

TV SCRIPT - September 18, 1963

BOB COAR~~S~~: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Today the Senate Majority Whip reports to the people on his work here in the Senate and on his work of the Congress. Now here is your Senator, Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, thank you. As I film this report to you the Senate is moving very close to final action, to ratification of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. A subject, of course, which has been discussed widely on many of the television and radio networks and through our press and periodicals. This is one of the great moments of the Senate. We have had the opportunity during the discussion and debate on the nuclear test ban treaty to review American foreign policy, to have a systematic, and, indeed, a very detailed review of American military strength, of our scientific achievements in the field of nuclear energy and particularly, nuclear weapons.

Many Senators, in fact, I believe all Senators have spoken their views on this treaty, what they believe the treaty means for our country, for the world. What the limitations are and what the positive achievements or assets are. And I would like for a very brief moment, to summarize these views as I see them, and give you my considered judgment on the debate and on the treaty. The treaty will be ratified it will be ratified by an overwhelming vote of support in the <sup>U</sup> S. S. One of the most gratifying developments is to be found in the public opinion polls relating to the nuclear test ban treaty. In July,

for example, it is estimated that only 52% of the American people were in favor of this treaty. But as the treaty was discussed, as the signing took place in Moscow, as the treaty was placed before the Senate by President Kennedy, as the hearings before the three committees of the Senate---the Foreign Relations, the Armed Services, and the joint Committee on Atomic Energy---developed and witnesses were heard, public opinion, public support grew for the treaty. And now we find that 82% of the American people in the most recent survey say they support this treaty unqualifiedly, and 11% more say they support it with qualifications, and only 6% have expressed strong opposition. This is most unusual, and at the same time most gratifying. Now let me just tell you what I think this treaty does.

First, it is a limited treaty; it is a treaty that is designed to affect nuclear tests, nuclear weapons tests in the environments of the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. It prohibits the signatories to the treaty---and there are now over 90 nations that have signed---from giving any information relating to nuclear weapons or nuclear explosions to any other country. It prohibits all such explosions, it prohibits all such tests except those underground where there will be no radioactive debris that can go into any other country. So it has limited purposes, and because it has limited purposes, those who have been for this treaty have sought to keep out of it and off of

it any reservations or amendments or any items or substance that doesn't relate to this specific treaty. This is a first step in the process of peace, it's a small step, a faltering one, to be sure, but it is a significant one. It's the first major agreement between ourselves and the Soviet Union since 1955---the Austrian Peace Treaty---unless you would add to that the Antarctic Treaty, of 1960 or 1961. But this first step is highly significant if the treaty is abided by, if the nations live up to it, and I think that they will. I think they will because to cheat under this treaty would open the nation to scorn by all of humanity, and there really would be no need to cheat, because there is a withdrawn provision in the treaty---namely, that if it is found to be absolutely essential for a nation's survival and it's own national interests, that it can serve notice on a 90-day basis that the nation is withdrawing from the provisions of the treaty. So why cheat? when you have a legitimate way of being able to withdraw and thereby, of course, to serve notice on other nations that testing can be undertaken by all countries who wish to do so. But this treaty, as I said, has limited purposes, and limited, possibly limited goals and limited effect. But what it really does is create a better atmosphere in the world. It creates a more reasonable attitude amongst nations, and it has already had this effect. You can see it in your press, you can see it in our relationships today with the Soviet Union and with other countries. I would add one other thing: that there



are some positive achievements of the treaty itself. I have letters from people back home and they say "Well, Senator Humphrey, you said there were some politico-pluses, that is some political achievements in this treaty, that one had to take into consideration," There are. What are they? Well, this treaty will prevent radioactive fallout, at least it will inhibit the growth of radioactive fallout. Now we don't know what radioactive fallout means yet. We know that it isn't good for us. We have scientific evidence that it leads to leukemia and all sorts of malformations of the human being---if there is too much of it. All we do know is that it is not good for us. But we do know that if you continue to test, that the radioactive debris collects in the atmosphere and what goes up must come down. And when that radioactive debris starts to come down, the fallout, it will take its toll on human life and plant life. Now this treaty will inhibit, yes it will slow down, it will ultimately prevent radioactive fallout. If it did nothing else than that it would be good. Secondly, it will slow down the spread of these weapons because you can't build nuclear weapons, if you are a new country at it if you haven't built any other weapons in the nuclear field, you can not start to build nuclear weapons without testing. To prohibit testing in the atmosphere will slow down the nuclear arms race. It will slow down the spread of these weapons, and I tell you that is worthwhile too.

And more than that I think it will do something else, it will lend itself to the thoughtful more responsible discussion of the other big issues in the world that face us. The issues that almost precipitate this world into nuclear conflict. It is a step towards peace, and the treaty does not weaken us militarily. The scientists that have testified have pointed out that we have a superiority in weaponry over the Soviet Union, that it will no more inhibit us than it does the Soviet. To be sure it does put some limitations upon the development of new weapons. But the limitations is upon the Russians as well as upon us. And those who have come to us: Dr. Harold Brown, for example, Dr. Kistiakowsky, Dr. York, Dr. Bradberry, Secretary of Defense McNamara, the great scientists with one or two exceptions, have all supported this treaty. Our chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our top military officers with two exceptions out of the top fourteen, have supported this treaty. The former President of the United States, General Eisenhower, supports this treaty, as does President Kennedy. This is an American treaty, it was our initiative, it was our draft treaty. We asked for the conference, we negotiated the treaty, we have been trying to get this kind of a treaty for eight (8) years. So when I hear people say that we're selling out to the Russians, or that we are weak on Communism, or that we are sacrificing our security, I can't take much stock in that. I do not believe that General Eisenhower would support a treaty if he thought that it weakened our security.

Nor do I believe that President Kennedy, or former President Truman, I don't believe that former Sec. of State~~s~~ Herter, ~~P~~resent Secretary of State Rusk would support this treaty if it violated or injur~~e~~d our security. I can't believe that the top military officers of this government would have ever supported this treaty if it weakened our, or threatened our security. And in truth they do support this treaty which indicates to me that it is good. I think that it is good for America, I think it is good for my family, I think it is good for your family, I think it is good for our state of Minnesota, for our nation, and for the world. And I am going to vote for it. And I am going to do it with a happy heart. And knowing that I am doing the right thing.

Now what can this offer for the future. Well that is where we ought to take a look. I don't think we ought to suspect any great developments in the area of peace for the future, this is a tough world in which we live, but there are signs of hope. This treaty itself is like a flickering candle, and I have said in the Senate that it was a candle of hope, a light, and I didn't want to put it out. I want to keep it alive. And that candle of light, light of hope possibly lights the way for other development. The 18th session of the general Assembly of the United Nations is now open. A



distinguished citizen of the Republic of Venezuela in Latin America is the new President, dedicated to freedom and democracy. This session of the General Assembly looks like it might be a very rewarding one. The Russians have come with a much more, well, let's put it this way, a much more sensible and reasonable attitude this far. They may change. But at least thus far. And I think at this session of the General Assembly and in our relationships with the Soviet Union, we ought to take the initiative. Let's not sit back, ~~streg~~ stagnate, let's not worry lest we make some move. We need to get our foreign policy in movement, to make it an active foreign policy. And I would suggest a few areas of endeavor that might ~~be~~ be worthy of our consideration, and that we ~~we~~ ought to try to work out with the Russians.

First of all, the Russians can prove their desire to make a better world and to ease international tensions if they will pay up their dues to the U. N. And we ought to insist upon that. And that the Russians ought to help pay the cost of the ~~peace~~keeping operations, which they have refused to do up to ~~K~~ now. And I predict that they will. I think they have made up their minds that they ought to do these things. Then we ought to join in the United Nations with other countries---particularly with the Soviet Union because it is an advanced country scientifically---in the development and exploration of outer space. Let's have a great international year, an international outer space year, for the exploration the peaceful development of outer space. Let's keep the heavens for peace ~~rather~~ rather than for war. But we ought to prove our scientific

knowledge and our scientists in this effort. It is very costly and there is so much to be learned. Thirdly, we ought to ask the Russians to join with us in the exploration and the landing on the moon. What do we want to get there along for? Why not have this a joint operation of any country that wishes to join with us? But the Russians are trying to get there, we are trying to get there, we are going to have to spend 35-40 billions of dollars on this effort. Why not pool the scientific knowledge and the costs? For a lunar probe or lunar exploration shot---a moon shot, as they call it---why not? If we can't get along with the Russians on the moon, how are we going to get along with them down here. It seems to me that this makes sense. Then, I think we ought to press further in the field of educational, cultural, economic, scientific exchanges between our respective countries. The more Americans that go to Russia the better. Let them see us, let them hear us. And we need a few of them over here, too, to take a look at freedom and democracy and capitalism at world. Let them see our factories. And finally, let's step up the trade between the East and the West. For example, why not sell some of our wheat, some of our food products to the Russians if they have the money to pay, and they do. We have seen that this past week.

Time forbids me saying more. All I can say now is "thanks for listening, it's been good to be with you, see you two weeks from now."

END



[Sept. 22]

TV SCRIPT

BOB COAR: This is Washington and this is Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota. Today the Assistant Majority Leader reports to you on an important issue of the Administration. Congress and the people.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you very much. There is seldom a dull day down here in Washington. Just about the time we finish<sup>ed</sup>/up our discussion, our final action on the nuclear test ban treaty--- which, by the way took us about a month---we find ourselves deeply involved in other matters of international policy, or domestic policy. Right now, the news headlines tell us about military juntas or military coups of Latin America, and about the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union to other communist countries. Could I just say a word about both of these with more emphasis upon the wheat sales to the Soviet Union by our friends to the north---the Canadians---and the effect of this action upon American policy. I have always been, and continue to be, a strong proponent and a strong supporter of what we call the Alliance for Progress. This is our cooperative working program with our neighbors to the South in Latin America. For better than a generation, we have neglected this part of the ~~xxxx~~<sup>world</sup>, that is neglected it in terms of our national and international interests. But in recent years, the advent of Castro helps us to see what can happen

when a dictator who has communist tendencies and finally takes on a communist program, what such a dictator can do. We took a new interest in the problems that affect the lives of the many millions of people south of the Rio Grande. Because of this, we have developed what we call the Alliance ~~of~~ for Progress, we have a program of technical assistance, educational assistance, development loans, all sorts of activities, including the Food for Peace Program, the Peace Corps, and others, working in Latin America. Regrettably, some of these countries are very weak democratic institutions. Many of them have been victims of not only poverty and illiteracy, but of dictatorships over a long period of time. Dictatorships that have corrupted the body politic that have corrupted the standards of public demeanor ~~and~~ and of public action. We witnessed this, for example, in the Argentine where there was the dictatorship of Peron for so many years. We have seen it more recently in the Dominican Republic where the Trijullo dictatorship, for better than 25 years, literally corrupted the entire society. Fortunately, in the Dominican Republic <sup>free</sup> and in the Argentine, ~~the~~ elections were held and in the instance of the Argentine, a new president will be placed in office as a result of an election in the month of October. We, of course, have had all kinds of difficulties there; the Argentinians have had to go through a great deal of difficulty. ~~Butchered~~ But closer in in the Carribbean and the Dominican Republic, a few months ago an election was held and a fine gentleman by the name

Juan Bosch became the newly elected and the first elected president for better than a quarter of a century of the Dominican people. I attended that inauguration, it was a very inspiring sight, because you could see the desire of freedom and liberty in the eyes and in the faces of the Dominican people. Now, that president has been kicked out of office, so to speak, by a handful of gun-toting machine-gunning colonels and generals in the military establishment of the Dominican Republic. All kinds of forces coalesced and destroyed this representative democracy, and we are seeing it again in Honduras, I predicted this some time ago. Now, what does this mean. It means that this government must draw the line on these military dictators. I for one don't believe we ought to give <sup>them</sup> one penny not one nickel. They'll be up here asking ~~us~~ us for help, they'll be asking us to bail them out in terms of their treasury needs, and I have extended my advice both to the President and the Secretary of State, and indeed to my colleagues in the Congress by saying that these military juntas violate every tradition of our country; they represent an attack on American policy of the Alliance for Progress. They represent tin-horned dictatorship; they represent a backward step in this continent and this hemisphere; and that we ought to have nothing to do with them, except to try to destroy them. And how? By cutting off all economic aid, by not giving recognition, official recognition to these regimes, and by doing whatever we can without going to the point



of direct military intervention, of seeing to it that these juntas, these military coups, and military dictators are thrown out of office. And free elections and constitutional government is respected. I thought you would like to know what my point of view is on it, because I am going to ~~vote that way~~ vote that way, and I thought that I owed it to you to tell you why I ~~will~~ shall vote in the manner in which I have just discussed. I am thoroughly ~~disgusted with~~ disgusted with this kind of development in the Latin American countries, area, and I think that our country should draw the line and make it perfectly clear that we will not ~~countenance~~ countenance this, that we will not condone it. That we will not help, as a matter of fact we will do everything to defeat it. That we will try to stop this trend which is becoming very dangerous. It was in Peru, in Ecuador, in Guatemala, in the Argentine, and now in the Dominican Republic. Too much, my friends, too much of this going on, and it will only lead ultimately to more Castros in Latin America. The next country could be Venezuela, and then it could be Brazil, and if this continues, communism will have won its victory. So the time to draw, the time to put the pressure on is now. Well, now let me talk to you about the second item. Wheat.

We know a great deal about wheat in America, we ought to we have a lot of it. We have over a billion bushels of it in surplus in the Commodities ~~ES~~ Credit Corporation, and we have several <sup>hundred</sup> millions/ bushels in private hands and

andon the farms of America, and we have another big crop coming in of over a billion bushels, and we have a new one coming up for 1964. So we had quite an interest in wheat, we also know a little about the Soviet Union, that we have had to face up to the power of the Soviet Union, its treachery, its aggressive instincts, to all of its political chicanery and duplicity over many years. So when we talk about doing business with the Soviet Union, we know what we are talking about, we know what kind of government is in the Soviet Union, is in the Communist bloc countries. So that whatever is said is to be understood within the framework of the knowledge that we have of the communist countries. Now what is the situation that relates to the wheat sale today. It has been in your newspapers and you have heard it on radio and television. Well, first of all the Soviet Union has had a crop failure. I recorded this by the way, when we came back from Russia, it didn't make any headlines, but you didn't have to be too smart to know that if you have hot, dry weather, and bad weather, you are going to have trouble in your wheat country. There are new lands in Siberia that have been plowed up where very much like the plains of the Dakotas. And without any soil conservation measures, without any real care of this soil, these lands after four or five years became the subsoil -- yes there is a dust

bowl in Russia, in Siberia, and the Russians today are short of their wheat crop by many millions of tons. There is bread rationing going on in Russia, and there is a shortage in Bulgaria there is a shortage in Poland, there is a shortage in Hungary, there is a shortage in East Germany. There has been serious crop failure, not only because of weather, but because of the collective farm system, because of the inefficiency and inadequacy of the so-called collective type of agriculture which you have all heard about. Thank goodness for what we have -- this private American family farm agriculture with the farmer and his cooperatives trading in his own local town, and his local merchants, what a great system this is. There is nothing like it. We have surpluses but that is a lot less onerous, and a lot less bothersome may I say, then having to go out and around the world to find enough to eat. The American farmer has done mighty well by this country, providing us with the security of an adequate food supply for ourselves and for our friends and for other peoples throughout the world. Now the Canadians sold to the Soviet Union \$500 million dollars worth of wheat. This ~~big~~ sale was one of several that have taken place, time forbids me to review it all, but as you know the Canadians have sold Communist China wheat some years back. The Germans have been selling the Russians flour, the French have been selling them flour, other countries have been doing business with the Soviet Union, for example, the non-Communist countries



last year did over \$5 billion dollars worth of exports to the Soviet Union and her satellites. \$5 billion dollars-- at the head of the list is West Germany with <sup>750 million, ~~12~~</sup> ~~\$1,100,000,000~~ Great Britain with \$393 million, France with \$320 million, where was the U. S.? Well, we sold \$125 million dollars ~~worth~~ worth of goods to all of the Communist bloc countries last year. That was mostly for ~~six~~ small pieces of manufactured materials, food stuffs and drugs and medical supplies. Now we haven't been doing ~~much~~ much business, yet we have a number of mills that are not fully used, we have 5 million people unemployed, and here we got to point where we had to think about whether or not it was in our interest, in our national interest now, to make available these excess wheat supplies that we have to the Soviet Union and the Communist countries in Eastern Europe if they could pay for it. Now I qualify my remarks by saying that I am not talking about giveaways, I am not talking about long-term credit, I am talking about the Soviet Union having gold or dollars, or hard currency that is willing to pay on the barrelhead, so to speak, gold bullion on the docks, delivered to the United States or any other form of <sup>convertible hard</sup> currency. If she has that, should we sell ~~her~~ her wheat? Well now if we don't the Russians will get it anyway, they will get it from the ~~Russians, the~~ Canadians, or the Australians, or the French, or the Germans, or the Danes. Much of the wheat will be bought from us, because we have no restrictions on selling to the Germans, then the German flour mills process

this wheat into flour giving workers jobs and making a little profit from it, and then they sell it to the Soviet Union. Now why is that alright, and yet to ~~the~~ other people it isn't alright for the United States of America to ~~sell~~ the flour directly, to give some jobs to our workers, to use our flour mills, to permit our people to handle these commodities, to do business, after all they have to pay taxes. You see, what I have been recommending and I have recommended that our government change its policy. A policy which today which prevents the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union ~~and~~ the Communist bloc countries. I have said "take off that limitation," and let the American free enterprise system go ahead and do business in this area of foodstuffs. You don't shoot wheat at people, these aren't bombs, these aren't guns, food is for peace for life. Not for war and destruction and death. I don't think we ought to look upon wheat as something to be confused with the cold war, so to speak. I think we ought to look upon it as a ~~good thing~~ god-given blessing, of our daily bread. And if we can do no normal commercial business I am speaking now of normal commercial relations where we benefit from sales and from profits, where our balance-of-payments improves that is where our foreign trade improves, our exports are improved, where our surpluses are used up, where our farm storage costs are cut back because they surely would be, and where our Federal budget is reduced because we spend now millions of dollars storing and buying this wheat, if we could sell lets say 2 or 3 million

dollars worth of wheat, do you think this would change the balance of power in the world? do you really believe that this would make the Soviet Union so strong that we would have to stand in fear of her? I don't think so, particularly if the Soviet Union stepped out and bought the stuff from someone else anyway.

Senator Humphrey, in a sense, has taken a political risk, yes, I did what I thought was right. I suggested that we start acting like Americans who believe in the free enterprise system, to permit our businessmen to do business to permit our farmers to produce instead of being under stifling controls and regulations where we tell them to take fewer acreage, take acreage out of production and yet our Canadian neighbors to the North, they plant more acres. It doesn't make much sense. I suggested, in other words, ~~X~~ that we think of our national interests on the one hand, and then possibly to trade, we might even be able to improve the international climate that we can ~~and~~ discuss things a little more sensibly with other people, especially the Russians. Well, I made this recommendation and I hope that by the time this telecast gets to you, our government will have changed its policy, that we will be able to do business. Until then, two weeks from now, I must say thank you and goodbye.

END





# 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)