

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.

WARNER BUILDING, WASHINGTON 4, D. C.

METROPOLITAN 3200

LEWIS W. SHOLLENBERGER

DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EVENTS  
WASHINGTON

May 9, 1950

*WHS*

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
Senate Office Building  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Humphrey:

We were delighted to have you with us on "Capitol Cloakroom" last Friday night. From all reports the program was well received and very much of a success.

For your information, we are enclosing a copy of the transcript. Please accept our thanks for your cooperation, and we hope very much that you can be our guest again in the future.

Sincerely,

*Lewis W. Shollenberger*

THE COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM

CAPITOL CLOAK ROOM

Friday, May 5, 1950  
10:30 - 11:00 P.M.

ANNOUNCER: CAPITOL CLOAK ROOM. From Washington, CBS presents another interview with an outstanding member of Congress, who will answer questions put to him in an informal and unrehearsed manner by three CBS correspondents. Tonight's guest is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, from Minnesota, and asking the questions are, Griffing Bancroft:

BANCROFT: Senator Humphrey, why has this session of Congress made no effort to repeal the Taft-Hartley act?

ANNOUNCER: Bill Shadel:

SHADEL: Senator, is there any real chance of passing civil rights legislation this session?

ANNOUNCER: And, Allan Jackson:

JACKSON: Senator, do you think all the McCarthy charges can be disproved?

ANNOUNCER: And now here is Mr. Bancroft.

BANCROFT: Senator Humphrey, welcome to Capitol Cloak Room.

HUMPHREY: Thank you.

BANCROFT: We've got a lot of ground we want to cover tonight so let's start right away with that first question, why do you think in this session of Congress there's been no effort made to repeal the Taft-Hartley act?

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Bancroft, I would say that we have had no new election since the last attempt was made to repeal the Taft-Hartley act, there's been little or no change in the complexion of the Congress or in its political attitudes.

BANCROFT: But isn't that in your campaign platform?

HUMPHREY: Indeed it is, and may I say that the Democratic platform is a platform not just for 2 years but I trust for 4 yrs. and - also think it should be noted that a real determined effort was made to

repeal, we came rather close to it, at least on one section, in the Senate. The record has already been established in the Congress, I believe that the merits of the argument indicate that the reasons for repeal are valid and sound, and I'm convinced that following the next election that a determined effort will be made to repeal the Taft-Hartley act and to substitute a more constructive body of labor law.

BANCROFT: Well, Senator, then what about these charges on the other side that you've laid off this thing in order to keep it as a campaign issue in next November.

HUMPHREY: Well, may I say that I think those are just charges and I would say to the opposition that if they would be as kind with their cooperation as they are with their charges we would have had the Taft-Hartley act repealed.

BANCROFT: Well, <sup>whether they're</sup> ~~what were their~~ charges, or not, nevertheless it will be a campaign issue.

HUMPHREY: Oh, indeed it will and those are good political charges, I mean they smack well of well seasoned politics. But the real issue here must be taken to the American people again. Those of us that fought for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley act felt that we had a people's mandate from the last election. The opposition said we didn't. And I believe that one of the best tests of the veracity of our respective statements is to go back to the American people and we will definitely make it a campaign issue, we'll bring it out into clear and sharp focus and no one can have any doubt as to where the respective candidates stand on this issue.

BANCROFT: Then you have saved it as a campaign issue.

HUMPHREY: Now we have not saved it as a campaign issue, the opposition saved it - had they given us a couple more votes they would not have been a campaign issue.

SHADEL: But, Senator, all legislation is a matter of compromise, you don't get all or nothing.

HUMPHREY: Oh, indeed, you're right, indeed you're right.

SHADEL: Why wasn't the majority willing to compromise on the various proposals that came before the Senate?

HUMPHREY: May I say that the majority would not only compromise but the majority offered a very constructive program; we not only advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley act, but we substituted in its place the Thomas bill.

SHADEL: Well, Senator Taft was willing to make some 23 concessions was he not?

HUMPHREY: Well, I would say that the testimony of Senator Taft was possibly the best testimony we had as to the ineffectiveness and the undesirability of the Taft-Hartley act, I believe it was 28 changes, and when you can find 28 things wrong in one law in 2 year period it indicates to me that there must be something basically wrong with it.

BANCROFT: Well, Senator, then I'd like to ask you just on this - what exactly in the last 2 years since the Taft-Hartley act went into effect what has labored suffered as a result of the Taft-Hartley act? Where has it suffered?

HUMPHREY: I think primarily in the Southern part of the country where we have already had testimony before a special sub-committee of the senate labor and public welfare committee that the organizational problems are much more difficult, that it's been well nigh impossible to make any progress. Likewise, I might point out ...

BANCROFT: Do you think that's directly due to the Taft-Hartley act?

HUMPHREY: Yes, I think at least the Taft-Hartley ... oh yes, there's always been some problem, there is the problem obviously of community environment and community standards and there's no doubt but what it is always difficult to organize in a new area. But you see - under the Taft-Hartley act you have all of these so-called unfair labor practices and all that an employer and a union - either one - have to do is to

file a complaint of an unfair labor practice and you have the docket jammed with them and in the meantime everything is held in abeyance, nothing can go on. We had testimony where unions had been established, where the employer filed an unfair labor practice complaint and by the time that complaint was acted upon by the National Labor Relations Board the union had been dissolved, its funds had been used up, its membership disintegrated and they had to start all over again. Now I say to you that that's what I call free collective bargaining, it's sort of free reign on a adjudication in a legal process.

SHADEL: Are you really going to make the pitch this coming election now for enough members to change the Taft-Hartley act or will that be held over to '52?

HUMPHREY: Oh no, no, no - I want to say there's going to be a determined effort made to ...

BANCROFT: How long can you save this as a campaign issue?

HUMPHREY: Well, frankly - I don't think you can save it too long, I think that's a very fair and honorable question and I have been one to believe that we should make every effort ... every effort humanly possible and politically possible to fulfill our platform commitment and if we can't fulfill the platform commitment we will have to recognize that the American public does not see the same as the political leaders of the Democratic party. But I believe that the next election will be a true test of whether or not our position in the platform was sound.

JACKSON: Senator, on that score now - the next election - do you think these present charges by Senator McCarthy will figure very prominently in the campaigning?

HUMPHREY: I hope that they won't but I gather that that is one of the purposes of the charges.

JACKSON: Well, I understand that Senator McCarthy is making two speeches this week-end and that he expects to say that he wants more than the State Department files, which the President has agreed to ~~xxxx~~



release.... (inter.)

HUMPHREY: Well, when Senator ... excuse me ...

JACKSON: Do you think that all of the McCarthy charges can be disproved?

HUMPHREY: Well, first of all may I make an observation on the two new speeches that Senator McCarthy will make this week-end. It seems that most of the difficulty that we now have is the result of another week-end speech at Wheeling, W. Va., and I think what Senator McCarthy should first do is to tell the American people whether or not he really said that there were 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department known by the Secretary of State. I want to paraphrase what the junior senator from West Virginia had to say on the floor of the senate just a few days ago....

BANCROFT: Senator Neely.

HUMPHREY: Senator Neely in a very brilliant presentation. Senator Neely said this that if there are 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department known by the Secretary of State the Secretary of State should be impeached and that he would be the first to join with him and I want to say I'll be the second ... I'll be right in there crowding for front place. But if there are not 205 card-carrying Communists then indeed the gentleman who made the statement as by his own statement lost all the confidence of the American people and should lost it.

SHADEL: But what if there are only 55, Senator?

HUMPHREY: Well, if there are one ... if there's one. Senator McCarthy went down so far as to say that he finally would rest his whole case upon one Communist in the State Department who was a super-spy not just an ordinary Communist but a part of a super-spy ring. But let me go back now. First of all - the Senator from Wisconsin has said there're 205 card-carrying Communists ...

SHADEL: That's what he calls your numbers game.

HUMPHREY: Well, that may be a numbers game but after all first of

all we have to establish whether or not that's a true statement, did he say it or didn't he? There are two affidavits that were brought to the attention of the Senate by the director of programs of a radio station that carried the senator's speech and by the editor of a newspaper, in which newspaper the column was making this particular quotation. Now either these affidavits have been falsified and the director of programs of the radio station and the editor of the paper are wrong or the senator from Wisconsin is wrong, and I think we ought to have that cleared up first. Because if there is falsehood on the first statement, I think that somewhat prejudices the case from there on out.

JACKSON: Well, Senator, isn't there some way that the Administration in particular can take a more positive stand on this to either if as the Administration says the charges are false to prove it .. put the case across.

HUMPHREY: Let me just go into that. We come back now to 205 down to 81 down to 57, I think that was the sliding scale of the numbers game that the Senator from Wisconsin talked about, and then finally we got down to 1. But the fact is the American public has been aroused and I don't blame them, if there are 57, 81 or 205 Communists ...

BANCROFT: Or one - you said.

HUMPHREY: Or one, that's right. Now what should the Administration do. The Administration - this isn't just an Administration challenge, this is a challenge as to the integrity of the institutions of free and representative government and I think this ought to get out of the realm of politics but I'm afraid some people want to play politics with it, so the committee has been established by a resolution of the Senate, a special sub-committee chairman - by Tydings, of Maryland, who is doing an exemplary and excellent job - now it's the purpose of that committee to hear all of the evidence and I believe that Senator McCarthy should present all of his evidence and should present it clearly, forcibly and without all this hodge-podge jumping around, just come up and clearly

present it, then what should the Administration do? - wait to see what the committee finds in terms of the evidence as it is presented.

SHADEL: Do you think the burden of evidence is entirely on Senator McCarthy?

HUMPHREY: No, but ...

SHADEL: Now that the public has been aroused - don't you think the committee has a responsibility to find evidence in its own right ...

HUMPHREY: It has the responsibility to search for evidence but the gentleman, who brought the charges first, has the great responsibility to follow through ~~xxx~~ on those charges.

BANCROFT: Well, Senator ... (inter.)

HUMPHREY: Now, what do I believe about this? I believe that the security of this country insofar as subversives are concerned in our respective departments of government is adequately protected by an agency in this government, which is equipped by training, experience and background and methods and techniques to protect it, namely, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

BANCROFT: Well, Senator, for some years you were mayor of Minneapolis, <sup>had</sup> an administrative officer, and ~~have~~ a lot of people under you in that administration, could you be sure always that there wasn't 1 Communist in your city government?

HUMPHREY: No. As a matter of fact, I don't recall that we had any loyalty tests, and I'm sure that no one can be sure that there isn't one Communist even in this building or in the next building next door ...

BANCROFT: Or on this program ...

HUMPHREY: But I'm sure if you please ... well, I think we'll excuse ... unintelligible ... (laughter) .... I'm sure though that when it gets down to being able to investigate as to who is a Communist or who isn't one that I prefer to trust the investigation not to the self-appointed fearless Fosdicks and amateur junior police but preferably to the established experienced organization in our government that has known how



to deal with espionage, that's known how to deal with traitors, that has known how to deal with subversives, namely, the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

BANCROFT: Well, then you think that you're safe in saying that you don't think there is 1 Communist in the State Department?

HUMPHREY: I think I'm safe in saying that ... I think I'm saying that there's not 1 Communist or known Communist in the State Department.

BANCROFT: Then you have answered the question, you don't think any of Senator McCarthy's charges can be proven?

HUMPHREY: I believe that the evidence ... that this is just an opinion because I surely am just resting my opinion upon my faith and confidence first of all in a loyalty board (sic) in a loyalty program in the department in a Loyalty Review Board that is made up of men of fine character and headed by a distinguished lawyer, who is not of my particular political opinion or faith, I mean I understand that he's a member of the Republican party, a former assistant attorney ...

BANCROFT: You mean J. Edgar Hoover.

HUMPHREY: No, I'm talking about Mr. Richardson now, Seth Richardson ..

BANCROFT: Oh yes, whammam.

HUMPHREY: Now that's the loyalty review board; first, you have your inside board in the department then your Loyalty Review Board and then you have your Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I can't help but feel, gentlemen, that these men are just as concerned about the security of this country as any United States senator and I ...

BANCROFT: But, Senator ...

HUMPHREY: And I can't ... let me just say this ... I can't help but believe that if J. Edgar Hoover knew that there was one man in the State Department that was a Communist, who in any way could jeopardize the security of this country that not for a single minute would he withhold that information to even hold his job. That job isn't that precious to him.

JACKSON: Well, Senator, we have another investigation now by the

House Un-American Activities Committee, of a man an employee of the Commerce Department, who was suspended because of Communist charges ...

HUMPHREY: Yes.

JACKSON: ... investigated by the government loyalty program and then reinstated.

HUMPHREY: Mhmmmm.

JACKSON: ... now his case is up again.

HUMPHREY: I believe that's Mr. Remington, isn't it?

BANCROFT: William Remington, yes.

JACKSON: Is that a reflection on the loyalty review program itself?

HUMPHREY: No, I wouldn't say that's a reflection upon the loyalty review program - the Congress of the United States has a right to investigate anybody any time they want to or any issue, and I'm sure that they will continue to investigate, as a matter - speaking of the House committees, I think you'll find before this investigation is through in the Senate the so-called McCarthy episode that the 81 cases that the senator from Wisconsin cited as being bad security risks or being Communists - I believe that's what his citation was that those 81 cases were once reviewed first by the House Expenditures Committee and the House Appropriations Committee and that the chairman of the subcommittee that did the investigating in the House said that all of these men were cleared and clean and that they were a good worthy government servants, now we dust off those files and bring them out again and that's supposed to be some new evidence. Gentlemen, that doesn't sound very new to me.

SHADEL: Senator, coming back to the F.B.I., you're well aware of the fact that the suspicion does not ~~rise~~ rest on the investigative agency but on the fact that the Administration may not want to prosecute.

HUMPHREY: Well, I want to say to you, Mr. Shadel, this that it seems to me that this Administration has been more vigilant and been more militant in investigating Communists and communism and subversive elements in our

government than any administration in the history of this country. And I think it's to the credit of our President that he without the action of Congress set up a loyalty program, a complete testing program that was severely criticised by many people in many areas, and that I think it's to the credit of the Department of Justice that Mr. Hoover under no circumstances or any time has been under political influence, that he has maintained himself as an honest man of great integrity and sincerity to do his job.

SHADEL: But, Senator, he cannot prosecute though.

HUMPHREY: No, he cannot prosecute.

SHADEL: And it's up to the Administration to do that.

HUMPHREY: But I want to say ....

SHADEL: In the case of the Amerasia case the criticism is that it was not followed through, it was not prosecuted completely.

HUMPHREY: Well, I just want to say this - I have enough faith in the honor of Howard McGrath, the Attorney General of this government of ours, a former United States Senator, a man of deep religious conviction and as far as I know of impeccable integrity and character, to believe that if there was a Communist in a department as vital to this government a Communist that people knew to be a Communist, and that is the charge of the Senator from Wisconsin, that the Secretary of State knows that there are Communists there, that if there were such people in the department that the first man in this country to expose that would be the Attorney General of the United States, because by the nature of his religious faith, by his political convictions, he would be the most ardent enemy of communism, and secondly, I for a single moment will never believe that Mr. Hoover, J. Edgar Hoover, who has a reputation of the finest quality and whose reputation for rotting out subversives in this country is one beyond reproach, would ever for a single minute play politics with this.

SHADEL: No, but what could he do?

HUMPHREY: What could he do? Well, if it was what Mr. McCarthy says

that it's a No. 1 Communist agent, the super spy, I think I know what Mr. Hoover would do, he would say to the American people through the press, if need be - over the radio or television, that, ladies and gentlemen, of America, fellow citizens, I say to you that there is a Communist in the State Department that is fundamentally effecting our security and if the price of my job is political loyalty to administration I resign tonight and expose them, I honestly believe that.

BANCROFT: Well, Senator, ...(inter.) ... would be over then wouldn't it?

HUMPHREY: His usefulness would not be over, as a matter of fact he'd be one of the great American heroes, because a Communist in my book is a traitor .... (several speaking simultaneously)

BANCROFT: ... Alger Hiss case then in that case, which is what they always come back to ... (inter.)

HUMPHREY: I don't know ...

BANCROFT: There is one that was apparently overlooked ... (inter.)

HUMPHREY: One that might have been overlooked or it may not have been overlooked, the question is was the Justice Department working on this case.

BANCROFT: I don't know.

HUMPHREY: I don't know either, and I think that the Alger Hiss case has beclouded this whole issue because everybody's a little bit afraid, and may I make my statement quite clear that if Senator McCarthy can prove and if the committee can find that there are Communists in sensitive agencies particularly in the State Department or any department of our government that Senator McCarthy will have performed a great service for his country and I will be one of the first to publicly testify to his service and I will be one of the first to testify to the service of the sub-committee of investigation. But, with equal candor I say that if they cannot prove it and if this is nothing more or less than just a barrage of intemperate and let me say of irresponsible



charges and accusations then I shall be one of those that shall join in condemnation of the procedure, because believe me what's happening in this country today, gentlemen, more than just this Communist issue is the creating of a cynicism and an indifference and sometimes an apathy about the institutions ~~them~~ of free government. And I think the thing we need to worry most about in America today is not just the Communist and his threat - to be sure that's a threat - but also how much respect do people have for their government, not the Democratic party, we're not talking about that, but for their institutions of their government, how much respect do we have for law? - how much respect do we have for the institutions of representative government? - and I think we're getting less respect because of this kind of activity.

JACKSON: Well, Senator, I think that brings us back to another problem that aside from the validity of the charges themselves, the problem has been thrust upon the Administration to come up with a positive answer of one sort or another.

HUMPHREY: That's right.

JACKSON: I was out in your part of the country the first part of this week, it was a flying visit and I didn't get a chance to see very many people, but those with whom I talked expressed concern not because they believed or disbelieved the McCarthy charges but they felt well where - as the saying goes and has gone - 'there is so much smoke, there must be fire.'

HUMPHREY: Isn't the problem on the Administration now to come out and expedite a positive answer?

HUMPHREY: The problem of this Administration is to present the truth. I don't want any political answers to these charges, I want the truth, and I think the President by releasing the files of the State Department to the committee has performed an admirable service.

BANCROFT: Well, Senator, weren't those files all released .. former committees 2 years ago?

HUMPHRIES: That's correct - but those are the files that have the information.

BANCROFT: Can you disassociate this thing from politics?

HUMPHREY: I imagine possibly that we can't, but I want to say that charges such as these are not only shocking the American people and worrying the American people and creating a lot of uncertainty and doubt, but they're also making us look just a little bit ridiculous in some of the other capitals of the world, where we're supposed to be a brave, intelligent, courageous, poised people and here we seem to be just quaking and quivering all over because somebody makes a charge that there may be one Communist in one department, while in Norway if you please, they even elect them to Parliament - I'm not advocating that, but the Norwegians don't seem to be quivering and quaking; Finland sits right alongside of the Soviet Union; in Great Britain, they had them running for office, and in other countries, and I might say the Scandinavian countries are pretty good examples of democracy and I would say they're good examples of good people too.

SHADEL: You have a few Scandinavians in Minnesota ....(inter.)

HUMPHREY: And we're very proud of them - thank you, gentlemen, I really am proud of them.

SHADEL: Senator, can we ever remove the civil rights issue from politics?

HUMPHREY: No, I suppose not, simply because politics in its best is the inter-play of forces amongst people of opinion and attitudes; in politics, we choose up sides as to a set of attitudes, so I suppose it will be in what we call politics, which means partisan politics and inter-party politics too.

SHADEL: Well, coming to that opening question then, is there any real chance of getting civil rights legislation this session?

HUMPHREY: Yes, there's a chance, there's a chance.

SHADEL: What kind of a chance - 50-50?

HUMPHREY: I don't think it's that good a chance, sir, and I think the main reason for it is that this session will possibly be recessed or adjourned within reasonable limits of time, secondly, that the decision of the Administration has been ~~that~~ to take up fair employment practices as the first item of legislation, which is, of course, one of the most difficult bills to pass. I do believe that we have the votes to pass a constructive and effective anti-lynching bill and I believe that we could pass an anti-poll tax.

BANCROFT: Well, Senator, I wanted to ask you about that, why do you think then did they choose to bring up the FEPC bill first which as you say is the toughest of them all to pass.

HUMPHREY: Because it's the basic piece of legislation.

BANCROFT: Well, why don't you start ... (inter.)

HUMPHREY: It is the one basic piece of legislation in the civil rights fight plus the fact it's the one piece of legislation around which there's the greatest amount of controversy and the greatest amount of as one senator says 'demerit' but as I say of 'merit' and it's the one piece of legislation that will probably test if you please the cloture rule, which was adopted by the first session of the 81st Congress.

BANCROFT: But let me ask you this then, Senator, you say that there's less than an even chance of getting the FEPC bill through and therefore of getting any civil rights through, whereas you also say that you could get through - if you took it around the other way around-you could get through an anti-lynching and anti-poll tax. Wouldn't it seem logical to do those ~~thir~~ first things first that you can get through?

HUMPHREY: No, I don't think it would seem logical to do those first things first.

BANCROFT: You're sure there's no politics involved .. (inter.)

HUMPHREY: Oh, there's some politics involved, of course, there's the politics of seeing whether or not this cloture rule that we have is an effective cloture rule that we have is an effective cloture rule to break

a filibuster.

BANCROFT: You're sure you're not trying to put the Republicans on the spot?

HUMPHRYE: Oh, it wouldn't hurt a bit to put them on the spot, if you please, because to be quite frank with you, they were instrumental in changing the rules of the Senate this new cloture rule and they've also been a bit instrumental may I say in kicking around the civil rights issues as a political issue, now I don't say they have any monopoly on that. ... (laughter) ...

BANCROFT: I know but is it to the benefit of the people at large to put the Republicans on the spot or would it be more to the benefit of the people at large to have an anti-lynching bill and an anti-poll tax bill and let's forget putting the Republicans on the spot for a moment.

HUMPHREY: Well, I think the benefit of the people will be served by finding out whether or not the rule of the Senate which doesn't seem to make very much sense to the average layman but surely makes a lot of trouble in the United States Senate, whether or not that rule is the kind of a rule that the proponents said that it was: one, a rule, namely, that would make possible the breaking of a filibuster and would expedite legislation because even though we bring up a poll tax, now I say that I think we could pass a poll tax bill ....

BANCROFT: Well, then why don't you ... (inter.)

HUMPHREY: I think we could pass an anti-lynching bill more readily, but to get a chance to bring it up we will have exactly the same problem that we got on FEPC. You see what I mean - I mean there are more votes I think available for a poll tax measure, more votes available for an anti-lynching measure, but the first thing we've got to do is to get a motion on the floor to bring up the bill and that's where your first filibuster comes and that's the filibuster that we're faced with right now on FEPC.



BANCROFT: But, Senator, would it not be easier to break a filibuster and to impose that cloture rule on anti-poll tax or anti-lynching than it would on FEPC.

HUMPHREY: No, not on the motion to bring up, not on the motion because you don't ... on the motion to bring up you're not debating the merits of the bill as such, what you're doing is on a parliamentary situation to decide whether or not you can bring a bill up before the Senate - now I don't know how many of our audience understand that the first thing we have to do in the Senate is to move to bring up a bill.

BANCROFT: I think they understand it.

HUMPHREY: Yes.

BANCROFT: But then are you saying that you think it will be as easy to get through an FEPC bill as it would to get through ... (inter.)

HUMPHREY: No, I say it would be as easy to get FEPC off ~~aff~~ from the calendar unto the floor as it would to get an anti-lynching bill off from the calendar unto the floor or an anti-poll tax bill off from the calendar unto the floor. I say that once we get it unto the floor that it will be easier to pass an anti-poll tax or an anti-lynching bill than it will be an FEPC bill.

BANCROFT: Well, then my question still stands, why don't you take up the thing that will be easier to pass first?

HUMPHREY: Well, because first of all we have to get the issue up for a debate. ... (several speaking simultaneously) ... It has to be done in either case and the real issue - to be very frank with you, gentlemen, I didn't come here to play games with you ... (laughter) ... to be very frank with you, the main reason for it is because FEPC is considered by the minority groups of this country and by the Democratic leadership to be the basic issue in the civil rights program, No. 1; No. 2 is that as long as we have to be faced by a cloture rule such as we are faced with let's test that cloture rule not with a piece of legislation around which there is not such great controversy, but let's test it with a piece of legislation

that will be really meaningful and really effective once that it is passed.

BANCROFT: You're sure, Senator, you don't want a campaign issue left to ... (inter.) ... (laughter) ..

HUMPHREY: I want to say this and I think both political parties are going to wake up some day to find out if they're just kicking these civil rights issues around for a campaign issue that they're going to be faced with another political party. I just don't think you can keep teasing people year after year with a campaign issue like that, that's my best conviction.

JACKSON: Well, Senator, can we move on to another subject here particularly the international situation - we have some conflicting views here on the situation: - President Truman says that it has improved and Senator Tydings says it is not so improved, what is your feeling on that?

HUMPHREY: Well, I must admit that there seems to be a good deal of conflicting testimony these days ... (laughter) ... These are days of uncertainty and sometimes there're days of opinions and even of misinformation. All I know, gentlemen, is that the international situation is not good, it apparently fluctuates somewhat like a child's temperature with a bad cold, it's a little hotter one day then it is the other or a little warmer, I hope that the President is right. I think possibly the President took some encouragement from the way that the May Day demonstrations were handled in Berlin, because I believe that Berlin in Europe is the powder keg, it's the potential explosive section, and the fact that the West Germans, the Germans of West Germany have stood solid against the influx of Communist political demonstration, I think gave some semblance of encouragement to the President. Also, I feel the fact that the Communist-dominated area didn't try to make more trouble than they did, gave the President some sense of encouragement. I think that the President is doing us a service when he doesn't constantly try to keep

us in a fever, a turmoil, and anxiety, but by the same token it is my personal conviction that we ought not to go to sleep, we ought not to get our guard down, let's not have any psychological preparation for a new type of Pearl Harbor, I mean let's remember that we're living in a very serious situation and that at all times our internal defenses ought to be strong, our economy ought to be strong and that our foreign policy ought to be militant.

JACKSON: Well, now, Senator, on the other side of the world, the Chinese on Formosa have again made an appeal - it came out today I believe - for quick American aid to help them withstand a possible invasion.

HUMPHREY: Yes.

JACKSON: Do you feel that that would help and that we should send it to them?

HUMPHREY: No, I ... it may help, but I think that we'd better make up our mind what would happen to us if we did do this. Formosa is not a great deal of distance away from the main body of China, and just as surely as we're gathered around these microphones, gentlemen, I imagine that the Communist government of China intends to make an assault upon Formosa just as they did upon the island of Hainan or Hainan however we pronounce it. Now if the United States government goes to Formosa, it better go there with the intention of winning because lost causes are not very happy causes.

BANCROFT: ... Mmmmmmm.

HUMPHREY: And if we go there we better not go therewith ~~name~~ what some people said 'with a little naval demonstration' or just a little contingent of troops or to go there with the spirit of just good will, we better go there prepared to fight; we better go there prepared to use Formosa as a base to lead in if you please unto the continent of Asia; we better prepare to make a frontal assault upon China, and, gentlemen,

that means World War III, now that's exactly what it means - there're no half way measures here, and the best way for this country to become involved in world war III is to get fooling around with naval units and troops on an island where let me say that isn't our island, isn't our base, we'd just been invited to come in to do what? - to save Chiang-Kai shek.

Now, I'm not a Chinese expert but I have a little interest in the security of the United States of America and I think if we're going to have to have a fight we'd better pick the time for it and we'd better not let somebody lead us around by the nose. And I hope that we don't have to have a scrap, that we don't have to have a battle, because world war II I don't think will be one that anybody wins - I don't think you and I will be around to find out who won, it'll just be ... the only good business after that war will be for the morticians.

BANCROFT: Senator, I'm afraid that's all the time we have and thanks very much, Senator Humphrey, for being with us tonight.

ANNOUNCER: From Washington, Columbia has again brought you a meeting in Capitol Cloak Room, presenting an outstanding member of Congress through informal interview.

Tonight's guest was Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, from Minnesota, and conducting the interview were 3 CBS correspondents: Griffing Bancroft, Bill Shadel and Allan Jackson. This is CBS ... THE COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM.  
ed. trans. P. Olszewska.





# 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)