

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF SEPT. 4, 1963

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING SEPT. 8

Ladies and gentlemen---

This is Senator Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you  
from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.....

This week the Senate begins an historic and important debate.  
The question is ~~proposed~~ ratification of the treaty banning tests  
of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, outer-space and underwater.

I have discussed this issue with you before. Most of you  
know that I have worked for a United States effort to secure a  
careful and safeguarded test ban agreement for the past seven  
years. I have participated several times in negotiations for a  
test ban in Geneva, Switzerland, most recently in February of this  
year. A few weeks ago, I journeyed to Moscow to witness the

(more)

signing of the treaty by representatives of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

Since then, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has conducted full-time hearings on the treaty's provisions. I and other members of the Committee have heard testimony from dozens of expert witnesses, including our chief government and diplomatic leaders, military officials and scientists.

The overwhelming preponderance of testimony from these witnesses pointed to the need for ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. The conclusion of almost all of the political, military and scientific officials was that the treaty is in our national interest and is consistent with our national security policy.

There has been time for those who have doubts or questions about the treaty to express themselves. I have respected those questions, and in the past several weeks have attempted to answer

(more)

them in my statements in Washington and my reports to you.

But right now---as the Senate begins full debate on the treaty---let me suggest that it is time to look at the positive achievements and opportunities represented by the nuclear test ban treaty. We are a positive-minded people, and I suspect that many Americans have heard enough about the risks and dangers, the weapons aspects, the military security problems and the scientific nuances of the treaty.

It is time for us to get back to a full understanding of the basic purposes and effects of the treaty.

First, the treaty---by ending atmospheric nuclear testing---will end contamination of our atmosphere by radioactive fallout.

Second, the treaty reduces the risk of accidental nuclear war.

Third, the treaty reduces the spread of nuclear weapons and the capacity to produce weapons by other nations.

(more)

Fourth, the treaty represents the first breakthrough in the field of disarmament and arms control since World War II, and is a first, practical step on a path which could lead to other significant safeguards for peace.

Let us never forget that the central goal of this nation in the world is a just and enduring peace. That is the reason we keep our military forces and strength. And that is the essential reason for the nuclear test ban treaty.

I expect that the Senate will reflect the widespread support by the American people for this goal, and will ratify the nuclear test ban treaty by an overwhelming majority.

(END)

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF SEPT. 10, 1963

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING SEPT. 15

Ladies and gentlemen---

This is Senator Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you  
from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

As I record this report to you now, the Senate is engaged in one  
of the most significant debates of this decade---on the treaty to ban  
the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, outer-space and  
underwater.

Last week, I reported to you the most important advantages of the  
nuclear test ban treaty to the United States and to the cause of peace.  
I stressed that this treaty will reduce radioactive fallout, that it  
will halt the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations, and that it

(more)



represents the first breakthrough in the field of arms control since World War II.

I know that many Americans are concerned about the military and scientific aspects of the treaty. It is my conclusion---after years of study and more recently after hearing the testimony of expert witnesses---that the nuclear test ban treaty is entirely consistent with our national security policies.

It is important for any citizen who has any doubts about the treaty to understand that the real experts---the men with all the knowledge necessary to reach wise judgments for the national interest---testified unanimously that the risks of the nuclear test ban treaty are not significant enough to offset the definite advantages.

Here are what some of those experts said to the Foreign Relations Committee:

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara: "The risks under the treaty are either small or under control...the values of the treaty are substantial

(more)

even if we consider only the military area. The scales are clearly tipped in favor of the treaty. It has my unequivocal support."

Here is what General Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said to the committee: "It is the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that, if adequate safeguards are established, the risks inherent in the treaty can be accepted in order to seek the important gains which may be achieved through a stabilization of international relations and a move toward a peaceful environment in which to seek resolution of our differences."

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, testified as follows: "There are some risks but they are minor. In the balance, the advantage is in favor of improving ~~our~~ <sup>the</sup> security of our country if we enter into this treaty."

Many other experts who have access to all, up-to-date military and scientific information, testified in favor of the treaty. They include John McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; Dr.

(more)

George B. Kistiakowsky, former special assistant for science and technology to President Eisenhower; Dr. Herbert York, former director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and Director of Defense Research and Engineering under both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy; and Dr. Harold Brown, present Director of Defense Research and Engineering for the Department of Defense.

The testimony of such men helped pave the way to Senate ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. But let all of us remember that the essential reason for the United States effort to secure this agreement and for the Senate to ratify the treaty is that it represents hope for peace and mankind, it brings light to the darkness of anxiety in the nuclear age, and that it is a step forward for peace.

The step may be modest, small and shaky. But so is the first step that a baby takes in his lifetime.

(END)



MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF SEPT. 18, 1963

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING SEPT. 22

Ladies and gentlemen---

This is Senator Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you  
from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

As I record this report to you, the Senate is nearing the end  
of its long and careful debate on the nuclear test ban treaty.  
There is no question now that the Senate will ratify the treaty---  
and by an impressive margin of votes.

The treaty is a modest but significant step ahead in our  
Nation's quest for safeguarded peace. And it is the first major  
breakthrough in the field of arms control since World War II. At  
this time, I am proud of the Senate and proud of the Nation. Today,

(more)

the United States stands before the world with proof<sup>o</sup> of its dedication to the cause of peace.

A part of our strategy for peace, of course, is the maintenance of strong and up-to-date defense forces and facilities. The United States must continue to spend immense sums for our defensive strength.

That is the subject of a report released this week by a Senate Small Business Subcommittee of which I am chairman. My subcommittee spent weeks studying what we call the "Impact of Defense Spending on Labor Surplus Areas." We conducted hearings at which the top economic experts in this area testified. The result of this detailed and extensive study are disturbing, and challenge us in the government to adopt new policies and programs for defense spending.

You will remember that both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have emphasized the importance of placing enough defense contracts and military bases in our areas of high unemployment to help boost the local economic opportunities of those areas.

(more)

It has been the avowed national policy of this country to place a proper number of defense contracts in economically-distressed areas---but this policy has been a complete failure. My subcommittee reports that more than 12 per cent of our people live in areas of high unemployment---but only four per cent of all defense contracts are awarded to those areas.

The report also concludes that shifts of defense spending from one region of the country to another have actually created a significant number of economically distressed areas. From the Korean War years to 1961, the shift of emphasis from weapons, ammunition and tank-automotive equipment to missiles and electronics facilities has decreased the share of defense contracts in the East-North Central States from 27 per cent to 11 per cent.

The danger, of course, is that defense contracts have been moving more and more to limited areas of the country---namely California and sections of the east coast---leaving in the wake many new areas of

(more)

high unemployment in other areas of the country.

The Nation has a responsibility to continue massive defense programs to maintain our strength in a world challenged by totalitarianism. But the Nation and the government at the same time have a responsibility to coordinate its defense contracting programs to assure that one area of the country does not profit economically at the expense of another.

My subcommittee report concludes with a series of recommendations designed to halt and reverse this pattern. I am determined to work for implementation of these recommendations to assure success for the policy of setting aside a reasonable number of defense contracts for areas with high unemployment.

(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)