUCERS: Sylvia Westerman and Prentiss Childs

NOTE TO EDITORS: Please credit CBS News' "Face the Nation."

GEORGE HERMAN: Senator Humphrey, the news from South Viet Nam has kind of a glum ring to it today. If the South Vietnamese defenses should fall apart and the country seems likely to go down the drain to the communists, what should the United States do?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I think it's time that we recognized that we've given about ten years of the best years of our lives for the defense of South Viet Nam. Now make no mistake about it -- I take no comfort in what's happening in that part of the world, and I don't want anybody else to take any either, because it has been a tragedy. But the South Vietnamese have an army of a million, two hundred thousand men, an air force, a navy, the best equipment that this country can give them. The only thing we can't give them is the will to defend themselves, and that is in their hands. It is my judgment and it has been that we should be out of this war, that our involvement should have ended long before, and surely we should not be any further -- have any further involvement, and that includes bombing, or the use of any of the American forces.

ANNOUNCER: From Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, FACE THE NATION, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, a candidate in next Tuesday's Democratic presidential primaries. Senator Humphrey will be questioned by CBS News Reporter Michele Clark, Don Oberdorfer of the Washington Post, and CBS News Correspondent George Herman.

HERMAN: Senator, what about the American troops remaining in South Viet Nam? Should any special actions be taken to protect them, to pull them out fast?

SEN. HUMPHREY: First of all, I think they should have been out

of there. It's been three and a half years since a commitment was made that we were going to withdraw, but those that are there obviously must be protected. No President could leave those troops without protection. But we have the airlift, and we have the sea power, the ships, to take those troops out of there. I think the question that people worry about is whether we're copping out, whether we're just going to leave this country, and my answer to that is, we've never copped out. We have been more faithful than any ally in modern history. We've given more and received less, and I think the time is at hand now to put the priority interests of the United States right on the line, and it's in our interest to be out of that war, to try to get a cease-fire to be sure, to try to get an end to the killing, not only of our troops, but to get the prisoners of war out, to get our troops out of there, and get back here and tend to our business.

OBERDORFER: Senator, in 1968, when you were running for President, you stated your view of what we ought to do in Viet Nam, and among the things you said is, let me tell you what I would not do, I would not undertake a unilateral withdrawal, to withdraw would be to jeopardize the independence of South Viet Nam and the safety of other nations, it would be an invitation to more violence, more aggression, more instability. Well, now, what has changed that changes your view of that?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Three and a half years, in which we have poured billions, in which we've given another 15,000 lives, in which we've added untold amounts of equipment, in which we've trained an army of a million, two hundred thousand, and five hundred thousand militia,

in which we've given South Viet Nam the fifth largest navy in the world -- that's what has changed my views, plus the fact that I think this war is tearing this country apart. I don't think there is any way that we're really going to get this country back together, and do the things that we ought to do, economically or socially, until we have withdrawn from this war. And I repeat, we have been a faithful ally beyond any degree that people have ever known, and might I add that in 1968 I did recommend a systematic withdrawal of American forces, I did recommend a mutual cease-fire, I did recommend an end to the bombing of the north. The bombing of the north has proven to be a futile exercise; it did in the Johnson administration and it is in this administration. Bombing for reprisals is no way to conduct an effort to obtain peace. I think we ought to be back at the peace table, also, and I think we ought to take this case directly to the Security Council of the United Nations, even though the United Nations is a weak instrument. I think we ought to use every means that we have to end the bloodshed, to end the war, and to get our forces right back here at home, and to start to heal the wounds of this country.

CLARK: Senator, you say that we obviously can't leave the American troops there unprotected. You support the Gravel-Mondale bill that says that, you know, will prohibit the bombing in South Viet Nam unless the President can show such action is necessary for safe withdrawal of U.S. troops. Well, just last week Secretary of State Rogers used that exact thing as the excuse for increasing the bombings. I don't quite understand.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, there's a lot of difference between massive retaliatory reprisal bombing in the north, and tactical bombing to

protect the safety of the American troops as we engage in an orderly withdrawal. And Secretary Rogers knows it, and I know it, and all the talk to the contrary is not going to disguise what the facts are.

CLARK: Are you saying he's lying then?

SEN. HUMPHREY: No, I am saying he's just trying to preach an administration line which I don't think holds up under real cross-examination.

OBERDORFER: Well, last week, sir, there was a discussion of this bombing affair in the newspapers here, and it was noted that you had voted last fall against the cessation of bombing throughout all of Indochina, that is, in Laos, in Cambodia, and in South Viet Nam. Have you changed your view on that? Do you believe there should be a cessation of bombing in those other areas of Indochina?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Now that is the so-called Gravel amendment --

OBERDORFER: Yes, sir.

SEN. HUMPHREY: -- which I think received somewhere around seven votes, as I --

OBERDORFER: Seventeen, I believe it was.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Seventeen votes in the Senate. Might I say that some of the people in the Senate that are the strongest for peace voted against that amendment, because it was one of dozens. I had voted for the Cooper-Church amendment, which would have cut off the funds. I had voted four times for the Mansfield amendment, which would have called for the total withdrawal of American forces. I had voted repeatedly for every measure in the Senate that called for our total disengagement from Viet Nam. I considered that particular amendment that might do damage to the protection of American forces as they were

being withdrawn, and when I run for the Presidency I am not about to leave American men prisoners of war or American forces unprotected or with no concern. I thought that was an irresponsible amendment, and I have no qualms about my vote at all; in fact, the overwhelming majority of the Senate, the men like Senator Mansfield and others, who sponsored the Mansfield amendment, did not vote for the Gravel amendment.

OBERDORFER: What is your position, sir? After American troops are withdrawn, would you be willing to continue American bombing in South Viet Nam, in Laos, in Cambodia, in Thailand?

SEN. HUMPHREY: No.

HERMAN: Well, how can you seriously propose taking this matter to the United Nations Security Council, knowing what the Security Council's membership is at the moment?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Mr. Herman, it's my judgment that we should not lose any opportunity to go any place to seek a just and decent peace. I know the Security Council is not all I want it to be, but it's a different Council than it was three years ago. It has Mainland China in it, not Nationalist China. Now Mr. Nixon has been to China, he's going to go to Russia. I think it is right and proper for the President of the United States to use every instrumentality that he can, using other governments, asking other governments to help, asking the United Nations to help, asking -- putting our ambassador back at the conference table in Paris, to try to get peace. The American people want peace, and I think we have to get it.

HERMAN: That is not what I don't understand. It's what the Soviet Union, Peking, India, the other members of the Security Council

could do that we have not been able to do ourselves?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I don't know, but I have a feeling that if there was some way that we could pose the issue to them, namely, of a mutual cease-fire, to stop the killing, that it surely wouldn't hurt our position in the world, and it surely wouldn't weaken us in any way. I think the American people want peace.

HERMAN: You sound like you're making use of it as a face-saving device and a propaganda device rather than actual solution -- I don't understand.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Not one bit. I remember the famous period or that difficult period of the Berlin airlift, and I remember the many, many months that went by with no success in negotiations, and I remember also that one day in the halls of the United Nations the Soviet ambassador and the American ambassador had informal talks and it led to an end of the Berlin blockade. Who knows? I want to leave no stone unturned, but in the meantime I want the withdrawal of American forces which President Nixon said was our policy. Now, let's get -- we don't argue about the policy; it's an argument about the time and it's an argument about the absolute necessity of the United States being out of this war.

HERMAN: How fast do you think we could get them out now, should get them out now?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, I think the President could get the balance of these forces out in 30 to 60 days.

HERMAN: Should he?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Yes.

CLARK: Senator, what happens after we withdraw the troops, if

we do in fact get them out without having to bomb again for their own protection? Do we provide economic assistance? I have a letter here where you suggest economic and humanitarian assistance should be undertaken for all of Indochina, with the cooperation of other donor nations. Does that include North Viet Nam?

SEN. HUMPHREY: That includes all of Indochina. That's the commitment that was made by President Johnson and President Nixon, and I think that it makes a sensible humanitarian commitment. It's economic assistance to bind up the wounds.

CLARK: What happens if there is no cooperation from other countries? Do we then provide economic assistance to North Viet Nam?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, let's see if we can't get cooperation from other countries. I happen to believe that we ought to be using our economic aid through multi-national organizations. I have grave doubts today as to the efficacy or the adequacy of bilateral aid. It's my judgment that programs such as the United Nations' development fund, United Nations' special fund, special efforts that are made in consortium between other countries is the better way to work, but if there is nobody else to help, then I believe that we have a moral obligation to be of some help to these people.

OBERDORFER: What about military assistance, sir?

SEN. HUMPHREY: No, I --

OBERDORFER: -- continuation of the war through aiding the South Vietnamese to keep their part of the war going?

SEN. HUMPHREY: It's my judgment that we should seek to be disengaged from this war, and that includes military assistance. Actually, South Viet Nam has piles of military equipment. One of the

major problems is what to do with it. We have flooded this country with military equipment.

OBERDORFER: Yes, but they also have an army, as you know, of over a million men, which that little country cannot support on its own. It takes a huge infusion of American aid, both in terms of bullets and bombs and in terms of money, to keep their army going. Should we continue supporting their army after our troops are withdrawn?

SEN. HUMPRHEY: It is ^{my} judgment that they can support themselves. It is my judgment that if we withdraw from that country, that they will find a way to peace, that Hanoi and Saigon will be able to work out their destiny, and I repeat what I've said before -- we can give them everything except the will, and that is up to them. I want the end of this war, to use every means at our command to get an end to this war, and I believe that we ought to reopen negotiations in Paris, I believe that we ought to use even the weak reed of the United Nations, I think we ought to call upon the other governments of the world to try to end this war, but, above all, I think as an American, and if I'm President of the United States, that we'll be out of that war and we will not be involved.

HERMAN: Let me ask you just one more question about Viet Nam and then I'd like to turn your attention to Pennsylvania. Everything you've said about your reasons for changing your opinion about the Viet Nam war has been on the pragmatic side. We've had this experience, we've had that experience, it has not worked. You didn't mention the word moral until you came to the question of aid. Do you have any feeling that what we have done in Viet Nam was wrong and immoral besides being unsuccessful?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I can't pass judgment on that, Mr. Herman. I really can't. Most wars have a lack of morality. The killing within itself is immoral, but in this instance it was the judgment of four Presidents that we had some interest and vital interest in that area of the world. I think we had a very wide lack of knowledge about that part of the world. I think honestly that we made judgments about it that were based upon limited information, and all I know is that what we tried to do there has not been as successful as people wanted it to be, and I know we've done everything that a nation could do outside of allout war which, pray God, we won't ever do. And because I think that, I think the time is at hand now to quit thinking about the past, to do something about the present, and to get on to trying to take care of this country.

(MORE)

HERMAN: But you have no feeling in yourself that it was either right or wrong?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I have serious doubts as to whether or not our decision was right.

CLARK: Senator, I'd like to change the subject just a bit. In the primaries coming up, busing will probably become an issue again. You have said that you support busing to achieve quality education, but not to achieve racial balance, which you have termed as some philosophical attitude. Does this mean that you support a one-way busing policy, the busing of black children to white schools, but not vice versa?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I support children, black, white, brown, red, yellow, whatever their color may be, that are in poor schools, where there's poor teachers and poor facilities, to good schools, to give children a chance for a good educational opportunity. I would have no hesitancy in supporting white children to good schools that lived in a black community, if the schools are proper and good. I think what we're really talking about here is, how do we get a good education. On top of this, as you know, I believe that a great need in this--there's a great need in this country to really redevelop the inner city, and not to run away from its problems, to clean up these neighborhoods, to provide the social services that are necessary, to bring in the hospitals, the doctors and the clinics that are necessary, and to provide industry and jobs for these areas. But that takes longer, so in the meantime, in order to give that child a good education, I believe that the busing tool is one of the tools that we use. Other things can be done; new school districts, location of

new schools--all of these things can be helpful.

CLARK: But Senator, implied in the discussion of inferior schools and the inner city, and cleaning up the ghettos is that the black schools are the ones that are inferior. In fact, would this not result in not busing white children to black schools?

SEN. HUMPHREY: That is a fact, if the black schools are inferior, and I wouldn't want to bus a black child to an inferior white school. I think what we've really got to talk about is education. Now, I happen to be for integrated schools. I happen to be for an integrated society, but I am not willing to sacrifice children on the altar, may I say, of a quota system in order to have--in order to meet all the questions of racial tension and racial problems in this country. I think we have to go deeper; I think we have to go far beyond the busing question.

CLARK: Senator, one of the arguments for quality education has been that if you bus white children to black schools, the parents of those white children will use some of the political power and some of the money to increase the facilities, to better the facilities and all of those things, so that it would, in fact, achieve better quality education in some of those schools.

SEN. HUMPHREY: I think that's partly true, and I can understand that very well. As a matter of fact, it's an outrage in this country that people have permitted all kinds of social degradation to take place around a school where black children go to school.

CLARK: But you would still then object to busing those white children to those black schools, if in fact it was --

SEN. HUMPHREY: I think that no mother or father wants their

child to be put into a social environment or into a school situation that will cause that child damage or trouble, black or white. I want for black people exactly what I want for Hubert Humphrey. I want a chance for a job, and so do they. I want a chance for a good life and a wholesome neighborhood and a good home, and so does a black family. I think the time is at hand in this country to talk about people, and to try to give people equal opportunity in education, in health, economic opportunity, right across the board, and I'm going to carry on this fight, no matter whether I'm elected President or not, because I really believe it.

OBERDORFER: Senator, in three tries for the Presidency, you've yet to win a state primary contested. Are you going to win your first one here on Tuesday?

SEN. HUMPHREY: First of all, you're wrong. I won in Minnesota in 1952; I won in the District of Columbia in 1960.

OBERDORFER: That's right, against--a state primary; the D. C. wouldn't be a state primary. That was Wayne Morse, wasn't it?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Wayne Morse was no small shakes in the District of Columbia. He was chairman of the District Committee. But I just thought we'd correct the record. As a matter of fact, I used to believe what you believed until I looked up the record. I'm going to win this one.

OBERDORFER: How well are you going to do here?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I hope very well. I'm not a calculator. I'm just good enough, may I say, to be able to say that we have a victory.

OBERDORFER: Will you win the majority of delegates in this

state?

SEN. HUMPHREY: That's a hard problem. That's a hard question. We run against the city machine in Philadelphia; we have the state machine opposing us here in the state, but I think I can get a plurality. There are three candidates, or four candidates on the ballot, so a plurality will look awfully good.

HERMAN: Surely you're not objecting to the existence of a machine here? Didn't it serve you well, the last time around?

SEN. HUMPHREY: But this is a different time, Mr. Herman. We have--we have party reform in the Democratic Party. I helped get that party reform; I fought for it. I worked with Senator Harris, as Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I helped get the McGovern Commission started in the Democratic Party. I've urged primaries; I've urged an open party, urged what we call the new--new reforms for the selection of delegates. This is a different ball game. Now, I happen to think we ought to play according to the rules.

HERMAN: How are the new rules going to affect you? Are they for you or against you?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I don't know, but I think the rules are fair, and I'll play within the rules.

HERMAN: I refer to the fact that one of your main sources of support has always been organized labor, and it looks to me as though for the first time in recent history, organized labor is not going to have a majority or controlling role at the convention. Will that harm you?

SEN. HUMPHREY: They've never had a controlling role.

HERMAN: Well, in sort of realistic terms, they've had a--pretty close to a controlling role.

SEN. HUMPHREY: I want to say that if the people of Pennsylvania will vote for the Humphrey delegates, the labor movement will have a good, sizeable representation. They're not entitled, any more than any other group, to have a domineering or dominating position. They're entitled to adequate representation, and I believe that my delegation includes the proper relationship between women and men, young, labor, the minority groups, as we call them. It's properly--it's properly set, and I like those new rules, because I think it's going to make a better party for us.

OBERDORFER: On the subject of the convention, sir, Senator-- Governor George Wallace said last week that he would support the Presidential nominee of the Democratic Party, unless they treat me bad at the convention in Miami Beach. He went on to say that if the Democrats take any other action, other than treating me with deference, they would be committing suicide. Will you and your forces at the convention treat him with deference, as he seeks, including accommodations on the platform, and would you welcome his support?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I will treat Mr. Wallace on the basis of issues. I have not engaged in political, personal attack upon anybody in this campaign, nor do I intend to. If Mr. Wallace is willing to endorse a platform, which I hope our party has, that bans segregation, that looks towards integration, that is a forward-looking, progressive platform, one that has not a tinge of racism in it, why, Mr. Wallace then will become a Democrat. But I want to say that I am not going to engage in what I call personal attacks. Mr. Wallace has many

delegates that are not racists, many delegates that are decent people, and I want them in that convention.

CLARK: Senator, when you say, will become a Democrat, are you suggesting that he's not now?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, I wouldn't call him a card-carrying Democrat, if you know what I mean. It seems to me --

HERMAN: But he's a delegate-carrying --

SEN. HUMPHREY: I think he ran as a third party candidate last time.

HERMAN: But he's a delegate-carrying Democrat at this point.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Yes, he is, yes.

HERMAN: Well, supposing he doesn't do any of these things that you would like to see him do and still comes up with an awful lot of Democrats behind him under the reform rules? Would you then support him?

SEN. HUMPHREY: As the nominee of our party?

HERMAN: Yes, or in whatever role as an important power at the convention -- would you be willing to do business with him?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Mr. Wallace will not get the nomination of the Democratic Party, he will not be the vice-presidential candidate of the Democratic Party, he will not dominate the Democratic convention; he will make a lot of news, period.

HERMAN: Will he move it at all? Will he not get some action to move things his way a little bit even?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Now if he wants to reform the tax laws, he can help us. He says he does. If he wants to provide better care for people, then he can help us.

HERMAN: If he wants his kind of plank on busing?

SEN. HUMPHREY: He'll not get it.

OBERDORFER: Senator, would you, as is widely believed, ask Senator Ted Kennedy to be your running mate if you receive the nomination, and do you have any shred of evidence that he would be willing to do so?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I have not even talked to Ted Kennedy about it. I haven't the slightest doubt -- the slightest inkling as to whether he'd be interested in it. As a matter of fact, I take Ted Kennedy at his word, that he's not a candidate.

OBERDORFER: Would you be interested in him being your running mate?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Could I just first of all get nominated, and then if I get nominated we'll start to think about whom we might want to have as the vice presidential nominee. He's a very fine man and a good senator and a powerful force in the Democratic Party, and of course a man of his quality and many others would be considered for any position in the Democratic Party, that's for sure, but I have made no contact with him, I've had no visits with him, and I think it is premature to talk about it.

CLARK: Senator, you said George Wallace will not get the nomination. I heard you say the other night in a coal mine in West Virginia in reference to George McGovern, and I quote you, oh, hell, he's not ever going to win the nomination.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Did you hear that?

CLARK: Yes, I did, sir.

SEN. HUMPHREY: I don't think that I said that.

CLARK: You said it to one of the -- the guy that was showing us around the coal mine, while he was showing you the map, and he said we haven't had a President visit the coal mine but we've had one of your opponents and he referred to George McGovern, and you said, oh, hell, he's not going to ever get the nomination.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, you've got to -- oh, I think what I said was that I was going to get the nomination.

CLARK: No, you followed it, sir, with but he's one of my good friends, he's a fine man. I wonder why you believe George McGovern is not going to get the nomination?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Michele, because I believe I am, and I think that's what I ought to be working for. I have said a number of times that if George gets that nomination, Hubert Humphrey will be there to help him, but I don't think he's going to get it, and I don't think Ed Muskie is going to get it, I think I'm going to get it, and I'm going to work for that nomination, and if I didn't feel that way, I would be a fool to be doing what I'm doing, and I don't believe that I'm that.

CLARK: Well, George McGovern is showing some very strong -- some strengths in many states now. He's coming to the convention with delegates, and so that's why I'm puzzled about why you say he's not going to get it.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Because many people come to the convention with delegates. I came to the convention in 1960 with 400 delegates -- do you think I got the nomination? I don't recall that I did; that's 1960. Coming to the convention with delegates doesn't mean you get the nomination.

CLARK: Well, what does it mean then, sir?

SEN. HUMPHREY: It means that you have a chance to get it, and if you have the chance and you get it, you will find Hubert Humphrey backing that good Democratic candidate.

CLARK: Then are you suggesting that what you come with gives you only the chance and not necessarily that you will get it?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Exactly. I'm working for the nomination, and I have said repeatedly that I doubt that anyone will come to this convention with sufficient votes to get the nomination on the first ballot, but I'm happy to say that those who come to that convention with delegates, most of them will be good party regulars and try to participate to give a victory for the Democratic Party.

HERMAN: Senator, what is that nomination going to be worth? The latest polls show that as the economy seems to improve, President Nixon's popularity is increasing, he's been to China, he's going to the Soviet Union -- will a Democrat really be able to crack him if the economy is in good shape?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, first of all, the economy doesn't look in that good shape, and Mr. Nixon is beatable. When the people find out that Mr. Nixon's administration is shifting the tax burden of this country from the corporations onto the working families, they are not liking it, and that's what is happening. When they find out --

HERMAN: With the approval of the Democratic Congress.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, let me -- wait -- no, with the approval but with the insistence of the President of the United States, and when I'm President of the United States there will be a new tax program and a tax reform that will stop this shift of the burden of taxation from

the corporations, who in 1969 paid 20 per cent of the taxes and today pay 16 per cent of the taxes, and the workers in 1969 paid 21 per cent of the taxes and are now paying 29 per cent of the taxes. And I'll say another thing about Mr. Nixon -- these prices that continue to rise, he may not shop in the supermarket but millions of people in this country do, and the American people know that the price control program is a sham and a hoax, and they know that they're not getting a fair deal, and I think the American people are going to turn out Mr. Nixon. If I didn't believe so, again I wouldn't be seeking the nomination of this party.

CLARK: If elected, would you end the wage-price controls?

SEN. HUMPHREY: No, I would make them fair. That's what the American people want. They want enforcement of price commission regulations, and there has been no enforcement. The total fines levied against known violators of the federal law is \$4500, and yet the Director of the Price Commission says that over ten per cent of the corporations are in flagrant violation. I submit this is unfair and it doesn't bode well for this administration.

HERMAN: And on that note, Senator Humphrey, we want to thank you very much for being with us today on Face the Nation.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Thank you.

ANNOUNCER: Today on FACE THE NATION, Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, was interviewed by CBS News Reporter Michele Clark, Don Oberdorfer of the Washington Post, and CBS News Correspondent George Herman. Next week, another prominent figure in the news will FACE THE NATION.



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