

JLWJR:jt
jt-1

CBS NEWS
Broadcast House
Washington 16, D. C.
EMerson 2-9300

HOLD FOR RELEASE: 6:30 p.m.
Thursday, March 29, 1962

"CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

as broadcast over the

CBS Radio Network

March 29, 1962

GUEST: THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
United States Senate
(Democrat of Minnesota)

CORRESPONDENTS: Charles von Fremd

Nancy Hanschman Dickerson

Roger Mudd

PRODUCER: Ellen Wadley

MR. VON FREMD: Senator Humphrey, is there a way out of the arms race peril?

MRS. DICKERSON: How will the Supreme Court's decision on reapportionment affect the Democratic Party?

MR. MUDD: Senator, what are the prospects for the Administration's major legislative proposals?

- - -

ANNOUNCER: "CAPITOL CLOAKROOM" From the Nation's Capital, CBS Radio brings you the 700th presentation of CAPITOL CLOAKROOM, a spontaneous and unrehearsed transcribed interview with an outstanding public figure. This week's guest is Senate Democratic Whip Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. He meets with CBS News Correspondents Charles von Fremd, Nancy Hanschman Dickerson and Roger Mudd.

First we hear from Mr. von Fremd.

- - -

MR. VON FREMD: Senator Humphrey, welcome once again on CAPITOL CLOAKROOM which, if you will permit us to boast just a little bit, is another anniversary day for the oldest program of its kind on the air. With this broadcast we begin our 15th consecutive year on the air, and our 700th program.

You are no newcomer to CAPITOL CLOAKROOM. In

fact you were our guest on this same date a year ago. We know from past experience you have got much to say in answer to our questions, so let's begin with that chronic nagging one: as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee, do you think there is a way out of the arms race peril?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, can I first express just a personal note. I want to say "Happy Birthday" to CAPITOL CLOAKROOM, and Happy Birthday on this, its 15th year and this, the 700th program. I think I have been on a good number of these programs and I have always enjoyed the privilege.

MR. VON FREMD: Than you very much, Senator; and so do we.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Now, to your question: is there a way out of the arms race?

I am sure that every reasonable and sensible person believes there must be a way found to curb the ever-growing arms race. Of many reasons for this, the arms race within itself is a risk, it poses a threat to world peace, particularly if that race gets out of balance with one side getting the ascendancy.

Furthermore, the burden of the costs of the arms race in terms of the utilization of physical and human

resources is becoming intolerable in many areas of the world and is beginning to take a heavy toll even in a rich and prosperous country like our own. Is there a way out? I felt that the recent conference at Geneva, which is still underway, but particularly the participation by our Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, indicates that there may well be a way out because despite all of the intransigence of the Soviet Union in such areas as Berlin and the violence that is taking place in Vietnam, there was a degree of calculated moderation on the part of the Soviet diplomats at Geneva and particularly on the part of Mr. Gromyko.

There apparently is a feeling that some way out must be found, and I believe that that way out will not come by arguing over old problems, but starting to find some new areas of contact and of understanding. And one of those would be Soviet-United States cooperation in the field of outerspace research and development and scientific exploration. This is a new area.

Now, outerspace can either become a battleground of the great powers or it can become a laboratory of cooperation and we are at the break point right now, this year. If we can decide through the auspices of the United Nations, for example, for

multi-lateral international cooperation in the field of outerspace research and exploration, I think we will have had the first opening for curbing the arms race because we will curb it in a new area of conflict, namely, outerspace.

Secondly, I think that we ought to press very seriously this matter of the prevention of accidental war. I have talked about this before. The modern machines of war, with electronics and with automation make it possible for both mechanical and human error to precipitate a major global conflict. Some breakdown in communications could cause this. Therefore, there must be every possible way taken to prevent accidental war.

I have proposed a conference of the military leaders and the scientific leaders of the United States and the Western allies, the Soviet Union and her allies on this one subject of how do we prevent accidental war? What precautions can we take? What do we know that the Soviet Union is doing to prevent accidental war?

We have no information. We know that we have taken some very definite precautionary steps but we ought to know what the other side is doing, too.

MRS. DICKERSON: Senator, while these things are going on, the United States still has said that we will

resume nuclear tests next month in the atmosphere. Do you think that there is any alternative for U.S. resumption of those tests if the Russians do not agree to an inspection ban, and they don't seem to be agreeing to that now? Is there any alternative for us?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think so. We've made a decision. I believe the decision was taken after the most careful thought and consideration. The President of the United States has as his first obligation the protection of American security, the protection of this nation. He is the Chief Executive, the Commander-in-Chief. I know that the President and our defense officials and our scientists examined very carefully the recent Soviet tests. I know that men in the field of science who are basically opposed to the extension and expansion of nuclear weaponry and particularly nuclear tests came to the conclusion after examining the results of the findings on Soviet tests that it was necessary for our country to have another series of tests unless the Soviet Union would immediately agree to any further testing and any further developments in nuclear weapons; even that is a calculated risk, I want to be very frank with this audience, that even if the Soviet Union were to

sign a nuclear test prohibition treaty today, with proper inspection, that we are still running a risk because of the great advances which the Soviets made in their recent test series. But everything is a risk and you have to take some risks about a risk, so that's what we were perfectly willing to do so I think the President would have to go forward with these tests.

Now there may be some way that we can bring them under reasonable control. We might very well, since the Soviet has threatened itself to have further tests, try to come to some agreement as to the number of tests. And, between the two powers.

And, secondly, we might want to come to an agreement as to -- if there are to be any further tests after this series, of reducing that number of tests. There may be something that we could approach.

MRS. DICKERSON: Well, Senator, you talk about risks and you say we must take them. Do I infer that you think that since the Russians latest series of tests they are ahead of us? Do you personally think they are in the matter of the kinds of nuclear testing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I don't think that the Soviets are ahead of us in quantity of weapons, nor do I think they are ahead of us in basic quality or

sophistication, at this time. I do feel, however, that the recent Soviet tests which were of an exploratory nature may very well have laid the scientific base for very significant Soviet advances in the next year or the next two years. And, if that is the case, then our margin of superiority over the Soviets could be liquidated or lost. And while I am very concerned about the arms race and the so-called balance of power with all of the risks involved in that, I think an even deeper and greater concern would be over the imbalance of power and imbalance in the hands of the Soviets or of the Sino-Soviet Bloc. I think that this would threaten peace as nothing else could. So we are, what we are doing today is, we are hanging on desperately in the quest for peace by the use of power. In the meantime, we are appealing through every known channel of diplomacy and contact to the Soviets and to the Communist area to halt the arms race before it gets completely out of hand.

I think that this appeal must be made, and it must be made with ever new vigor and new -- with continuing sincerity. Whether there will be any response, who knows?

MRS. DICKERSON: Well, as everyone knows, the Russians said if we test, they are going to start testing again. And you said just a second ago that you are concerned about the balance with one side getting the ascendancy. Can't the case be made that by our testing we are forcing them into testing again because they are worried about the balance?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, the case can be made on that basis, and some people have made it.

I would say, however, that at the present time the Soviet Union is harder pressed than the United States is in terms of its ability to maintain the defense or the arms struggle. I'd like to develop that point for just a moment.

It was my view during recent years that we neither had a disarmament policy nor an arms policy. What we did, we coasted. We had a defense budget about big enough to take care of minimum needs without any sacrifice on the part of our people, and it was big enough so that the Soviets could pay for it without any real breakdown of their economic structure.

Now we have put the pressure on in recent months. We have improved our defense system. We have given greater flexibility and mobility to our military forces. We have really plowed into the Defense Establishment billions of dollars of new capital. This is causing difficulties for the Soviets. If they are going to keep pace, it means that they must divert capital from much-needed domestic programs. They have a shortage of capital far beyond what we have. They are going to have to make up their mind in the Soviet Union -- do you want tractors or are you going to have more missiles?

Mr. Khrushchev is right now, it seems to me, at a point where great decisions are being made in the Soviet Union and those decisions may very well mean a continuation of the arms race, or they may mean, if we are firm, and if we are not -- I don't want us to be bellicose or arrogant -- but just firm and dedicated, if we pursue a course of strength I think we may very well compel the Soviet Union to re-evaluate this arms race that they are in and they may very well want some disarmament in order to be able to fulfill their objectives on the domestic scene.

Remember, the Soviets have made great promises to their people and to the world, and the Soviet Union

now stands before the world with an agriculture that is a failure, with a seven-year plan that is behind, and with a twenty-year proposal that doesn't have a prospect of success.

Now, the Soviets understand the importance of propaganda and psychological warfare, and I think Mr. Khrushchev is going to have to come to a decision within the next twelve months as to whether or not he is going to scrap a seven-year plan, forget his speech about the next twenty years of the Soviet Union and how they are going to surpass the United States, or have to engage in the arms race even more than he is at the present time.

MR. MUDD: Senator, the Senate is going to have to make a decision pretty soon on this UN bond issue. I would like to ask you what is wrong with Richard Russell's proposal that the UN be relieved of repaying this \$38 million to the United States?

On paper this looks like a pretty good plan.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, if that was all there was to it, it wouldn't be so bad; but Mr. Russell's proposal doesn't mean to give life to the UN, it means to give it a sort of patriotic and historic burial. It will just leave the UN stripped because what he also said was, of course, that this would

have to be as a credit to any further obligations on the part of the United States to the UN. And furthermore, he indicated that any action on the part of the UN that related to military action would have to come back to the Congress of the United States for approval.

Now, we haven't been engaged in any UN military action except in Korea. The United States has only been engaged in that particular military action. And, may I say that the UN helped the United States, after all the attack in Korea was an attack on American forces, it was an attack upon an American ally and upon a vital area in the world to American security. And the fact that the United Nations joined with us in the defense of South Korea was an advantage to the United States and I think also to the peace of the world.

Mr. Russell's proposal is not designed to strengthen the United Nations. It is designed to leave the United Nations financially prostrate because the United Nations needs capital now, it doesn't just need forgiveness of our share of the United Nations' indebtedness to us, it needs about \$200 million worth of capital if it's going to continue its peace-keeping operations.

And what disturbs this Senator is that the United States of America has a great stake in the ability of the United Nations to enter into peace-keeping operations. We were the author of the peace resolution in the General Assembly in 1950, at the time of the attack in Korea. We by-passed the veto of the Security Council. We gave the General Assembly the authority to commit UN power and UN forces and UN nations to areas of defense and areas that needed police action. This was our proposal and for years we thought this was one of the most astute and most far-reaching and far-seeing proposals in our diplomacy. Here is the United Nations now performing peace-keeping functions in the Middle East, and the Middle East is still a powder keg. The recent Syrian-Israeli clashes indicate this. Here is the United Nations attempting to keep the peace in Africa, and it's doing a fairly good job. If either one of these areas breaks out into open hostilities without the United Nations there to do police action, one or the other big powers will be there, either the Soviet Union or the United States; and if we meet the Soviet Union head on in the Middle East, it's World War III. If we meet the Soviet Union head on in Africa, it's World War III.

The fact that the United Nations is doing this job of keeping the peace is in the vital interest of the United States. It's not only in our interest in terms of saving the peace, of saving our country, but of saving our men and saving our dollars. I, for the life of me, can't understand why anybody would want to cripple the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations unless -- unless you just sort of feel that this world isn't what it is. This is the world of the Twentieth Century. This is not the world of Metternich, and this isn't the world of George Washington, and it isn't the world of the Nineteenth Century, it's the late Twentieth Century with the world in revolution and violence and disorder, and the United Nations performs the vital function of the policeman in many areas.

MRS. DICKERSON: Senator, we have been talking about decisions being made. The Supreme Court recently has made a decision on the Tennessee case, the effect of which will be to give city voters a greater voice in State governments which have long been dominated by rural areas. Now the Democrats are traditionally much stronger in the cities. How will this recent Supreme Court decision affect the Democratic Party nationally?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mrs. Dickerson, it seems to me that the first thing that this decision does, is to fulfill the purpose of our Constitution, namely, the establishment of truly representative government.

Now, there has been a hue and cry in this country for a good long time that power is gravitating to the National Government, that Washington, the Government in Washington, has been taking over the responsibilities that ought to be local, and that government is getting too far away from the people; and that the National or the Federal Government is getting too big and that State Governments are losing their effectiveness and their powers are being usurped by the Federal Government.

There is a degree of truth, of course, to all of these charges. But we might ask ourselves -- why has this happened? And one of the reasons that it's happened, and not the only reason but one of the reasons that the Federal Government grows bigger and stronger is because State Governments have been unresponsive to local needs. And what the Supreme Court has said, it has served warning upon States, upon citizens in States, it has served warning upon the leaders, the political leaders in State Governments to put their house in order, to give representative government a truly representative meaning, and not to have a representative

government in the form of a legislature that no longer represents the population.

I happen to think that this decision, instead of developing, or instead of exaggerating the power or increasing the power of the central government in Washington, will do much to increase the power of State Governments. Because the day that State Legislatures are reapportioned, the day that Legislatures really reflect the make-up of the population in a State will be the day that State Governments will take on more responsibility in their own particular area. And when that happens, you will have a decentralization of power, and I think government will become more meaningful and more representative and more responsive to the needs of the citizenry.

So, this is a great decision in the long run. I think it will act, I think it will precipitate some very important action.

Now, as far as the political implications are concerned, well, out my way Democrats win in the country. We win in the cities, too, thank goodness, but our main problem has been in the smaller, what we call the smaller towns.

JLWJR(3)
jt-1

I don't think there is any guarantee that Democrats, or the Democratic Party, will be naturally victorious in the cities or industrial areas. We have lost industrial areas.

Robert Taft was quite a Republican leader around this part of the world. He was a great Senator and he was a great political leader. He carried industrial areas in Ohio that were highly unionized. I think what you really need to take into consideration about this decision is not what it does to the political parties as such, but what does it do for government, and this decision is a good government decision. It has done more to bolster representative government than any decision that I have read for a long time, or heard of. And I might add to those who feel that the Supreme Court is usurping some powers here, that the answer to that is -- put your own house in order.

MR. MUDD: Senator, is the Democratic Party, and this Administration, going to be able to go to the voters this fall with a good legislative record from this Congress?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes. From the 87th Congress yes, from both sessions. We had a very good record in the first session of the 87th Congress and I think we will have a good record in the second session. We

2

are right now at that point in the proceedings of the Congress where legislation really starts to move.

MR. MUDD: Are you gloomy about the prospects of any of the major proposals from the White House, take Medicare or tax reform or the tariff program in particular?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, you have selected three very important ones. I would say that the tax reform measure will most likely go through after quite a bit of anguish and gnashing of teeth and oratory, but I believe that the basic provisions of the President's proposal on tax reform will be adopted.

MR. MUDD: It's being chopped up in the House, or an attempt is being made --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, they have been chopping at it, they haven't chopped it up and it's the same old wood choppers, you would have expected this, this is nothing, there is nothing sensational about this.

I am interested, however, in noting how the Republicans are attempting to chop out of the tax bill the investment credit feature which is really pro-business, which is designed to stimulate business, which is a great tax relief for American business. And yet the party of business, supposedly the Republican

3

Party that has hoodwinked many businessmen into believing that it was for them, now finds, these businessmen now find that the Party is revealing its true colors, its just an "aginer", just plain against the Administration's program.

Now, as far as the foreign trade bill is concerned, it will pass.

MR. MUDD: Will you have a wood-chopper's ball out on the floor of the Senate on that one?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes. I expect that you can look forward to these normal developments of the political arena. But when we are all through, the mighty oak of the President's program of foreign trade will be there, with most of the limbs on it, may I add.

MR. MUDD: This metaphor has gotten enormous.

(Laughter.)

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Medicare, you mentioned --

MR. MUDD: Yes.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: -- this will be the hottest political issue I think in Congress. It will be the most, the one that has the greatest amount of emotion and explosiveness attached to it. I'll just simply say this: I hope that we will pass Medicare, that is, the program of hospital and nursing home care for people aged 65 and older under the terms of Social

4

Security. We are going to have a vote on it. The American people want it. The young people want it. They want it for their -- for their elders, they want it for this country, and if the Congress does not pass the hospital and nursing home care program all I can say is -- every Congressman will have to face the political music when he goes home because, make no mistake about it, this is the most important and the most volatile and I think the most sensitive political issue that has ever been before this Congress in this Administration. And we are going to fight this one through. We want this program. If we don't get it this time, we'll make it a political issue in November and we will go to the people. We'll ask the people to repudiate those who voted against it and we will ask the people to support those who voted for it or who pledged their vote for it. I think there is no other way to face up to this.

MR. VON FREMD: Senator Humphrey, we only have about 45 seconds left. I would like to ask this one:

Some strange things are happening across the country, if we believe the pollsters. The Democratic Party is -- is on the increase in popularity, it seems, from border to border -- this despite the fact that the incumbents usually lose on off years.

What do you think this means?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it means a great Democratic victory in November. President Kennedy is popular, his program is popular. The Democratic Party has proven itself to be a reasonable, responsible, progressive party. We have a program, we are taking that program to the people. The opposition, the Republican Party, is, as I said before, is chopping away, whacking away, it's against it. It has no program and very frankly can't make up its mind whether it has a leader, and without a leader and without a program I don't think you can expect to get much public support.

MR. VON FREMD: On that note we've run out of time.

Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, for being with us once again on CAPITOL CLOAKROOM.

- - -

ANNOUNCER: You have been listening to the 700th meeting in CAPITOL CLOAKROOM. This week's guest was Senate Democratic Whip Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. He was interviewed by CBS News Correspondents Charles von Fremd, Nancy Hanschman Dickerson, and Roger Mudd.

Be with us next week when our guest will be another

prominent Washington personality.

You have just heard another broadcast in the public interest by CBS News. Only a network like CBS Radio can present this kind of service and only a station affiliated with CBS Radio can bring it to you. Originating in Washington, D. C., CAPITOL CLOAKROOM is produced by Ellen Wadley, and is a recorded Public Affairs presentation of CBS News.

end-jt

- - -



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