

For Release: Tuesday p.m.  
October 25, 1960

HUMPHREY CALLS FOR STRONGER WORLD COURT TO ADVANCE "THE  
RULE OF LAW"

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today called for action to strengthen the World Court and to advance the rule of law in international relations.

"The self-judging reservation of the United States' adherence to the International Court of Justice undermines the authority and the prestige of this international tribunal," Humphrey told members of the Hennepin County Bar Association.

"No court can be effective if one party in a dispute can withdraw itself from the court's jurisdiction," Humphrey declared.

"The Democratic platform -- which I helped write -- pledges action to repeal the self-judging, domestic jurisdiction reservation which permits the United States -- and six other nations -- to prevent a decision by the World Court in any case in which they may be involved.

Humphrey, a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is the author of a proposal to repeal the self-judging reservation. The Humphrey proposal has the support of President Eisenhower, the American Bar Association, and Senator William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

"Not all international problems can be settled by summit talks or by United Nations votes," Humphrey said.

"We need to strengthen the World Court as a judicial forum for peaceful, non-political settlement of international disputes.

"And we must give the World Court the authority it needs to build up a sound body of international law.

"It is not enough to favor the idea of the rule of law. We must also support a workable international judicial system with effective jurisdiction in international disputes.

U.H. *My Experience*  
From the Office of  
Citizens for Humphrey Committee  
1625 Hennepin Avenue  
Minneapolis 3, Minnesota  
Federal 9-0521

*News Lounge*  
For Release: Wednesday p.m.  
October 26, 1960

*Domestic For*  
HUMPHREY ASKS HERTER TO HELP AFRICAN STUDENTS COME TO UNITED STATES

*Sample for newspaper*  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey revealed today that he has asked the Secretary of State to help African students in Iron Curtain countries come to the United States.

*Right money my energy*  
Humphrey told a student forum at the University of Minnesota that many African students at Eastern European universities rejected Communism but lacked money to attend American colleges and universities.

The Minnesota Senator called on American student and college organizations to help bring African students to their institutions for higher education.

An article from the New York Times of October 11 reported many anti-Communist African students stranded behind the Iron Curtain without funds to leave. The article reported an official State Department denial of the African students' applications for financial help to transfer to American colleges.

"These students will be leaders in the newly emerging nations of Africa," Humphrey declared. "If we turn down their plea for help in getting an education, America will lose the goodwill and the confidence of the people of Africa - and we will fail in our responsibilities as leader of the Free World."

"Here is a dramatic opportunity for our country to seize the initiative in helping to shape the future of Africa," Humphrey wrote to Secretary of State Herter.

"It would be a dangerous tragedy if our country, the leader of the Free World, fails to show that America is genuinely eager to share the blessings of freedom and democracy with those African students and with the peoples of Africa," he added.

Here is the text of Senator Humphrey's letter to Secretary of State Herter:

October 21, 1960

"The Honorable Christian Herter  
Secretary of State  
Department of State  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I was shocked in reading the New York Times of October 11, to note a report that the Department of State directed United States diplomatic posts overseas to reject applications from African students now at Eastern European countries behind the Iron Curtain who want to study in the United States.

(More)

Here is a dramatic opportunity for America to seize the initiative in helping to shape the future of Africa. Many of these African students have first-hand knowledge of Communist theory and Communist practice, and they have rejected Communism.

It would be a dangerous tragedy if our country, the leader of the Free World, fails to show clearly that America is genuinely eager to share the blessings of freedom and democracy with these African students and with the people of Africa. I am sure many private, voluntary groups in this country would be happy to cooperate with the Department of State in bringing these African students to American colleges and universities.

Mr. Secretary, I know your deep interest in our foreign student exchange program, and I urge you to reconsider the position of the Department of State on this important matter.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Hubert H. Humphrey"

-30-

you will  
Listen to Sen Kennedy  
Humphrey  
He will discuss with  
you the basic  
objectives of the Demo-  
cratic Program -  
Support this Program  
(1) increase farm income  
(2) Preserve & Protect  
the Family Farm  
(3) ~~use water~~  
~~Produce~~  
Conserve water  
Resources  
(4) Use water Abundantly  
at home and  
abroad  
Now Sen Kennedy

From the Office of  
Citizens for Humphrey Committee  
1625 Hennepin Avenue  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
Federal 9-0521

For Release: Thursday a.m.  
October 27, 1960

*Voluntary Programs*  
*Y.C.C. - Educ - Youth Peace Corps*

HUMPHREY SAYS YOUTH CORPS CAN CUT MINNESOTA'S RISING  
CRIME RATE

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey declared last night that establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps would help cut Minnesota's rising crime rate.

"More than 13,000 youngsters in Minnesota got in trouble with the police last year, and the juvenile crime rate is still rising," Humphrey told members of the Hopkins Optimist Club.

Humphrey declared that juvenile crime was 27 percent of total crimes in Minnesota and 68 percent of such serious crimes as murder, robbery, burglary, rape and other sex crimes reported to the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension.

"Establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps would provide an outlet for the energy of many boys who might otherwise end up in the police courts," the Senator declared. Humphrey's YCC bill passed the Senate last year over Republican opposition.

"In view of the rising crime rate in Minnesota and particularly in Minneapolis, I believe it is vitally important to get boys off the streets and into healthy, constructive outdoors conservation work.

Humphrey cited an official report that crime in Minnesota rose 21.6 percent in the first eight months of 1960 over a similar period in 1959, but crime in Minneapolis rose 35.9 percent during the same period. During August, he said, the Minneapolis crime rate was up 56.3 percent above August of 1959.

Humphrey also called for action by Congress on area redevelopment legislation to provide job opportunities for young people who might otherwise turn to crime.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND OUTER-SPACE CONTROL

United Nations Day Banquet, Minneapolis  
6:30 p.m., Monday, Oct. 24, 1960

(15-minute Limit)

We meet tonight to honor the United Nations.

We can express gratitude and enjoy pride tonight. We are grateful for 15 years of progress and achievement by the United Nations. And we are proud that the United States had the wisdom and the leadership 15 years ago to help put the United Nations Organization on its feet.

Today we know that the United Nations is not just a hope and a dream. We know

15<sup>th</sup> Anniv

U.N.

World WAR  
III might  
Well have  
been underway!

It is not dying  
It is vital  
It is living  
It is growing

that it is a reality and an imperative  
in a world of real problems, real dangers,  
real crisis.

L We know that it is imperative for the  
new nations of the world to sit as equals  
in discussions and decisions which are  
made soberly and rationally.

Peace  
Requires

L We know that it is imperative for  
U.N. representatives to be on the scene  
in the world's critical trouble spots.

(eyes)

L We know that if there were no United  
Nations Organization, we would have to  
create one now. The United Nations is  
essential to our own peace and security  
and the peaceful development of the emerging  
nations.

If not, we  
have to  
make one!



And it is a check on Communist imperialism  
-- a weapon and a wedge for freedom.

But we cannot restrict our attention  
tonight to accomplishments of the past,  
or the achievements of the present.

Past

Present

Mankind is rushing toward decision.  
The world is whipping toward its destiny.  
We cannot waste a month, a day or even an  
hour smiling at the past, or frowning at  
the present.

Rushing to  
Decision

~~Now tonight -- every day --~~ we must  
anticipate tomorrow, and be ready.

Look to  
tomorrow!

One challenge we must face is the advance  
of science into outer space activities.

Very soon -- perhaps even tomorrow --  
we shall witness the launching of the first

(V)

(Here)

~~Best~~ model of a Samos reconnaissance  
satellite.

L The Samos will represent a <sup>great</sup> ~~momentous~~  
step into the Space Age -- a step which  
will require basic, long-range decisions.

L We must decide -- soon -- whether  
the Samos will be used as a peaceful  
eye-in-the-sky, or a militaristic spy-in-  
the-sky.

L We must decide -- soon -- whether <sup>the Nations</sup> ~~we~~  
are going to carry the arms race from earth  
into space or whether we are going to adopt  
space arms control before it is too late.

L The Samos can be sent orbiting over  
any country to relay information back to  
the military command which launched it.  
Thus, it can have extremely high value as



a military weapon.

But the Samos can also be employed as  
an instrument of peace. Under proper

international management, it could be

used for monitoring some forms of

disarmament and provide warnings of preparations

for attack.

*Prevent surprise Attack!*

The Samos is a reminder that space  
technology is plunging ahead at a

bewildering pace -- coming ever closer

to a point where it may pass beyond the

possibility of international political

control.

The nations of the world must face the  
grim possibility that regulation may no longer  
be technically feasible.

~~But~~ the nations of the world must begin  
now to develop a comprehensive plan of space  
armaments control.

The first requirement, the first step,  
must be an agreement to assure the use of  
the Samos as an instrument of peace. I  
propose that the United States work to perfect  
this satellite, with the intention of turning  
it over to a United Nations authority. The  
Samos could then promote international harmony,  
instead of sparking international hostility.

< With their great powers of observation,  
the Samos and other "eyes in the sky" could  
help deter war by giving strategic warning  
of preparation for attack.

The Samos is only one part of the  
challenge of the space age.

L <sup>Further</sup> ~~primary~~ requirement now -- for peace  
and ~~harmony tomorrow~~ -- is the development  
of an international code of law to govern  
space activities. } Law of the Seas - Law of Space

Two major powers -- the United States  
and the Soviet Union -- are engaged in massive  
space programs. These two space powers  
are also political rivals. Space law is vital  
if we are to avert conflict, crisis and  
confusion between the United States and the  
Soviet Union over space projects.

L Many basic legal questions ~~are~~ unanswered. } For Space

We ask, Should outer space be considered free -- as  
are the high seas? If so, where does  
sovereign air space end and outer space begin?

The present <sup>U.N.</sup> Committee on the Peaceful  
Uses of Outer Space <sup>is</sup> responsible for studying  
these legal problems. But so far, the committee  
has been paralyzed by organizational questions  
raised by the Soviet Union. The result is that  
the formation of <sup>the</sup> space law is lagging far  
behind the onrush of scientific space research  
and exploration.

In the current session of the United  
Nations General Assembly, the United States  
should insist that all roadblocks be removed  
to allow the Space Committee to work effectively.

The most critical aspect of the space  
challenge is the need to establish safeguarded

arms control agreements for outer space

activities.

*to here*

I strongly favor the conclusion of an agreement that no bodies in space and no portions of space can be subject to national claim. I also urge that we seek an agreement which would forbid any military activities in outer space.

We already have a model for such an agreement -- the recently concluded treaty on Antarctica. That treaty forbids new national claims on Antarctica, but guarantees freedom of scientific investigation. And most important, that treaty forbids any military projects or weapons testing in Antarctica.

*Antarctic  
Treaty*

A treaty demilitarizing <sup>outer</sup> ~~out~~ space would prohibit the placing into orbit of nuclear bomb-bearing satellites.

We should also ~~strive for safeguarded~~ ~~agreements to forbid~~ any other means of mass destruction, such as biological or radiological weapons. Compliance to this agreement would require an international system of inspecting each satellite before it is fired into orbit.

And Without necessarily waiting for these agreements to be concluded, the United States should ~~also~~ take the lead in working for an agreement by which each nation would notify a United Nations authority of any plans to launch missiles or satellites into outer space.



These are the goals -- the requirements  
~~we face~~ to meet the challenge of the  
space age.

~~We cannot achieve these goals, we cannot  
meet tomorrow's challenge unless the United  
States takes the lead now in working for  
solutions to the problems of outer space  
activities.~~

The lessons of history command us to  
seek and conclude agreements now.

~~In the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries,  
European countries engaged in war, because  
they failed to agree on how newly-discovered  
lands should be divided or governed.~~

△ In this age of nuclear weapons, it would  
be suicidal for us to allow war between space-  
power nations because of conflicting claims

in space.

Speed is essential, determined effort is essential. As weapons and space vehicles become more advanced and numerous, they will become more difficult to regulate and control.

h We do not now have the machinery necessary ~~to work~~ for agreements and inspection systems for outer space control.

L But the United Nations offers us the opportunity to establish that machinery.

L I propose the establishment of a new agency -- an International Space Peace Agency -- to work toward space control agreements, to develop safeguards and inspection systems, to utilize the new space vehicles as instruments of peace instead of weapons of

war.

The international Space Peace Agency  
should be organized through the framework of  
the United Nations and then operate under  
United Nations sponsorship but as a  
separately-functioning organization.

This new agency should include political,  
legal and scientific representatives of all  
nations concerned with the peaceful  
exploration and use of outer space.

Without leadership by the United States,  
without work through the United Nations and  
without an International Space Peace Agency

-- mankind faces an ugly era of conflict

in space.

Peace on earth can never be secure if we  
allow confusion and conflict in outer space.

*We must*  
~~let us~~ begin now to end the confusion.

*We must*  
~~let us~~ work now to replace the conflict with  
cooperation.

*Arms Control and the Public Interest*  
*yes !* #####

## Answers to Mr. Selikoff's Questions

by  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Question: Do you feel the prestige of this country has risen or fallen during the past seven or eight years? Please elaborate on the reasons for your answer.

Answer: America is still powerful, but our prestige and influence have slipped during the past eight years. The direction of the shift in the relative strength and influence of the Free World and the Communist bloc is a serious matter. We must face the hard facts -- and then get busy and restore America's dynamic world leadership.

At the end of World War II and through the Truman years, the whole world looked to the United States for initiative and action. America was on the offensive for freedom and progress. We had the initiative in the great struggle between freedom and tyranny.

But during the past eight years the Russians launched the first earth satellite and the first moon missile -- the American government was caught in outright lies about the U-2 flight over Russia -- the Soviet premier insulted and ridiculed our President -- anti-American riots in Japan forced our President to cancel his visit -- anti-American riots endangered the life of the Vice President in Latin America -- Communist influence grew in the anti-American Castro regime of Cuba, only 80 miles from America's coast-line.

The decline in America's prestige and influence stems from the inability of the Republican Administration to shake off complacency and to give top priority to progress and achievement in the long, hard competition we face with the Communist world. It is wrong and dangerous to say that all is going well when the American people should get a clarion call to action, a challenge to meet the big issues of our time.

Question: How do you stand on the issue of Quemoy and Matsu which has been debated rather thoroughly by Nixon and Kennedy? What is your position on Formosa itself: Do you feel that the United States should continue to defend it? Why?

Answer: It is reckless and dangerous to risk World War III over two small, indefensible islands two miles off the China mainland, unless the President determines -- as authorized by the Senate -- that the attack on Quemoy and Matsu is part of an attack on Formosa. I believe Vice President Nixon has weakened his claim to the Presidency by his irresponsible position that the United States will risk a nuclear war over Quemoy and Matsu -- regardless of whether the attack by the Chinese Communists is part of a general attack on Formosa, or simply an attack on these two small, off-shore islands.

We have a treaty commitment with the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-Shek to defend Formosa and the Pescadores -- but not the off-shore islands. We should stick by this obligation. The potential for freedom and progress on Formosa would be wiped out under Communist rule. Furthermore, the American military position in the Pacific would be seriously weakened by loss of Formosa to the Chinese Communists.

Question: What are you doing personally to help open the gates of Red China to newsmen and educators so that information about that country can be obtained?

Answer: Certainly we need more information about Communist China, and I have supported the efforts of American newsmen to enter Red China. However, it must be made clear that those who seek to enter Communist China must do so at their own risk and on their own responsibility. The United States government cannot sponsor the efforts of private citizens to visit Communist China when our government is unable to offer them any guarantee or protection against arbitrary action against their life or liberty by the Chinese Communist government on trumped-up spy charges.



Question: It is apparent to some people that we are losing ground in connection with admission of Red China to the United Nations. If you believe this is so, do you agree that it might be better to "save face" and reverse our position by ourselves when a new president is elected (which is thought by some to be a natural time to do so), instead of waiting for a defeat which will only injure our reputation and lower our prestige even more?

Answer: We will accomplish nothing by voting for entry of Communist China into the United Nations without firm guarantees that Communist China will abide by the peaceful principles of the United Nations.

Question: From a look at our foreign policy, some analysts deduce that the U.S. is quick to attach itself to any government which is not Communist, despite the fact that it might be fascist or ultra-reactionary, i.e., Spain, South Korea, etc. It appears that the U.S. searches not for the man advocated by the mass of people, but for the person who speaks English. Inevitably and unfortunately, however, this individual does not have the backing of the people and is usually rich and out of contact with the masses. Do you feel the above is true? Can anything be done about it?

Answer: We should always support governments which are working for peace and progress, for a better life with freedom and dignity for all the people within their boundaries, but it is foolish and dangerous to oversimplify this problem. We cannot reform a foreign ally that fails to meet our standards. That would be meddling interference in the country's internal affairs.

Nevertheless, we can encourage and support liberal, progressive leaders and policies in other countries, and we can make clear our disapproval of governments which fail to reflect and work for the true interest of their people. There is a great difference between formal diplomatic recognition and friendly approval.

QUESTION: Whose fault, if anyone's, is it that Cuba appears to be on the threshold of communism? How could this have been prevented? Do you have a solution for the present Cuban crisis?

Page 4

ANSWER: Castro won Cuba because the people of Cuba are poverty-stricken, sick, hungry, and illiterate. These are the conditions in which revolution and Communism breed and thrive.

The Republican Administration fails to understand the revolution of rising expectations among the people of Cuba and the other newly awakening countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Our government was still embracing the dictator, Batista, up to the last week before he was thrown out by the Castro revolution.

Years ago we should have launched a massive attack on hunger, disease, and poverty in Cuba. But -- instead of food, medical supplies, books and technical assistance for economic development -- the American government shipped military supplies to Batista which he used against the Cuban people.

There is no easy solution to the present crisis in relations between Cuba and the United States. I expect tensions to increase rather than diminish as Cuba steps up its propaganda campaign in other Latin American countries. Our course will be difficult. We must work through the Organization of American States and we must encourage establishment of an inter-American police force to help maintain peace in Latin America.

We must not be provoked into rash, hasty actions. We must prepare for a long, patient program of friendship and assistance to the developing nations of Latin America -- a program we must hope will eventually include Cuba.

5

**QUESTION:** Do you feel that the religious issue has been over-emphasized in this presidential campaign? Why? What is your opinion about the theoretical concept called the "frame of reference," which indicates that a person will perceive those things which fit in with the experiences he has had in the past and which has affected his nervous system. In other words, it would seem, according to this theory, that a person used to a formal, hierarchical type of religion would react to events within this narrow frame of reference, and perceive events through the same narrow frame of reference. Would you comment on this?

**ANSWER:** Yes, the so-called "religious issue" has been over-emphasized and I believe that those who continue to raise this issue would destroy a basic American tradition -- that no religious test shall be required for any public office.

Religious bigotry will condemn us as hypocrites in the eyes of the watching world just as much as racial discrimination and Little Rock incidents.

I do not accept the "frame of reference" theory. Human beings are not just bundles of nervous reactions. We are individuals with reason and capacity for independent judgment.

**QUESTION:** Are you for or against a world government if this were possible? This, of course, would mean the loss of sovereignty of the United States and other nations, yet, as some people believe, it is the only remaining solution to survival in this age of terrible weapons and suspicion on an international basis. There is no reason, some theorize, why nationalism should stop merely at the gates of the present system of sovereign states. What, to you, is the job of the United Nations' both at present and in the future?

**ANSWER:** Before we can talk intelligently about world government, we must decide what kind of world we want. Now I think we want an international order in which peace and freedom flourish, a world of spiritual and material progress accompanied by social justice.

We must strengthen and encourage the growth of free institutions and free societies and we must seek international agreements which help to create the kind of world we want. First and foremost, we must achieve international agreement

on an effective arms control program with international inspection and guarantees to protect all the nations of the world.

There is tremendous significance to arms control agreement. Such agreement can reduce international tension by ending or reducing the arms race and by setting a precedent for international agreements on other political problems in constructive and conciliatory manner.

Some people may say that international arms control agreements will mean a loss of sovereignty for the United States. I say that the growing availability of nuclear weapons makes arms control imperative.

The United Nations is now primarily a forum for discussion and debate. All the nations of the world bring their combined influence, judgement, and wisdom to the struggles and discussions at the United Nations, and they develop a consensus, they help to form world opinion.

But Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold has helped turn the United Nations into more than a forum. The United Nations has become a positive force for peace in the trouble spots of the world such as the Congo and the Middle East, and I foresee further progress in this direction as the U.N. grows stronger with each new experience and each new successful solution of a difficult problem. I believe the United States can contribute to this progress by strengthening the World Court and supporting establishment of a permanent United Nations police force.

QUESTION: Many educators feel that the U.S. government should support more general research in our universities, but that the government should not then attach longer strings to that research which would prevent the researcher from leaving the narrow range of his subsidized activities. In other words, they would like the money for pure or theoretical (as against basic or immediately utilitarian) research, but don't want to be controlled by the government.

ANSWER: We need more support for basic, theoretical scientific research and we should make sure this kind of research is not stifled or discouraged by unnecessary restrictions in the distribution of federal research funds.

I believe a cabinet-level Department of Science can give

new focus and understanding to scientific research programs within the federal government and in our colleges and universities.

My proposal for establishment of a Department of Science and Technology to coordinate and clarify more than 80 scientific programs of different federal agencies has support from scientists in universities and private industry as well as from officials of the National Bureau of Standards and the National Science Foundation.



Question: Are you in favor or against Communists teaching in our universities? Please elaborate. What about (1) Socialists, and (2) pacifists? What is your position on the outlawing of the Communist party in the U. S.? Do you feel that the party should be allowed to function as long as it follows the "rules of the game" and seeks its goals through democratic and peaceful means?

Answer: A Communist Party member is a member of an international conspiracy dedicated to the violent overthrow of our democratic government. Lies, deceit, and violence are the stock in trade of Communist Party members. I believe a university teacher must be dedicated to truth, and therefore, I oppose employment of a Communist Party member as a teacher at the University of Minnesota or any other institution of higher learning.

It is dangerous to think that the Communist Party will follow the "rules of the game" and seek its goals through peaceful, democratic means. The Communist Party will use peaceful, democratic methods only as long as such methods will advance its purpose, which is the overthrow of the democratic process. This is why I believe the Communist Party is properly regarded as an illegal conspiracy.

I do not consider socialists and pacifists in the same category as Communists. Their beliefs and their actions do not threaten our society with violent overthrow or revolution. They are not committed by their beliefs to the destruction of our democratic society and our democratic political process.



- 9 -

Question: What is your position on the future testing of hydrogen and other similar weapons? Do you feel such testing should stop immediately? Must there be adequate controls? If so, what controls? Whose fault is it that we have not achieved much progress with the Soviet Union on this matter? Why?

Answer: I am convinced that an effective, controlled international agreement to stop nuclear weapons testing is in the best interest of the United States and of all the nations of the world, but an agreement is meaningless without inspection safeguards and guarantees. Inspection is our primary method of control.

The Soviet Union has often been unreasonable and prone to delay agreement in the two-year negotiations at Geneva. But, unfortunately, American policy-makers have also contributed to the failure to reach agreement by delays in submitting proposals and in presenting the views of our government. These delays reflect the weakness and indecision of this Administration on the important issue of disarmament and arms control.

Question: As a highranking member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, do you feel that there are "holes" in our aid to Africa? If so, how can we best provide transportation and education to these people at low cost.

Answer: The newly emerging nations of Africa desperately need Point Four type aid, yet last year we sent to Africa less than 5 per cent of all the technical assistance funds that we spent abroad. Clearly we are not doing enough to bring these new nations into the 20th Century. We cannot expect these newly independent countries to listen to harangues from us on the virtues of democracy when their people are hungry, sick, illiterate, and troubled by the decay of tribal culture.

Of course, the development and progress of Africa is not wholly an American responsibility. Our friends and allies in Europe can and should

-10-

participate in a multilateral economic aid program. But, as a leader of the Free World, it is our responsibility to show what can be accomplished by free people moved to action by genuine friendship, brotherhood, and compassion for those less fortunate.

That is why I proposed a Food for Peace program -- to help lift the curse of hunger from nations struggling for bread and freedom. That is why I proposed Health for Peace -- with a Great White Fleet of mercy ships and American assistance in medical supplies and public health and sanitation programs. That is why I proposed Education for Peace -- to teach the ignorant and the illiterate to teach them modern technology, to teach them the principles of freedom.

I believe a Youth Peace Corps of dedicated young men and women can make a tremendous contribution to peace and progress in the new nations of Africa by teaching new techniques of agriculture, by raising standards of literacy and education, and by giving basic public health instruction. These are the Works of Peace which we should support in African and in other underdeveloped countries.

Question: Do you feel we are losing the psychological and propagandistic (on an ideological level) battle for foreign peoples' minds (especially in Asia and Africa)? If so, what can we do about it? What do you ascribe the causes to?

Answer: We Americans are too much inclined to neglect the vital importance of information and education -- or "propaganda," which the dictionary defines as the spreading of a system of ideas -- in winning the hearts and the minds of uncommitted peoples and in giving hope to those who seek break and freedom and human dignity.

We are lagging seriously in the propaganda battle. The Sino-Soviet bloc puts out 3,000 hours a week of international broadcasting -- more than give times as much as the United States' 590 hours. And

11

Communist transmitters are four times more powerful, on an average than ours. The Communists are also exploiting every possible channel of television, books and magazines in translations of the local language, cultural and education exchanges, and a wide variety of people-to-people contacts. The Communist bloc spends as much on propaganda in Latin America as we spend on our entire world-wide information program.

Last June I stood up in the Senate and called public attention to our "propaganda gap." I warned against obsolete military, political, and psychological thinking and planning and against the dangerous tendency to measure power in terms of guns and missiles and divisions of troops and nuclear warheads. These are factors of national power and vital elements in our shield of defensive strength. But there is a tragic lack of understanding and lack of emphasis on the most powerful weapons, the weapons of ideas, which the Communists are exploiting to the maximum. I believe the time is overdue for a tremendous increase in our overseas information and cultural programs and in our student exchange efforts.

Question: Would you like to see any changes at all in the mass media of the U. S. ? Such as more government control over radio and television to curb these media from what some believe can be called their present excesses? Do you advocate any type of control of the newspaper trade?

Answer: I would like to see more public service broadcasting on radio and television and better enforcement of the present regulations of the Federal Communications Commission. The "payola" scandals indicate the danger of excessive control over broadcasting by advertisers.

I oppose any controls over news gathering and news dissemination by newspapers or broadcasters. The free press is fundamental to American democracy.

-12-

Question: Do you feel it is good or bad for the country that we have only two major parties?

Answer: The division of political responsibility between two major parties is good. It promotes responsible party government and American democracy simply cannot operate without political parties.

Question: What do you feel was the fundamental reason for your loss in the primary contest against Senator Kennedy? Do you have any future plans to run for President?

Answer: The fundamental reason for Senator Kennedy's victories in the primary contests is his strong, attractive personality, and I must add that he worked hard and campaigned vigorously. Jack Kennedy is an able, intelligent, vigorous, patriotic American, and I am not at all ashamed of the results in the Wisconsin and West Virginia primaries.

Furthermore, I believe our primary contests made a vital contribution to the liberal platform adopted by the Democratic Party at Los Angeles. In our primary contests, Senator Kennedy and I discussed and defined the issues facing the American People, and we set the stage for the Democratic Party to accept the best platform report any political party has ever written.

No, I do not have any plans to run for President in the future.

ANSWERS TO THE MINNEAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE QUESTIONS  
TO  
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Question: In your opinion -- what is the single most important domestic problem that will face the 87th Congress?

Answer: Economic slowdown will be the most serious domestic issue facing Congress next year. Right now business activity and business borrowing are slowing down -- business profits are being squeezed -- homebuilding, mortgage lending, and installment debt all show that American economy is in serious danger of sliding into a full recession. And I think you will find many hard-headed business forecasters are warning that the present economic slow-down may turn into something far more serious.

Agriculture continues to be in serious economic trouble. The cost-price squeeze, along with the mismanagement of the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory and ineffective price-support programs, have reduced farm income and purchasing power.

Question: Should budget surpluses be applied to reduce the national debt or provide individual tax cuts?

Answer: It depends of course on the size of the surplus and the consistency of the surplus over a period of years. Tax cuts should take priority if the business forecast indicates



recessionary trends or economic slow-down. If the economy appears strong, then the federal debt should be cut.

Question: There is considerable talk about major tax reform on the Federal level. What specific tax reform measures would you suggest?

Answer: I want early action by Congress to ease the tax burden on small business. We should have a graduated corporate income tax to give substantial tax relief to all business firms with taxable incomes of less than \$100,000 and especially to those firms with taxable incomes of less than \$10,000. The objective of the tax relief should be to provide from earnings the capital needed for expansion.

But we must also plug up some of the glaring tax loopholes which result in the loss of billions of dollars of tax revenues. Tax reforms should include, among others, interest and dividend withholding, tighter controls on business expense allowance and revision and reduction of oil and mineral depletion allowances.

If we expect the American people to respect and obey the law, we must make sure that our tax system does not give unfair advantages or favored treatment to a small minority of taxpayers.

Question: Do you favor putting the postal system and the federal highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis with adequate postal rates and sufficient highway user taxes?

Answer: In general, I believe we should keep government operations on a pay-as-you-go basis. Certainly we must make postal operations just as efficient and economical as possible. However, postal service is a public service. It is an aid to commerce, to agriculture, to education and science. To place it on a continuous self-supporting basis would impose serious hardship on rural users, educational, cultural and charitable institutions, and others.

Similarly, highway construction can and should be financed largely with highway user taxes, but we should remember that a highway is a national asset, a capital asset for the future. No businessman would hesitate to invest in equipment that will increase his income, and we as a nation should be willing to invest in a good highway system to build up our national economy. A highway program is a basic part of our defense and security system and therefore requires financing, in part, from general revenues.

Question: How serious is the "adverse balance of foreign payments and gold outflow" situation, and how will it affect our national credit and monetary policies?

Answer: Our success in restoring the economy of Western Europe with the Marshall Plan means that we are now getting more



competition in international trade -- but we still have a substantial program of military and economic aid to other parts of the world. Actually, our commercial balance of payments is sound -- it is the foreign aid program which gives us an over-all adverse balance. The gold outflow from the United States is a temporary short-run response to higher short-term interest rates in Western Europe, but this situation is already changing as short-term interest rates in the Western European money markets drop closer and closer toward short-term interest rates in the United States.

I foresee a trend toward over-all balance of this country's foreign payments as our present favorable balance of payments on the commercial account increases and covers the deficit we produce with our foreign aid programs. I believe the Federal Reserve has over-emphasized the dangers of inflation and has neglected our real source of strength -- our ability to produce efficiently and our ability to compete effectively in world markets.

Question: Do you feel that present defense expenditures are adequate?

Answer: No. We are lagging seriously in our capacity for anti-submarine warfare -- we need to increase our airlift capacity -- we must speed modernization and increase mobility of our conventional weapons so we can deal

successfully with brush-fire situation short of all-out nuclear war. If Congress had not pushed support for the Polaris submarine missile program in recent years, our retaliatory capacity against nuclear attack would now be seriously inadequate.

Question: Is the medical aid bill passed by the 86th Congress adequate? Why?

Answer: No. It fails to protect the vast majority of elderly people who are too proud to take a "pauper's oath" even though they have very small incomes. Furthermore, it is fiscally unsound -- it is an open-end authorization for spending millions of dollars from general tax revenues. I favor medical care for the elderly financed soundly and prudently through Social Security. Those not covered by Social Security should also be included in the program. The McNamara-Humphrey bill includes this provision.

Question: Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries?

Answer: Yes. Congress received overwhelming testimony about desperate the/need of many school districts to raise teachers' salaries. I want to make it clear that federal money will not go directly to the teachers. Federal aid will go through the state education agencies and to local school

districts which can then decide how to allocate the money between construction and teachers' salaries. This will increase -- rather than weaken -- local control over education.

Question: What specific improvements would you make in the current labor law?

Answer: We need machinery to protect the public interest in labor-management disputes which create national emergencies. Existing procedures under Taft-Hartley have failed to prevent or settle strikes seriously affecting the safety and welfare of our country. I favor establishment of fact-finding boards to give findings and recommendations concerning emergency disputes to the President, the Congress and to the general public. This would encourage voluntary settlements, preserve free, collective bargaining, and focus attention on the public interest -- without government dictation or compulsory arbitration.

Question: How could our foreign aid program be improved?

Answer: We must shift our emphasis from military aid to economic and technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We can use our food abundance to help speed industrialization and we should share our technical know-how in health,

and education with these countries. I also want to see the industrialized countries of Western Europe and Japan contribute more to economic progress in the less developed nations. We must work more through the United Nations and such regional agencies as the Organization of American States

Question: Will you vote to continue reciprocal trade agreements?

Answer: Yes, I support the reciprocal trade program. However, we should realize that while the nation's welfare as a whole benefits from this policy, there are certain industries which suffer serious injury from increasing imports. Therefore, I have sponsored and am working for "trade adjustment" to help industries and business firms develop new and different lines of production with loans, accelerated amortization privileges, technical information, and market research. Reciprocal trade benefits us all, and therefore we should all share the costs of adjustment to this national policy.

Question: What do you think the United States can do to successfully compete in world markets.

Answer: First let me make it clear that we are already competing very successfully in world markets. We can do better and we should do better.

How? By investing in new equipment. By investing in

skilled workers. By investing in research and development. By cutting costs with new management techniques.

The United States has the most efficient mass production economy the world has ever seen -- and I expect America to continue its world economic leadership. Of course, we must avoid inflation. But businessmen who look unhappily at lower labor costs overseas fail to realize that foreign workers get less because they are less productive.

Question: What specific proposals could you advance to solve the farm surplus problem?

Answer: This question seems to make the assumption that the main farm problem is "farm surplus", an assumption with which I do not agree. Agriculture's problem is lack of income, and our farm abundance is one of the factors involved. It would be improper for anyone to claim he can give you the answers to improving and stabilizing our complex agricultural economy in a few simple words, for it involves far more than slogans or "curealls". It involves first of all a real desire to improve farm income, then a willingness to use an array of means and methods, administrative and legislative, to work toward that goal. Any businessman in the Chamber of Commerce engaged in the

grain trade knows that decisions of the Department of Agriculture can move prices upward just as easily as decisions have moved prices downward, regardless of legislation on the books. But this question was aimed primarily at surpluses, so I shall direct my reply to that subject. The reply is: Use them!

There is too much loose talk about surpluses without defining whether we mean government holdings, ~~being accepted~~ total supply in excess of demand at a given price, or total supply in excess of existing human need. Present government policies that force supplies through government hands instead of into private inventory prevent government holdings being accepted as any real indicator of "surplus".

Our first task is to make a realistic appraisal of our needs as a nation -- for cash markets at home and abroad, for protective security reserves, for developing and fulfilling international commitments to bolster the free world, and for relief feeding at home and abroad. When this is properly done -- and it has not been properly done -- then and only then we can honestly appraise how much supply management control is needed to avoid waste of resources in producing beyond any possible use or need.



Question: Can any Congressman seriously believe that farm supply and production can be balanced without ~~some~~ economic hardship in some of the small communities?

Answer: I doubt if many Congressmen or Senators think so, but apparently most Chamber of Commerce groups and the Republican party does for that has been the basis of the Benson-business approach to agriculture for a long time. It is simple to say all that is needed is to bring supply into balance with demand -- but it depends on what you mean by demand. If you mean the same as the steel industry means -- holding down supply enough to get the price you feel you are entitled to -- then not only small communities but every city in America would suffer from such a restrictive farm production pattern. It is time that city farm critics woke up to realize that the greatest consumer safeguard we have for reasonable prices is more than enough at all times -- and the greatest security blessing our country has is its abundance of food and fiber in a world of need.

The only question is whether or not the ~~farmers~~ should be asked to bear the brunt of the cost of this assurance to consumers and the nation alone, or whether a public interest factor is involved in making sure we have enough for all possible needs.



Question: Mass production is generally the best way to lower costs. How can we expect to compete by lowering and restricting production?

Answer: Again, your question simplifies in a generality what is really a more complex question. Certainly maximum production should be the goal of our economy -- in steel, as well as agriculture. Paraphrasing your question, how can we expect to compete with Russia by lowering and restricting steel capacity to around 50%, as at present?

The answer is one thing from a national standpoint, and perhaps another from the steel company's standpoint interested in profits. The same is true of the farmer. As I mentioned before, the final answer rests on how willing we are to face up to the public interest involved, and find other ways to protect the individual producer. But if by mass production the question indicates the belief that a change is needed in our production pattern, away from individual family enterprises and toward corporate, absentee ownership, to gain lower-cost efficiency, I disagree.

In the long run our family farm system of agriculture is our best assurance of abundant food at reasonable prices. Most of the so-called efficiency of big mass operations is based on cheap, imported labor. If this becomes the dominant pattern of American agriculture, I am sure we can

expect eventual unionization of farm laborers for their own protection, just as happened in the growth of industry. In time the low cost production factor would be wiped out, and consumers would be paying more than ever for food -- with the threat of strikes always hanging over our food supply. Our farm pattern is unique in its combination of managerial and labor force in the same family; we should be cautious about changing our nation's food production pattern to one in which management and labor are separate forces.

##



# 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)