

# *Youth Wants to Know*



Founded and Produced by Theodore Granik

*Vol. V*

*SUNDAY, JUNE 2, 1957*

*No. 11*

## **Youth Wants to Know Presents**

**SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY**

*Democrat of Minnesota*

**STEPHEN McCORMICK**

*Moderator*

*The Announcer: YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW! The Peabody Award-winning program founded and produced by Theodore Granik. And here is your moderator, Steve McCormick.*

*Mr. McCormick: Our guest today has just returned from a fact-finding mission to the Mideast and Southern Europe where he personally conferred with leaders of State in those areas. As an authority on American foreign policy, his trip will undoubtedly have a profound influence on future progress. He is one of the outstanding spokesmen in Congress, vice-presidential candidate in '56, one of the youngest Democratic members of the Senate.*

*Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. It is a pleasure to have you as our guest on YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW.*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Steve, it is a pleasure to be with you and all these wonderful young people on this magnificent program.

I really like YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW—that is, up until you start to work me over. Until then, I like it.

*Mr. McCormick: These young people who appear here under the auspices of the National Education Association have many questions for you.*

QUESTION: Senator, do you believe Britain's recent move to send goods to Red China will have a permanent damaging effect on the already strained relationships between the U. S. and Great Britain?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I do not. I really think this will be one of those other adjustments we have to make. I can understand the British point of view. Britain is like a man who has had some trouble. He has to eat, too, and the British are a little worried about the loss of markets, they are worried about the fact that their dollar balances are running low, that is, their cash reserves, their gold balances, and Britain also sees in China the Japanese moving into that market, she sees the Germans moving into the market, the Dutch and others, and so she wants to get some market of her own.

QUESTION: Do you think that the United States should change her policy if Formosa's people have shown hostility to the United States?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: In Formosa, are you speaking of?

QUESTION: Yes.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I wouldn't say we should change our fundamental policy, and by that I mean the policy of mutual security, of common defense. But let me be very candid with you: I think the time is at hand for our Government to re-examine our overseas missions.

My personal view is these missions are too large. There is a tendency on the part of Americans overseas to form sort of an American colony. And if I were living overseas, I can understand how I would feel about that. Americans are accustomed to better living standards and this promotes, after awhile, a resentment.

This is really a very touchy subject. So, let me say this: I am going to introduce a resolution into the Congress asking that our Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee re-examine our entire overseas personnel commitments. I am of the

opinion that they are too large. Now, I am not sure, but I am of the opinion they are too large and, as such, they have a tendency to promote hostility.

QUESTION: In this re-examination, sir, do you feel there will be a cut made?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I do. As a matter of fact, the other day in the hearings on the Mutual Security Act, I brought this topic up with Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, and in his usual candor—and by the way, he is a very candid and interesting gentleman—Mr. Wilson said that they were contemplating a 12-percent cut of our overseas military personnel.

Now, that is in what we call our overseas military missions. This does not necessarily mean in our troops, but in those that are there for training and for purposes of development of overseas military power.

QUESTION: Would there also be a cut in the civilian?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I imagine so. As you know, we try to hire as many of the native peoples as we can, but you see, what I think Americans fail to understand is that those of us who are paid very poorly, even when our wages are low, live much better than the vast majority of people in other areas, and while for a time they may be grateful for our presence, after a while there is a little growing resentment. This isn't being anti-American. It means you just can't take it that long, that is all.

QUESTION: Senator Humphrey, in the light of this expanding trade into Red China, would you personally, under present conditions, support the recognition of the Red Chinese Government?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think that is the issue at all, but I do think that the issue is that we ought to re-examine our trade policies and possibly our political policies with China.

QUESTION: Do you think we should recognize Red China?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I don't. I don't think so until China has made amends at the United Nations. She is still branded as an aggressor before the United Nations, and I think recognition of Red China at this time would have a very serious effect on our relationships in South and Southeast Asia.

How would you feel about that?

I have talked to a number of young people about it, and I don't think anybody should be closed-minded.

QUESTION: I think we have a non-existent country with 450 million people, and I think it is time the Americans should wake up and recognize Red China. We are going to have to do business with them and we are not in a bargaining position, now.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I ask you, would you recognize her before the United Nations took some action on the charge of aggression that Red China still has leveled against her in the U. N.? Don't you think we ought to go to the United Nations and see whether or not the Red Chinese are willing to make some amends in terms of their—

QUESTION: No, I don't think we can get the Red Chinese to bargain until we have recognized them, and I don't think they will

make amends until we can get them to bargain. That is why I think we should recognize them.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think you ought to come testify some time. I am not closed-minded about this. I want you to know.

QUESTION: What influence does the powerful Nationalist Chinese Army have on the non-recognition of Red China in Washington, today, sir?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I really don't know. I am not trying to duck the question. I wish I did have an answer to it. They have never worked on me, and I will be very frank with you: I have never been what I would call a pro-Chinese Nationalist, emotionally. I have just felt it was desirable for us to keep Formosa from falling into the hands of the Red Chinese, and primarily because there are many millions of what we call "overseas Chinese" who would have no political home to look to if the Nationalist Government in Formosa were to fall, or if that area were to go into the hands of Red China. And I am speaking of the Chinese in Indonesia, in Thailand, in Malaya, even in India and other areas.

Now, those are merchants. They are very prominent people, professional people. They are skilled people. And if they were to defect, so to speak, all into the hands of the Government in Peking, I think it would have an injurious effect on our over-all foreign policy.

QUESTION: Sir, at the present time, we are having a disarmament conference in London. Do you believe that if Russia accepts our Western proposals, that there are any guarantees that she will follow them?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, let's make this quite clear, because that is a good question, not only for me and for you but for the whole American public.

The truth is, any agreement that we come to with the Soviet Union must never be relied upon on the basis of good faith. If you are going to look upon good faith and honor as a means of enforcement of any agreement, then, really, you are just dreaming. You are smoking political opium, so to speak.

Now, any agreement we come to with the Soviet will be lived up to simply because the Soviet finds it is necessary to do so—to her advantage. And there are some things that may be to her advantage and to ours.

For example, the economic burden of constant armament on the Soviet Union with the tremendous cost of this new equipment is really causing the Soviet Union, I am sure, very serious trouble. Her people are becoming restive. They want consumer goods.

Now, therefore, do not rely upon treaties, alliances, honor and good faith to keep the Soviet Union in line. Rely upon self-enforcement, inspection, mutual benefits, the need of getting something done. And I want to emphasize inspection. Aerial inspection, ground inspection, political inspection, as fool-proof as we can make it.

*Mr. McCormick: Do you think they will go for that?*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think there is a possibility. I want to say if the Soviet Union does go for any kind of disarmament pro-

gram, at all, it represents a fundamental change in Soviet political policy. It is a possibility. I don't want to go way out on a limb. I have been Chairman of this Disarmament Committee and, by the way, next week we are releasing, what I think is a very important report on the Soviet Union and the possibilities of disarmament negotiations with the Soviet. I think it will be released in the middle of the week.

*Mr. McCormick: You wouldn't give us some idea of what that might say, Senator? Let me ask you this: Is it favorable, so that you think we can get together with them?*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It depends upon how much the desire is on both sides. I think there are real factors today that are compelling the Soviet to talk for the first time realistically about the disarmament. If we are not too sticky, too inflexible, we may be able to make a beginning. And may I caution you, just a little, tiny bit of a beginning. There isn't going to be any big over-all disarmament. If you can get an Arctic zone, for example, if you can get a 10-percent cut on arms, if you can have a modicum of aerial inspection, it will be good.

QUESTION: After this small start, what will be the second step, sir?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know. I have never been much of a prophet. I have found if you can look ahead 24 hours, you are pretty lucky and you are almost brilliant and a genius.

I will only say this, that the important thing, as in all other things, is a start, because the start represents a change of fundamental philosophy, and that is particularly true of the Soviet.

QUESTION: I would like to go back to this thing in London. Mike Mansfield has stressed a Big Four Meeting.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

QUESTION: I know that you do not go along with this.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Now, wait a minute.

QUESTION: At least, I think you don't.

Wouldn't you rather have it after the London talks?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I said so. In fact, I do go along with it. I am an admirer of Senator Mansfield. I think he is one of the truly great men of the United States Senate, and he is unusually well qualified in the field of foreign policy, and his proposal is sensible.

My only suggestion was that as long as these talks are going on in London, of the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee, where Mr. Stassen is, that we ought not to have any Summit Conference before those preliminary negotiations have taken place. It is a matter of timing. And then the Summit Conference, which I am all for, so that we can climax it, seize it and really put the stamp of State approval upon it—that is, heads of State.

QUESTION: Why don't you think Mr. Mansfield wanted it right now, though, before the London talks?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know that he stressed that point quite so much. Maybe I don't quite understand it like you do.

QUESTION: Well sir, you are talking about this disarmament report. Exactly what is in it? Can you give us the sense of it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I can't give it to you. What do you think



my twelve-man committee would think if I got on this program and revealed what was in that report a week ahead of time? They would fire me and I have enough trouble, already.

QUESTION: Don't you think it would be a good start toward better conditions in the world if the United States were to take the first step to stop hydrogen bomb tests?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I feel that the limitation of testing on hydrogen weapons is absolutely essential. I really do, and I hope that our government will proceed with it. Now I said limitation. I don't mean unilateral. I don't think we should do this alone. This is another one of these negotiable points and I am of the opinion that the Soviet Union is keenly interested in it and let me tell you one of the reasons I think the Soviet is talking disarmaments, they are very fearful that other countries are going to get hydrogen and atomic weapons. They may be even fearful that Red China is going to get one and when you look at the map and see the common frontier between China and the Soviet Union it is entirely possible that the Soviet may not have all the confidence in the long-term good relationships with Red China that she has for the moment. After all, the Chinese have been parading into central Europe a great deal lately trying to sort of be the big man of communism. They went into Poland, they went into Hungary, they have been into Rumania and Bulgaria when Khrushchev and his boys had to stay home. I don't think the Soviet Union is too happy about this.

QUESTION: Senator Knowland has proposed an escape clause to this "Atoms for Peace" organization. Isn't it sort of indicating to other nations that we are going in kind of half-heartedly and looking for an out if things don't go our way?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think so. May I say, I am going to support the President's proposal on the "Atoms for Peace" program. I think the treaty that has been developed is about as good as you can get. None of these treaties are foolproof. There is no way in the world that the Americans can have a foolproof, absolutely sure, secure existence. And we are in a sense the people who take gambles. We pioneered a whole continent, we are free-thinkers in many ways, we are ingenious and we like to have new things in science. After all, let's not be so fearful. After all, we are the most powerful nation on the face of the earth. What are we always worried about so much? As a matter of fact the other people have good reason sometimes to worry about us in view of our wealth, our strength and our prestige.

QUESTION: In taking gambles, couldn't you possibly say that atomic weapons, just by the simple horror of them, might prevent war? I mean that they could be a preventative as well as a starter?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think so. I think this is part of our defense philosophy, today, the deterrent effect of the massive hydrogen weapon. I am of the opinion as I said earlier—if I didn't say it, I intended to—that another reason the Soviet Union is willing to talk a little bit more realistically in London, on disarmament, is because General Zhukov was the head of a task force in the Soviet Union that examined into the entire military potentialities of the H-Bomb, and apparently that report shocked not only the military but

the political leaders of the Soviet and since then they have been just a little bit more careful what they have been saying. The H-bomb is a terrifying weapon and I will add this: Those people in Russia who are running the country, today, they like to live. They are living pretty well. They are not anxious to have their factories blown to bits and the Soviet leaders today have always sacrificed the ideology of communism to the immediate needs of the Soviet Union.

QUESTION: You recently said that you would like to have all jet air displays stopped to the public.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not all jet displays, but go ahead.

QUESTION: Do you think the public wants these stopped?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I said I felt the ceremonial flights at low altitude in close formation should be banned over metropolitan areas and I still say so. After all, the American people don't need to go into that kind of activity too often. If we want to have a jet formation, let them fly at 20,000 feet or 15,000 feet. You can see them pretty well. And they go fast enough so that you don't get too good a look, even when they are high. But let's not put them over crowded urban areas as they did out in Minneapolis, Minnesota. We have had some trouble out there.

*Mr. McCormick: And tragic trouble.*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Tragedy indeed.

QUESTION: Senator, do you feel we can eliminate aid to West Germany since they have more or less regained their economic stability? Do you feel we could sort of reduce their aid to just possibly military aid?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is about all it is right now. Yes, I think so, very definitely. West Germany is, today, one of what I would call the "have" nations, not "have-not" nations. They have had phenomenal recovery. There should be no economic aid. Military, yes.

QUESTION: Senator Humphrey, this Civil Rights bill that will be before the Senate pretty soon has sections in it which as written would permit the government to get injunctions against civil rights violators, or people who violate this, and this more or less denies the trial by jury. Are you in favor of this?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Of course, you are never denied a trial by jury in a criminal case, but in civil suits this is not unusual. Also a case in equity when it comes to cases of law and equity, the failure to use trial by jury is quite common. Furthermore, when it comes to contempt of court cases, very seldom do you have trial by jury.

Yes, I am for a right-to-vote law. I am for a right-to-vote law that means something that is effective. And may I just add this, that the judges who will be making these decisions are judges from the local area. There will be northern judges in the North, eastern judges in the East, southern judges in the South. They know the temperament of the people, they know the culture, the background, and I happen to believe that our judicial system has done more in recent years to protect the Bill of Rights and to protect the meaning of our democratic institutions, than any single branch of our government.

QUESTION: Well Senator, doesn't our judicial system as it stands say there should be trial by jury for such things as this?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It states there should be trial by jury, of course, in any criminal case, but civil cases, not always. In contempt of court cases so far as I know, seldom. In the case of equity, which is what this amounts to because a man's rights are being denied and you really need protection before the right is denied, then it is customary to have a decision by the judge rather than the jury.

QUESTION: I would like to get back to the Red China question for a moment: You stated before that Russia was fearing Red China, fearing their acquiring—

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Possibly.

QUESTION: Possibly fearing their acquiring the hydrogen bomb.

Wouldn't we be helping to split Red China and Russia, then, if we released our trade barriers to Red China.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I happened to say and I said here over the week-end, that I thought we ought to re-examine this entire trade question, vis-a-vis our allies and ourselves, as it relates to Red China and our own selves in relationship to Red China. I don't think you should have closed minds on these things. Now these are explosive topics politically but I think a man in Congress and the President and the Secretary of State, all of us have to look at what is the long-term good of the country and if we see that it is possible to split two major communist powers, or to, if not split them, at least draw them further apart, then we ought to proceed.

QUESTION: On the question of not recognizing Red China while she is still an aggressor, doesn't Colonel Nasser in Egypt say the same thing about Israel, they refused to recognize it because it is an aggressor? Do you feel this is right?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think Israel has been an aggressor in that sense. I think that Israel, in the sense—what she tried to do, as Ben Gurion told me when I was visiting with him, he said he saw the build-up of arms in Egypt and he went in like the sheriff in the old pioneer days of the West, he just went in and sort of disarmed the rowdy or the bandit, and took the weapons away.

By the way, I saw those weapons on display. They are Russian weapons. It is mighty good equipment, but they are all in the hands of the Israelis today. They made a clean sweep. They took all the chips off the board, I guess.

QUESTION: Senator, Senator Wayne Morse, for whom I know you have a considerable regard, has compared President Eisenhower's official actions as comparable to those of Dave Beck. Do you go along with him in that respect?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think Senator Morse put in the record the other day the transcript of his speech, and I must say that the interpretation that was placed on that speech earlier did not jibe with what the Senator had to say.

What Senator Morse has been saying is that an administration that gave the Idaho Power Company, now, as it is revealed, \$83 million in tax benefits, is performing an immoral act.

Now, first of all, he said this when he thought they only got 17

million. In the meantime, the Kefauver Anti-Monopoly Subcommittee has revealed under testimony from the Federal Power Commission that the Office of Defense management without any recommendation from the Federal Power Commission, gave the Idaho Power Company not only the rights out in Hell's Canyon, the rights which I think belong to the people—that is, the right to build dams on a river that belongs to the people, not to the Idaho Power Company, the Administration not only gave them that right to build the dam, but they gave them a fast tax write-off provision that saved them \$83 million and cost the taxpayers of the United States some \$80 million, according to the testimony.

Now, if that is all true, I will only say this, that the Administration will have to stand accountable before the American people for what I call outrageous favoritism.

QUESTION: And will President Eisenhower have to stand behind—

SENATOR HUMPHREY: President Eisenhower is the head of the Government. I never presumed that we had some sort of collective leadership and I have never presumed that the President didn't represent the country. Of course, he is responsible. Now, he may not have made the decision himself personally, but having not made the decision personally he can remove anyone that did make the decision personally, and I would most respectfully suggest to our President—for whom I have a high regard—I would suggest that he examine this, and if somebody did give this kind of a tax favoritism, tax write-off, at the expense of the American taxpayer and the American people, the man ought to be fired summarily—quickly, and what is more, the Idaho Power Company ought to have their right to develop that river taken away from them.

QUESTION: You feel there was some criminal behavior involved, there?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't charge anybody with anything like that, at all. I have been for the public development of Hell's Canyon.

QUESTION: Sir, back to Russia, for a moment: You seem to feel—I believe from listening to you talk—that Russia is relaxing her rather strict policies, and yet I wonder, sir, a very high Russian official just recently stated that succeeding generations of America will be ruled by communism.

Does this indicate to you that they are relaxing their objectives of ultimate world communism?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I couldn't thank you more, if I were to express thanks for that question, because let me tell you, the Russians aren't relaxing a thing in terms of objectives. The Soviets intend to communize this world. They may have come to the conclusion they are not going to blow the world to bits by H-bombs, but bear in mind they want to pick up the world bit by bit, and anything we release they will take over. They have sticky fingers for world real estate, make no mistake about it. They are very gregarious and acquisitive people.

I don't happen to think that the Soviet Communist or any Communist is going to take over this world if we try to stop it. And when



I say "stop it," let's not be anti-Communist but let's be pro-freedom. For example, if there ever was a Communist in the world, people ought to be taught to read and write. We ought to fight against illiteracy, against poverty, against disease, against oppression. We shouldn't have to have a Marx, a Lenin, a Stalin, or a Khrushchev to motivate us. We ought to do this because we love people, because we believe in democracy.

And what I ask you young people to do is become on fire with, literally consumed with the love of democratic institutions, and this means a belief in the dignity of people, a belief in their equality. It means a belief that there is a fatherhood in God, it means there is a need for freedom of conscience. Believe this.

Don't take it for granted. And then be willing to go on out and carry the message.

That is all I am saying. Then, they won't take over anything. I want to compete with these Soviets. I say if they want peaceful competition, I am willing to take them on anyplace, anywhere, on their terms: economically, culturally, educationally, politically, militarily, psychologically, anyway they want it, if that is what they want. If they don't want to drop bombs but want to have a conflict of ideas, let's go to the mat.

I hope you feel that way.

QUESTION: Senator, if you want to stop all this illiteracy and everything, why don't you start at home? You have all this foreign aid and you give everything to other countries, and then you don't stop to appraise everything that is going on here. Why don't you do that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Dear young lady, we are not giving anybody anything. What we are doing is for ourselves. You cannot have America living in a world slum. Just think that over for a minute. Two-thirds of the people of the world are sick, illiterate, diseased, and feeling a sense of hopelessness.

Now, America cannot exist in that kind of a world for long without becoming a garrison state. So what we are doing when we help other people, when we share with our food, share with our technology, our science, our teachers, is to help ourselves by helping them.

Now, you say "why don't we help ourselves?" We are. Now, there is much more to do. I realize that. And I have always been one who believed that we should use the institutions of Government and our private institutions to expand opportunities for people.

I believe in civil rights for all people and civil liberties. I believe in education, and I believe in it strongly. I believe we need more and better schools, and I believe we can afford them, and I am not one of these people who thinks that freedom is free. You've got to pay for these things.

But let me just add for you that Americans have no conception how well they are off, compared to the rest of the world.

I have seen people in slums and filth and degradation that broke my heart and made my body ill, literally, within the last month. I never thought it could ever be so, and I came home and all I could say was "What a privilege to be an American. What a privilege, and

yet what a responsibility." It is a tremendous responsibility today, to be an American.

QUESTION: Well, sir, could the fact that you are so proud of Eisenhower and endorse him on many things be attributed to the overwhelming majority the Minnesota electors gave to him?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I got many more votes than that, and I wouldn't even brag about that.

No, I wouldn't say I am fond of Eisenhower; he is my President, and he is your President. I don't mean in being President.

QUESTION: You said you admired him.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I said I had a high regard for Mr. Eisenhower.

QUESTION: That is the same thing.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That doesn't mean I agree with his policies. I disagree with his tight money policy—

QUESTION: How about his "Atoms for Peace"?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have disagreed with his farm policy, I have disagreed with the manner in which their fiscal policy is conducted.

And I would like to argue politics not on the basis of personalities, after all, we have to live with one another here, and when politics gets personal in a democracy, then it starts to fracture and split up.

On "Atoms for Peace," I am for it. I believe in supporting the President when he is right, and I have. And believe me, when he is wrong, I believe in standing up and being counted, too, because I am an elected public official.

You see, it isn't a matter of whether you are friendly or not, it is a matter of what you believe and what your convictions are.

Mr. McCormick: Doug, I know you have many more questions, and all of you have, but Senator, we need another half-hour for just the political side.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: These young folks are wonderful. Could I just add one word?

Mr. McCormick: A quick one, please.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Let's use American food as an instrument of American foreign policy abroad. Let's not restrict our farm population at home in order to cripple ourselves abroad. I saw the good this food can do with CARE and all the other programs.

Mr. McCormick: I must interrupt, Senator.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I had to get that plug in.

Mr. McCormick: I know you did.

Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, for being our guest today on YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW.

Now, this is Stephen McCormick speaking for Theodore Granik and bidding you good-bye.

The Announcer: The questions you have just heard do not necessarily reflect the opinions of YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW, the National Broadcasting Company, or the National Education Association.

*The Proceedings of*  
**"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW"**

*as telecast over the coast to coast network of the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed, and a limited number are distributed free to further the public interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare.*

*by*

**PRINTERS**

**RANDELL INC.**

**PUBLISHERS**

**810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E.**

**Washington 18, D. C.**

*(When requesting copies by mail, enclose ten cents to cover mailing)*

---

The proceedings of "Youth Wants to Know" are held alternate Sundays from 3:00-3:30 P. M., D. S. T., on the National Broadcasting Company Television Network at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.



J-47122



# 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)