

MARCH 6, 1951
654th BROADCAST

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 287 Stations of the ABC Network



Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Should Congress Limit Troops for Europe?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

HUBERT HUMPHREY

FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

COMING NEXT WEEK

**The Role of Labor and Business
In Our National Defense**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 45  \$5.00 A YEAR; 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 16 No. 45



Should Congress Limit Troops for Europe?

The Broadcast of March 6, 1951, from 9:00 to 9:45 P.M. EST, over the American Broadcasting Network, originated in Baltimore, Md., under the auspices of Beth Tfiloh Forums.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY—Democratic Senator from Minnesota, member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. In 1942, after several years of diversified experience, Hubert Humphrey was appointed State Director of War Production and Re-employment in Minnesota, and in 1943 he became Assistant Director of the War Manpower Commission in his region. During the next few years, as his participation in political affairs expanded, Mr. Humphrey served as daily news analyst and commentator for a Minnesota radio station, taught political science in a St. Paul college, lectured, and was nominated for Mayor of Minneapolis. He was elected to that office in 1945 by the largest plurality in the city's history and was re-elected in 1947. Senator Humphrey is a member of the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the National Citizens' Council on Civil Rights. He has just been re-elected Vice-Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action.

FREDERIC RENE COUDERT, JR.—Republican Congressman from New York City and member of the House Appropriations Committee. Frederic Coudert, a graduate of Columbia Law School, is a member of the law firm of Coudert Bros., New York City. He served as assistant United States attorney for the Southern District of New York from 1924 to 1925, inaugurating a long career of public service. From 1939 to 1946 he represented the 17th (now 20th) District, Manhattan, as a State Senator. During this period he was widely known as chairman of the Rapp-Coudert Joint Legislative Subcommittee to investigate public education in New York City. Mr. Coudert was elected to Congress in November, 1946, and was re-elected in 1948 and 1950. Congressman Coudert is a member of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the New York County Lawyers Association, New York State Bar Association, Nassau County Bar Association, and the American Bar Association.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 18, New York. Send subscription and single copy order to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year. (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00. (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00. (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1951, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

Should Congress Limit Troops for Europe?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. And many thanks to Governor Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin of Maryland for his cordial welcome to us on behalf of the Beth Tfiloh Forum. Tonight we are transferring the scene of the great debate from the nation's capital to the city of Baltimore, where Congressman Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., Republican of New York and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota will debate the question "Should Congress Limit Troops for Europe?"

Congressman Coudert introduced a resolution on the opening day of the present session of Congress designed to prevent the commitment of armed forces abroad in advance of aggression solely by executive decision.

The President instantly challenged this view and cited precedents to prove his right to send American troops abroad without the consent of Congress.

Then came Senator Wherry's resolution, now before the Senate, in substance the same as Congressman Coudert's except that it applies solely to the present situation.

This was followed by the proposed Connally-Russell resolution now being considered by the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee of the Senate, which approves action by the President to send ground troops to Europe without limitation. This resolution, we must remember, is not Congressional action but a Senate resolution of approval of the President's position.

The real issues in tonight's de-

bate embrace both a constitutional question involving the power of Congress in these matters and the very practical question of how we are to meet our obligations under the Atlantic Pact to countries of Western Europe.

We are grateful to Congressman Coudert and Senator Humphrey for their willingness to meet the issues of this debate openly and frankly here tonight. We'll hear first from Congressman Frederic Coudert, Republican of New York, who is a member of the House Appropriations Committee. Congressman Coudert.

Congressman Coudert:

Mr. Denny, ladies and gentlemen of the audience of Town Hall of the Air. This is no dry as dust legal question to excite lawyers' crocodile tears; it is a very real flesh and blood question. It involves the lives of our sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers. Who is to order them into the slaughter that is modern war? Is it to be the President alone, upon his sole responsibility, or are the people through their elected representatives in the Congress to have a say in the matter?

President Truman asserts the absolute and unlimited right to send American troops abroad, at any time, in any numbers, for any period, without the knowledge or consent of the Congress or of the people. This assertion of right is utterly without precedent. No other American President has ever asserted it. If the people in the Congress accept they will have accepted a far-reaching revolution in American life and government. They will have taken a long and

probably irretrievable step in the direction of irresponsible one-man government. Has the Truman administration's conduct of the tragic Korean War inspired the confidence of the American people to such a point that they now want to extend to President Truman and his successors unlimited power over lives of the men and women of America? I don't think so.

The wise men who framed our wonderful American Constitution gave Congress the power to declare war. They believed that they were striking a blow for peace by transferring this vital function from the executive to the legislature, representing the people who pay for war with their blood and their treasures.

The new Truman doctrine would now again seize that power for the executive leaving little in the popular government as represented by the Congress. In Korea, the President committed the United States to a bloody and expensive war, not only without the knowledge and authority of the Congress, but in direct violation of the expressed limitations of law passed by the Congress when it authorized membership in the United Nations. No European dictatorship could have more contemptuously disregarded the will of the popular assembly and the people which it represents.

The Korean War is still going on with no end in sight. Now the President is pursuing his claim of absolute right by planning to station large American forces in Europe without the authorization of the Congress. Such action would be another misuse of Presidential power. It would be in violation of the spirit if not the expressed

provisions of the North Atlantic Pact. In ratifying that Treaty the Congress undertook definite and limited obligations. The President is authorized to act within the scope of those obligations. In seeking to go beyond them he is again defying the Congress. Nothing in the Atlantic Pact either requires or authorizes participation of American troops in a permanent European Army.

Congress and the people must meet this challenge. It can be effectively met by reassertion of Congressional authority to impose a limitation upon the use of military appropriations by the President. I have introduced such a resolution. No one questions the constitutional right of Congress to take such action. It would restore assurance of orderly constitutional government which means continued participation by the people in vital national decisions.

The proposed Connally-Russell resolution in the Senate would not constitute Congressional action. Passage of it would constitute a shabby fraud upon the American people. They would be asked to believe that Congress has been consulted and had authorized Presidential action. In truth it would be but a blank check and a shameless acceptance of the President's fantastic bid for power.

Members of Congress and the people themselves should fight to the finish for the right of their elected representatives to participate fully in decisions for substantial military commitments abroad. The right to participate in such decisions is even more important than the question of whether troops should now go to Europe, and, if so, how many.

Eternal vigilance is always the price of liberty and, today, that vigilance demands that Congress retain some rein upon the President, and, therefore, impose limitations upon his power to send troops abroad.

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Coudert. Now we're ready for the other side of this question from Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. Senator Humphrey.

Senator Humphrey:

Mr. Denny, Congressman Coudert, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. Congressman Coudert is without doubt a very fine constitutional lawyer, but he will be the first to admit, I am sure, that on the constitutional issue which he raises here tonight there are as many constitutional opinions as there are constitutional lawyers.

The question as to whether the President as Commander in Chief, or the Congress should have the power to decide troops movements does not now face the American people since the Congress is in fact now debating and is soon to act upon a resolution dealing with the question of troops to Europe.

The basic question facing the American people is, first, should we send troops to Europe and, second, if so, should the Congress limit the number of troops to Europe.

My answer to the first question is, "Yes," we should send troops to Europe. The defense of West-

ern Europe is essential to the defense of the United States. Western Europe and the United States represent the muscle, the fiber and the tissue of the forces of freedom. Communist aggression looks upon the countries of Western Europe as but the steps—the gateway—to a frontal attack upon the citadel of liberty, the arsenal of democracy, the United States of America.

The question, tonight, then is simply this: Where do we defend freedom against the constant pressure and the force of communist totalitarianism? Shall 150 million Americans undertake this task alone or shall we join as willing, strong, and full-participating partners with our friends and allies in Western Europe where the battle line has been drawn?

Now let's make no mistake about it. The defense of Western Europe is the key to the security of the United States. With the people of Western Europe on our side, we have a combination that the communists cannot beat. But with Western Europe dominated by the Soviet Union, Western Europe's people enslaved, its resources exploited, its factories producing the materials of war for Russia, we will be faced with an overwhelming predominance of power.

Now military power today consists of manpower, industrial production, natural resources, and the will to fight and to resist. If Western Europe is lost to the communists, the majority of the world's manpower goes to the communist forces. If Western Europe is conquered or dominated by the Soviet Union the balance of industrial production goes to the communists. If we lost West-

ern Europe the overwhelming proportion of raw materials and critical supplies goes to the communists. If Western Europe is controlled by the communists, a spirit of defeatism and hopelessness will befall all of humanity.

Now the second question is: Should we limit troops to Europe? And I say "No." If the security of Western Europe is basic to the security of the United States then it would be sheer folly, yes madness, to limit the security by an act of Congress. World War II should have taught us, for once and for all, the lesson of "too little and too late." The events leading to World War II should now be conclusive evidence of the futility of halfway measures. Let this be perfectly clear, military assistance to Europe, troops for Europe, is in our own national interest. I for one refuse to seek bargain prices and cut-rate special deals when it comes to the defense and the security of the United States.

Congress has decided, through the North Atlantic Pact and the Military Assistance Program, the basic policy of our defense. Military leaders must, I say, decide technical questions of military strength and the troop movements.

In the struggle against communism we have today as our allies 175 million people in Europe who are with us under the North Atlantic Pact. They know that their homes and their lives cannot be defended without American help. And we know that it is to our self-interest to join with them in common defense. Our task is to lift their morale, restore their confidence and help give them strength. Our answer to them must be yes, an unqualified yes, that we will help. We cannot say "Yes, but . . ."

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Humphrey. Well, it looks as if you and Mr. Coudert have a few things to straighten out between you before we take the questions from this representative Baltimore audience. Congressman Coudert?

Congressman Coudert: Let me say to my friend, the Senator, that I quite share with him the belief that it is wholly desirable and important to hold Western Europe if that is possible. In principle, that question is not before us or between us.

The Senator makes the point that he would allow—he would have the generals determine how many troops and what kind of troops would be sent to the defense of Western Europe. Now let me call your attention to the fact, Senator, and to the audience, that we also have military obligations in the Far East, and in other parts of the world. Now does the Senator mean, that he is going to permit the generals to determine what military commitments we are going to make and what forces we are going to send to all of these parts of the world? And if his answer continues to be "Yes," does he not recognize that that means, in effect, turning over the government control of the nation, its resources and its manpower, to the generals?

Senator Humphrey: Well, I'm very happy to be able to answer that question of Congressman Coudert. I'll point to the history of this United States of ours, these United States. Every time we've had trouble in terms of a national security of this country it has been because Congress quit legislating and started being generals. Every time! Now I'm opposed to

generals legislating and I'm opposed to the Congress of the United States trying to think that it acts as the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the United States. The Committee on the Conduct of the War, in the War Between the States, from 1861 to 1865, almost wrecked the effort of the Union and may I point out that in the days of the Revolution the Continental Congress, when Washington was at Valley Forge, stood around talking about how many troops ought to be there, when Mr. Washington, General Washington was fighting for the life of this country.

Congressman Coudert: I take it the Senator agrees then there is very little brains in Congress and it might just as well be dissolved for his purpose.

Senator Humphrey: No, the Senator does not agree to that. The Senator happens to think that the broad policies which must be established, the fundamental decision of our foreign policy, the basic decision of whether we send troops to Europe is a legitimate question for the Congress. I submit that the Congress is not prepared either by training, background, or facts, to know whether or not there ought to be two divisions in Germany, one division in Italy, or six divisions in France. It just doesn't have that information.

Congressman Coudert: The Senator does agree that the fundamental policy of making military commitments abroad should be determined by the Congress, does he not? Now you can answer that yes or no.

Senator Humphrey: I do.

Congressman Coudert: Now, does the Senator recall that in

the United Nations Charter and in the Congressional Act ratifying our membership in the United Nations provision is made for a special agreement to set up an international army, which international army defines for each nation the number of troops and the kind of troops? That's in a Congressional Act. Now why, why doesn't your Administration and your President submit to the Congress, tomorrow, a treaty, an agreement with the United Nations like the Brussels Agreement based upon that United Nations' precedent setting out the numbers and character of the troops that we contribute to an international army and then let the generals run it after we've set it up?

Senator Humphrey: Well, I'll be very happy to give you my answer. My answer to that is simply this—that the size of an army depends upon the nature and the strength of the opposition, and what does the opposition do. Now if my friend, the Congressman from New York, can tell me what Joe Stalin is going to do and where he is going to strike, if he can tell me how many divisions Joe Stalin will send across Western Europe, if he can tell me where the Russians will strike in the Far East, if he can give me the blueprint of the Kremlin's action, then I'm willing to have Congress legislate down to the last platoon, company, brigade, division and regiment.

Congressman Coudert: Can you tell me a general that can give you that information? And yet you would give the generals the power to make the decisions and send two million men to Europe.

Senator Humphrey: No, I can say this—I can say this quite

frankly—that in the conduct of a war a general is generally a better military strategist than a Congressman or a United States Senator. I happen to believe that General Eisenhower as Supreme Commander has a little bit more information as to the science of war, as to the power potentialities of the Soviet and its aggressive instincts, than does the Junior Senator from Minnesota or the distinguished Congressman from the State of New York. And I say again, that once the policy has been laid down, that it's the duty of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, the Number One General—an elected general if you please—the Number One General under the Constitution to protect the national security of the United States.

Congressman Coudert: Senator Humphrey evidently doesn't agree with that very penetrating observation of a very great Frenchman, who saved France from disillusion and disaster in 1917, Georges Clemenceau. He said that war was too important a business to be entrusted to the generals. I say the security of the United States and the control over its people and its resources is too important to be left to the disposition of a few professional generals.

Senator Humphrey: I want to congratulate the distinguished Congressman from New York for his reference to the great Frenchman Clemenceau. I think that's very appropriate. But I want to say this, that the Congress of the United States is a legislative body on policy, the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief, and the President of the United States has control over the

generals of the United States. I am one of those who wants generals to lead the armies, and I want Congressmen to legislate in the Congress and not to get these things twisted around, vice versa, where generals legislate and Congressmen think they're corporals and generals.

Congressman Coudert: There is one other point I would like to make with respect to the remarks of my friend, the Senator. He apparently agrees that Congress should participate in making this decision. He evidently believes that the Smith-Russell resolution, pending, is such a participation and consultation. It's nothing of the sort. It's a sham and a fraud and does not represent Congressional action of any kind or character.

Senator Humphrey: Well, I merely want to say this, that in so far as the argument is concerned on constitutionality, it is my personal opinion that the President of the United States does have the power, but it is also my prudent opinion, and one that I believe to be wise in this great period of human history, that the Congress of the United States should participate in that decision as one of the coordinate branches of the Government of the United States. So I'm not going to argue with the Congressman as to who sets the policy. All I say is that once the policy is set, let the Congress continue to legislate and quit have it acting as if it were made up of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Humphrey. Now we will take some questions from the audience.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Man: Representative Coudert, why should the nation with the most at stake hesitate to place sufficient men and materiel where they may be needed to maintain our position?

Congressman Coudert: What nations does the questioner refer to?

Man: The United States.

Congressman Coudert: Does the gentlemen mean that the United States has more at stake in Europe than the French, or the British, or the Belgians, or anyone else?

Man: We have more at stake in the world because we have a higher standard of living than anybody else.

Congressman Coudert: Could anybody have more at stake than their lives and their liberty? That's what the French and British have at stake and so have we.

Senator Humphrey: I'm happy that the Congressman said what he did in just the last moment because, if the French and the British have their lives and their liberty at stake and if the French and the British are equal partners with us, then, believe me, we ought not to be trying to get cut-rate prices on this whole business of the defense of Western Europe.

And I want to agree with this young man that asked the question. No nation does have more at stake than the United States. This is the fountainhead of liberty and this is the ultimate objective for the dagger of communist imperialism—the United States of America. This is where they want to drive the lethal blow to destroy

us. Once that's done there'll be no more free world.

Man: Congressman Coudert, will Congress be guided by the opinion of our military experts in reaching its decision?

Congressman Coudert: Not necessarily, I shouldn't suppose. The Congress, if it were intelligent and did its job, would consider all the elements of the problem, including our own economic position, the extent of our resources, our manpower, and the demands upon those resources and manpower from the Far East, from everywhere in the world—not just one sector alone.

Lady: Senator Humphrey, do you feel that we should send troops to Europe? Are we militarily able to spread our troops to Europe as well as to Asia?

Senator Humphrey: I happen to believe that our prime area of concern in this world today is in Western Europe. I happen to believe that much of the action in Asia is diversionary action — to divert our attention from the major field of operation. And I want to say to you that the Western European defense is fundamental to our own security. Just to give you an example: steel production—for every ten tons of steel we produce, Europe produces six, Russia produces four. If we lost Western Europe, Russia would then have ten tons of steel for every ten tons that we have. Now with a 175 million skilled, trained, educated people, it appears to me, there is the place to put our emphasis because there is where Joe Stalin takes over the world, if he ever has a chance to take it over,

by conquering the European countries and taking over their people.

Congressman Coudert: I'd like to add to the answer to that question by reminding you that we are still engaged in bloody war in Korea with the Chinese. Are we committed in the Far East? Of course, we are.

Man: Congressman Coudert, please. Is it fair to our troops in Europe now to place any limitations on their Commander in Chief to send relief and support in great numbers if necessary?

Congressman Coudert: You're asking a question that could be easily answered in several ways. The simple answer to that is that somebody has got to decide what's going to be done with those troops in Europe, how far they ought to be reinforced, or whether they are to be withdrawn. I say that that is a question of major policy affecting the life of the nation as well as of those men themselves and it should be made by the Government of the United States which includes the elected Representatives in the Congress.

Senator Humphrey: I'd just like to make this observation that two divisions of American troops are now in Germany and the Congress didn't decide how many divisions would be there. Where was Congressman Coudert when that decision was made? Where was Senator Wherry of Nebraska when that decision was made? No, it was all right to have two American divisions in Western Germany, right up next to the Soviet troops, but now, when we're talking about the defense of Western Europe, somebody comes along and says, "Wait a minute, we'd better be careful how many we are going to send over there."

Congressman Coudert: I'm afraid Senator Humphrey is somewhat misleading in that answer. Do you remember we were at war with Germany once? Do you remember we're still at war and acting under the war power and a war that was declared by the Congress? And the Congress in the Declaration of War directed the President to do everything possible to carry it to a successful conclusion.

Man: Senator Humphrey, after our tragic experience in Korea, the so-called police war without consulting Congress, would you still give the President unlimited power to send unlimited armies to Europe and perhaps provoke another war—a major war with Russia which we are not prepared for?

Senator Humphrey: I'm happy to answer that question. First of all, may I say that I happen to feel that in this instance of troops for Western Europe that the Congress should be consulted. I also have stated, quite frankly, that I think the constitutional power rests with the President if he wishes to make the decision alone. Now as to Korea—this is one of the most difficult issues that faces an American public official or an American audience but I want my position quite clear. I think that the action of our country and the United Nations in Korea may well save this world from world war number three. I think that those men that have died on the field of battle in Korea are greater than the heroes of Lexington and Concord, greater than the heroes of any war in the history of America, because they are laying down their lives for the principle of international law and order, and it may well save the peace of the world by showing to the aggressors that aggression

does not pay, that the forces of decency in this world are not willing to backtrack and are not willing to appease regardless of sacrifice and the tremendous tragedy to those that are involved.

Congressman Coudert: I'd like to add a comment to that answer. Even if everything that Senator Humphrey has said is correct, the fact still remains that Americans were committed to a full war in Korea, without the authorization of the Congress, in defiance of a specific limitation of the Congress, and without the authority of the United Nations Charter.

Senator Humphrey: I merely wanted to point out this, that immediately after the President committed American forces in Korea, I was on the floor of the Senate, I was over to the House of Representatives, and I heard Congressman after Congressman and Senator after Senator get up and praise the President of the United States for his bold, his brilliant, his courageous action. And the press of this country, the public opinion poll showed overwhelmingly—over 85 percent—that the people of this country approved what the President of the United States had done. Now the times are more difficult. Now that it is a more difficult hour we have the Johnny-come-lately who says it never should have happened.

Congressman Coudert: I'd like Senator Humphrey to show me what action the Congress took to express its approbation.

Senator Humphrey: I'd be happy. I will refer to the action where the Congress of the United States, the House Military Affairs Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, of which my friend, tonight, is a distinguished member,

the Senate Appropriations Committee called upon the President, called upon the Chiefs of Staff, to hurry up and get the defense program going, to give us the bills, get these bills down here in the Congress, so we can appropriate the money. There was genuine enthusiasm. And may I repeat again the power of the Congress is, of course, to declare war and to raise armies and to tax for the common defense. But the power of the President of the United States, stated by some of the greatest men in our history, is the power to deploy our armies, to use them for the security of this country. And there are over one hundred instances in the history of the United States where the President has done that, even in the days of Thomas Jefferson, and the war between the Tripoli pirates.

I would remind my friend from New York, a great constitutional lawyer, that Thomas Jefferson declared war upon the Tripoli pirates—not declared war as a defense action—without the approval of the Congress of the United States.

Congressman Coudert: I'm sorry to have to differ with my friend as to the history of the matter but the fact is that President Jefferson instructed our naval forces merely to defend themselves when their ships were attacked by the Barbary pirates. Mr. Hamilton was very angry that he didn't do any more, but he said he couldn't do it without the authorization of Congress and he didn't get it.

Lady: Senator Humphrey, many of us feel that the President has plunged us into the Korean War by acting alone. By acting alone may he not plunge us in another war?

Senator Humphrey: No, the President did not act alone in the Korean crisis. The President acted under the obligations of the United Nations Charter. And I think it's to the eternal credit of this country, and to the eternal credit of the President of the United States, that we fulfilled our obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. And I do not consider it to be a blunder. I repeat again that despite the sacrifice and the tragedy that what is happening in Korea today may well save the city of Baltimore, and the city of Washington, D.C., and the United States of America, because the aggressor in Korea is finding out that it does not pay to be lawless, to be brutal, and to be ruthless, that the forces of decency in this world still have something to say and are willing to pay the price for human freedom and human liberty.

Congressman Coudert: The Senator's insistence that the Korean War is not just Truman's war but is a UN war, forces me to call your attention to the statutes, to the documents, to the authority. In the act of Congress authorizing our participation in the United Nations, and the use of American troops in a United Nations' force, there is a provision that the United States is authorized to enter into an agreement with the United Nations for provision of a military contingent—indicating the number and types of the armed forces, all to be made available to the United Nations—but listen, listen to the provision at the very end of that (there never was such an agreement, incidentally, it was never made)—here is the conclusion of the Statute of the Congress, "Provided, however, that nothing con-

tained in this section shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress, to make available to the Security Council for such purpose, armed forces in addition to the forces provided for in such special agreements," which "special agreements" were never made. So there were never any forces which the President was authorized to send to Korea and what he did he did solely as Commander in Chief. He can't hide behind the skirts of the UN.

Senator Humphrey: I would like to just point out to my friend from New York that there have been many constitutional decisions on the power of the President. For example, one of the most brilliant members of our Court, the late Supreme Court Justice Charles Evans Hughes, had this to say, "There is no limitation upon the authority of the Congress to create an army, and it is for the President as Commander in Chief to direct the campaigns of that army wherever he may think they should be carried on." And I would point out that the late Supreme Court Chief Justice William Howard Taft pointed out the President is made Commander in Chief of the army and navy by the constitution, evidently for the purpose of enabling him to defend this country against invasion, to suppress insurrection and to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. If the Congress were to attempt to prevent his use of the army for any of those purposes the action would be void. Again in carrying on as the Commander in Chief it is he who is to determine the movements of the army and the navy. Congress cannot take it away from him—that discretion—and place it beyond his

control or any of his subordinates. Now the President of the United States saw in Korea—saw in Korea a threat to the security of American forces in Japan. And there are divisions of American boys in Japan. Our legal obligation, if you please, is to defend that country under the Occupation Statute and the President of the United States acted in good faith to defend not only our forces in Japan, which he is morally and legally obligated to do, but also to defend the United States of America against aggression which was growing rapidly in the Asiatic world.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Humphrey. It looks like we have a constitutional debate after all. Congressman Coudert?

Congressman Coudert: Senator Humphrey seems to question the right of the Congress to limit the President in his functions as Commander in Chief. Let me remind him of the Conscription Act of 1940 on the eve of the war, where Congress specifically provided that the forces to be conscripted should not be sent abroad without the consent of the Congress. That consent was given after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Man: Senator Humphrey, you want to send an unlimited number of troops to Europe. Why can't we send only a number proportioned to the obligations of the other European countries?

Senator Humphrey: I want my position quite clear. I believe that the defense of Europe, of course, is basically in the hands of the European people. But I believe with General Eisenhower, General Marshall, I believe with General Lucius Clay, I believe with every single military man that has testified before the Congresses, before

the committees of the Congress, that troops to Europe, without limitation, will provide a greater spirit of resistance on the part of the Europeans, will give them the morale and the moral stamina to stand up and to resist, as they well ought to and as I'm sure they well will. I do not want to see our armies limited in this kind of a world where you have no idea what may happen tomorrow or a week from now. Here we are in a city. What would you think of it, if the City Council passed a resolution saying, that in case of a riot in the city of Baltimore, not more than two plain-clothes men and one ordinary police officer on the street corner shall be used for the riot—the Council thinking that the riot may be of about five or six people. But what happens if you got a five- or six-hundred-person riot. All I'm asking for is the right to manage the military power of this country for the security of this nation.

Congressman Coudert: I wonder what Senator Humphrey would do if General Eisenhower and General MacArthur between them asked for more troops and equipment in the East and the West than the entire United States could supply. Doesn't that render pretty ridiculous this business of leaving it to the Generals?

Senator Humphrey: I don't think an answer needs to be made to that question except to say that the record of General Eisenhower and of General MacArthur is a rather enviable record for reasonably good military judgment and also for a reasonable knowledge of the capacity of the United States to defend itself, to supply troops and production.

Man: Congressman Coudert, how can we safeguard necessarily secret preparations for troop movement if we must air our plans beforehand in Congress?

Congressman Coudert: Does the gentleman honestly believe that an American division could be sent all the way across the North Atlantic or the Pacific without the

Kremlin finding out about it?

Mr. Denny: Thank you very much, Congressman Coudert and Senator Humphrey, for your straightforward answers to the many questions that have been put to you here tonight.

So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Now that you have read the opinions of both speakers on the subject, "Should Congress Limit Troops for Europe?" you are probably ready to draw your own conclusions on this question. Before doing so, however, you may find the following background questions helpful in considering the issues involved in this topic.

* *

1. Would American troops constitute real military assistance, or would they be sent as a psychological and morale-building gesture?

2. Can the four divisions advocated by the Administration really bolster Western defense against the numerical superiority of Russian troops?

a. Are ground troops necessary to the defense of Europe?

b. Can Europe be defended solely by air and sea power?

3. Should the number of American troops be contingent upon the number supplied by Europe?

a. Should American troops be sent to Europe before Europe builds up her own armed forces?

b. Or, will our participation encourage Europe to proceed faster with her mobilization?

4. Will additional American troops in Europe incite Russia to the point of aggression against Western Europe?

a. Or, would lack of troops make Russia feel strong enough to launch a successful attack against the West?

5. Does the President have the authority to send troops to Europe?

a. Should Congress be consulted before troops are sent?

b. What is the relative importance of these constitutional technicalities when weighed against the debate and delays which would result if the question were placed before the Congress?



Mrs. Colclough spends nearly four hours a day on the telephone arranging Town Meeting programs

BEHIND THE CRIER'S BELL

On this page we take you "behind the scenes" of America's Town Meeting. We will welcome your questions about the program and your suggestions on what phases interest you most.

★

When millions of Americans tune in their radios every Tuesday night and hear the familiar call of the Town Crier, "Town Meetin' Tonight! Town Meetin' Tonight!" they little realize the vast amount of work and preparation that has gone into making the broadcast ready for the air.

Each program entails exhaustive research as to subjects and speakers on the part of a competent staff of experts. Ideas for Town Meeting topics spring from every available source—but principally from the news of the day, for the most part, and also from suggestions by listeners.

The Town Meeting staff maintains extensive files of clippings on all controversial questions and a list of possible speakers.

These program suggestions are routed through a research staff which screens them for public interest and available speakers. The results are placed before the program committee, consisting of Mr. Denny; Mrs. Elizabeth S. Colclough, Program Director; and Robert Saudek, Vice-President in Charge of Public Affairs for ABC.

This committee meets on call. The swift-moving events of the day require its three members to be in constant touch to make final decisions. The bulk of the responsibility rests upon Mrs. Colclough and her staff who are usually working on from four to six programs at a time. Mrs. Colclough and her two assistants read all varieties of newspapers, magazines and research reports ranging from the Congressional Record to the Daily Worker. They listen to all important addresses on the radio, forums and other programs, and make reports on their card files of potential future speakers for Town Meetings.

After a subject is decided upon, Mrs. Colclough consults her classified speakers' list and begins her search for two qualified spokesmen who hold opposing views on the subject. All Town Meeting

speakers must be well-versed in their subjects, preferably nationally known, and at the same time be able to speak well and handle themselves creditably during the question period.

It is often necessary to call as many as 20 prospective speakers to put together a single program. Mrs. Colclough may call many more to complete her research for qualified speakers. Previous engagements of prospective speakers constitute her greatest hazard.

Speakers accept on condition that they send in a rough draft of their speech at least five days before the Tuesday broadcast. This is not only for clearance as to network policy, but principally so that technical suggestions can be made as to revisions which will help present a coordinated, well-balanced program.

A speakers' meeting with the moderator is usually scheduled for 10:00 a. m. the day of each broadcast. Here the subject is thoroughly explored under the skilled leadership of Mr. Denny, who endeavors to see that each speaker deals with the really crucial portions of the subject under discussion.

During the afternoon speakers revise their speeches, and typewriters are busy right up to the hour of broadcast with last minute revisions.

The above is a condensation of one of the many informative articles appearing in "Good Evening, Neighbors," the 15th anniversary publication of Town Meeting. Copies are still available at one dollar each and can be ordered from Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

S T A T E M E N T
o f
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
o n
TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR BROADCAST
March 6, 1951

"SHOULD CONGRESS LIMIT TROOPS FOR EUROPE"

The question as to whether the President as Commander in Chief, or the Congress should have the power to decide troops movements does not now face the American people since the Congress is in fact now debating and is soon to act upon a resolution dealing with the question of troops to Europe.

The basic question facing the American people is, first, should we send troops to Europe and, second, if so, should the Congress limit the number of troops to Europe.

My answer to the first question is, "Yes", we should send troops to Europe. The defense of Western Europe is essential to the defense of the United States. Western Europe and the United States represent the muscle, the fiber and the tissue of the forces of freedom. Communist aggression looks upon the countries of western Europe as but the steps -- the gateway -- to a frontal attack upon the citadel of liberty, the arsenal of democracy, the United States of America.

The question, tonight, then is simply this: Where do we defend freedom against the constant pressure and the force of communist totalitarianism? Shall 150 million Americans undertake this task alone or shall we join as willing, strong, and full-participating partners with our friends and allies in Western Europe where the battle line has been drawn?

Now let's make no mistake about it. The defense of western Europe is the key to the security of the United States. With the people of Western Europe on our side, we have a combination that the communists cannot beat. But with Western Europe dominated by the Soviet Union, Western Europe's people enslaved, its resources exploited, its factories producing the materials of war for Russia, we will be faced with an overwhelming predominance of power.

Now military power today consists of manpower, industrial production, natural resources, and the will to fight and to resist. If Western Europe is lost to the communists, the majority of the world's manpower goes to the communist forces. If Western Europe is conquered or dominated by the Soviet Union the balance of industrial production goes to the communists. If we lost Western Europe the overwhelming proportion of raw materials and critical supplies goes to the communists. If Western Europe is controlled by the communists, a spirit of defeatism and hopelessness will befall all of humanity.

Now the second question is: Should we limit troops to Europe? And I say "No". If the security of Western Europe is basic to the security of the United States then it would be sheer folly, yes madness, to limit the security by an act of Congress. World War II should have taught us, for once and for all, the lesson of "too little and too late." The events leading to World War II should now be conclusive evidence of the futility of halfway measures. Let this be perfectly clear, military assistance to Europe, troops for Europe, is in our own national interest. I for one refuse to seek bargain prices and cut-rate special deals when it comes to the defense and the security of the United States.

Congress has decided, through the North Atlantic Pact and the Military Assistance Program, the basic policy of our defense. Military leaders must, I say, decide technical questions of military strength and the troop movements.

In the struggle against communism we have today as our allies 175 million people in Europe who are with us under the North Atlantic Pact. They know that their homes and their lives cannot be defended without American help. And we know that it is to our self-interest to join with them in common defense. Our task is to lift their morale, restore their confidence and help give them strength. Our answer to them must be yes, an unqualified yes, that we will help. We cannot say "Yes, but . . ."



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