



# *Youth Wants to Know*

Founded and Produced by Theodore Granik

*Vol. I*

*SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1953*

*No. 9*

## **Youth Wants To Know Presents**

*SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY*

*Democrat, Minnesota*

*STUART FINLEY*

*Moderator*

*Announcer: The National Broadcasting Company presents YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW, a program dedicated to the principle that the future of America rests with the young people of our nation, and to help resolve some of the questions in their minds, here is Stuart Finley, speaking for Theodore Granik, founder and producer of YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW. Mr. Finley.*

*Mr. Finley: Excuse me, Senator Humphrey. As we now come on the air, I would like to welcome you to our program.*

*YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW is having as its guest today, Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. Senator Humphrey, the young people participating in our program here, presented under the auspices of the American Legion, have just dozens and dozens of the auspices of the American Legion, have many questions to ask you.*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I want to say it is wonderful to be on this program and I know I am in for a tough half hour.

MISS PETERSON: My name is Minnelle Peterson.

I would like to know what good you think will come out of the Bermuda conference?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think great good will come out of the Bermuda conference if we proceed as I think we shall. The purpose of that conference is to get a unanimity of view, or at least a stronger spirit of cooperation between the Big Three, France, Great Britain and the United States.

When the heads of state meet in such a conference, they are able to iron out many of the minor difficulties which seem to separate us and to unite on the greater programs that will hold us together and bind us as one unit. Therefore, I look to the Bermuda conference as a very significant development in our foreign policy.

MISS CREEK: Do you think after the Bermuda conference, Russia will hold to her agreements more than she has in the past? Do you think we will be able to count on her holding to these agreements or not?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The only way I think Russia will hold to an agreement is when the West, that is, the free nations, are strong and determined. By that, I mean when we have a policy and we follow through on it and we back it up with the necessary strength and sacrifice which is required to maintain a policy.

The Soviet will always look for a weakness in the strength of the free world. If any of those weaknesses appear, you can expect the Soviet to dash in and try to disrupt us. Therefore, to me, any conference that we hold, if it is one in which we try to do away with our disagreements and arrive at common points of agreement, it strengthens our foreign policy and literally compels the Soviet Union to act that much more responsibly in the world.

MR. HOLMES: My name is Jim Holmes.

I want to know if you feel we can lose anything by a 4-Power Conference. Do you think Russia can get away with anything on the Big Three?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think we will lose anything out of a 4-Power Conference. There is always the feeling that the Soviet will

use those conferences for purposes of its propaganda. I would like to believe that we were capable of occasionally saying something that had some propaganda value, too. I get a little tired of having the U.S. and its spokesmen, or any other spokesmen of the free world, feel that in any conference with the Soviet that we will come out second best. We ought to be coming out every time on top.

It also puts the Soviet on the spot on certain critical issues such as the unification of Germany, a treaty for Austria, a peace settlement in Korea, and the whole problem of the Far East. So if we have a policy and if we have a program, and our allies have agreed with us upon that program, I would say that a 4-Power Conference would be definitely to our advantage.

MR. WEISS: My name is Donald Weiss.

You speak of strengthening the Soviet and the West. Where, in your opinion, do you think this will eventually lead, the continuous strengthening of the Soviet and ourselves? What do you anticipate for the future?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Weiss, I didn't speak of strengthening of the Soviet. In politics, whether it is domestic or international, it is always a contest of strength. Now, strength must be held within bounds and it requires rational men to do so.

I am of the opinion that the Soviet is not looking for a war. It is looking, however, to the possibilities of attrition, economically and politically upon the West. I am ruling out the long-range possibility of a struggle. We must always be prepared for that unfortunate eventuality. But our statesmanship and our diplomacy should be in line and in the thinking of being able to negotiate and being able to fix definite positions around which we can rally large numbers of people and numbers of things. So to me, the strengthening of the West or of our allies and ourselves includes the political strengthening of unity between us—a better understanding is a better term than "unity," because that is usually interpreted as meaning everybody agrees on everything. That never happens among free people, but we will agree on the basic objectives and basic policies and programs, strengthening ourselves economically—that includes domestic production as well as foreign trade. It involves many things. I cannot help but believe that we have the potentiality and the possibilities of being much stronger in every area of life than the Soviet and its satellites.

MR. FRIEDLANDER: My name is Harry Friedlander.

I would like to know, what are your views concerning the possibility of advancing world trade in the future?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Harry, the question of world trade in my mind is one of the most significant questions that faces the American people and our Congress. It also is very important to the whole free world. We have been losing the trade struggle in recent months. The Soviet Union shifted its tactics momentarily away from what I call the politics of violence into the politics of economics and diplomacy. They have been tying down—when I say "they," I mean the Soviet and the satellites—have been tying down one trade agree-

ment after another, particularly in Latin America, in the African area and the Far East.

We should advance on this front. That means a firm trade policy on the part of our own government and our allies. These are questions which I feel should be discussed in any conference between the heads of state, such as our President, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Laniel, of Britain and France. We must have a concerted, comprehensive, coordinated trade policy among the western allies and go on out to seek new areas of opportunity, and to tie down good trade relationships.

MR. FRIEDLANDER: Along these lines, what are your hopes for a United States of Europe?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, that is a long-range hope. I would like to be sufficiently optimistic to think that it could be realized, possibly not in my lifetime, but maybe in yours. We have made real progress. The European Coal Community, commonly known as the Schuman Plan, the Benelux countries, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, Italy and Germany, that is a beginning.

The Office of European Economic Cooperation, another beginning. The Customs Union, another beginning. We have made many beginnings toward economic federation of Europe, and economic federation, to me, is paramount, and following that economic federation will come political federation.

MISS O'CONNOR: My name is Holly O'Connor.

I want to know if you agree with the Republican Administration that the United States is now taking the initiative in world policy?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Miss O'Connor, this word "initiative," and all of its derivatives, is rather difficult to define, particularly in a fluid situation such as we find in the present world area. It appears to me that our strength has been growing since 1946—from '45 to '46 we quickly disarmed. Many people say we shouldn't have, but everybody was for it at the time. Since that time, we have been rebuilding the western world and building a strong alliance. So, "gaining the initiative" is a matter of time. There is no spectacular thing that you can do because initiative requires, if it is to be sustained, strength, and long-term strength. It means the rehabilitation of Western Europe that was pummeled into debris by World War II. It means stability of government, stability of currency, expanding trade, political alliances such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I think we are beginning to get the initiative. I really do. But I don't think it has happened because of any one agent. It has happened because of a series of developments.

MISS O'CONNOR: I take it, then, you approve of the new "get touch" policy of the Republicans, rather than the old "appeasement" of the Democrats?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is a mighty good political phrase.

I would say that the policy being pursued by the Eisenhower Administration in foreign policy is basically the same as the Truman-Acheson policy. The reason that it is, is because the facts are the same. If you are going to have a policy based on fact, the policy

must be the same as the other. The prior Administration did not have an appeasement policy. An Administration that authored the Marshall Plan and NATO, and military assistance, and stopped aggression in Korea, that was anything but an appeasement. The present policy isn't one of getting tough, at all.

As a matter of fact, I would say if anything it has possibly been a little bit on the "getting softer" side, but that again is a matter of degree. I can document that, by the way, too.

Mr. Finley: Could you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, yes. I would say, for example, when Secretary Dulles went to the recent meeting of the NATO nations and permitted the NATO countries in Western Europe to more or less set their own pace on rearmament, that was equal to telling tired people how much they ought to do. Leadership requires that you ask people to do just a little bit more than they think they can do or are willing to do. I think the reduction in some of our forces in Western Europe may indicate a relaxation, somewhat, of policy.

I read with considerable interest that insofar as the truce is concerned in Korea, that we are now just about ready to accept the original Communist terms, insofar as neutral nations participating in the truce conference are concerned.

I don't say all of this is bad, but if you are talking about getting tough, that is a peculiar way to get tough. I don't think we have been very tough on trade policies. I think, as I said earlier, we have retreated and retreated and, in fact, we haven't even made that much motion. I am wrong. We have just stood still while the Soviet Union has gone ahead.

Mr. Finley: Do you think the policy in Korea is wrong?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am of the opinion that we have to be exceedingly careful in this conference in Korea, lest we find ourselves engaged in another one of these "talkathons." It seems to me our representative there—Arthur Dean—in order to carry out American government instructions, has gone just a little bit further in permitting the Soviet to get its way than I would prefer.

MISS EAST: My name is Marion East.

I believe you are a member of the Americans For Democratic Action?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I am.

MISS EAST: I wonder if you would explain its functions and its objectives briefly, please?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, maybe I should tell a little bit about its birth. It came into being at a time when there was a great split in the ranks of what you might call liberal forces in this country. It came into power at the time that Henry Wallace and the third party, the Progressive Party, was organized. We felt, those of us who were members of the Americans for Democratic Action group, that the Democratic Party and liberal forces in general should take a strong position against Communist infiltration, against Communist tactics and programs. We felt that the Progressive Party was a Communist

front organization, or at least it was motivated by Communist planners and policy-makers.

This was not to say that Mr. Wallace was ever one, because I don't believe he ever was, and I think he was unfortunately duped and has suffered a great deal because of it.

The ADA has stood for a liberal domestic policy along the lines of the New Deal. It has stood for what I call a strong internationalist policy in the foreign field. It is definitely anti-Communist, or any other kind of "ism" or subversive or totalitarian force. You cannot even be a member without taking such a pledge, as a matter of fact.

MISS EAST: Do you think that your position in the ADA will hinder or help you in the coming election?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think the ADA will make a great deal of difference one way or the other. The people of my State know me. They know where I stand. I want them to know. They know what my position is on international policy and domestic policy. I have been a strong supporter of the New Deal and Fair Deal program, domestically and internationally. I think I will have to come before the public without any particular auspices from outside forces at all. I will have to come before them as a member of the Democratic Party on the basis of my record.

MISS KREEK: My name is Mary Jane Kreek.

Are you going to play the farm issue as part of your campaign?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The farm issue is not being played at all. The farm issue is happening. It is one thing to play something. That means that you are really playing, playing up things. It is another thing to see what is really happening.

I happen to represent in the Congress an agricultural state—basically agricultural, at least—and we have had a severe economic recession in the agricultural area. Our general parity runs about 82 to 83, whereas a year ago it was standing around 100. You don't play with that, it is too dangerous.

MISS KREEK: What policy would you think would improve the situation, if you were in a position to call all the plays? Exactly what would you do to improve the situation?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Several things. No. 1, I would surely ask for a continuation of the price support program as enacted in 1949, with some improvements such as on perishable commodities. I don't think you can have price supports on what we call the storable, wheat, corn, cotton, rice and tobacco, and not have price supports on the other commodities such as cattle and pork products and eggs and dairy products—the perishables. I would improve there.

I certainly would improve the credit structure.

For example, I was of the opinion that we could have stabilized the beef market had we extended short-range and long-term credit immediately upon the break in beef prices, because many of the cattle feeders in the country where I come from were under pressure to liquidate their herds in order to pay off loans. Had they been able to get better credit facilities at low rates of interest, I think we could have stabilized it. Many other things. Increasing our agricultural

export trade. The development of an international food reserve, which, by the way, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations organization has strongly recommended. Just many, many things.

Second, I would have the Secretary of Agriculture quit frightening people. Every time he makes a speech on agricultural production and commodity prices, he drives the market down. I don't think he does this intentionally, but by some strange quirk of events, his speeches are very expensive. Those are the most expensive speeches that have ever been made.

*Mr. Finley: Let me ask you a question. Do you think that in the months between now and the election that the Republicans will pass a farm policy that will take the farm problem out of the election issue?*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I would hope so. I must say that members of the Congress who come from agricultural states, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, see this problem pretty much eye to eye. The House hearings of the Agricultural Committee held all over the United States brought in full reality the problems pertaining to agriculture to the members of that committee.

I want to warn on this issue, however, that a one-year extension of the present law would be a fraud and a delusion, because it would just get in over the election period. I am of the opinion that we must legislate in the agricultural field on the basis of permanent legislation. Let's quit treating agriculture as if it were a sick child. You can't go from one crisis to another. Farmers must have the right to plan just as businessmen do. The way we have legislated in the past, I regret to say, is to say, "Well, we'll get you over one more year—you are sick, now, but maybe then you won't be." This only adds to the problem and the confusion.

*Mr. Finley: Maybe it is good politics.*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is bad politics, because good politics helps the country. This kind only helps the politician. I have come to the conclusion that a politician that plays with this agricultural issue, as the young lady mentioned a while ago, will be destroyed, and justly so. By that, I mean he will be defeated, because the farmer is hurt and he doesn't want to be played with.

PAUL HOLBERG: I was wondering, isn't farming a competitive business?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Exceedingly so, sir.

PAUL HOLBERG: Wouldn't it rise by competition? Wouldn't prices rise through competition?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Price supports, sir, do not belie the possibility of competition. All that a price support does is to put a floor under certain agricultural commodities. In other words, instead of letting the farm economy fall into the ditch it puts a safety net down a few feet so that you can crawl out. Ninety per cent of parity is 10 per cent less than a fair price and there is plenty of opportunity for competition above it. Then consider that you have five and one-half million small individual farm operators. They live in no controlled market, at all. They must have cooperatives, they must have

legislation that gives them a chance for orderly marketing and orderly production.

MILDRED FRANCIS: I understand that you have recently been back to your home State and you probably have talked to many of the farmers. What do the farmers say?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I think it is always a little bit dangerous for one to assume that he knows what anybody else thinks. I can assure you, however, that I have talked to thousands and thousands of our farm people and merchants up and down Main Street of the smaller, rural communities. They are deeply concerned over the present trend in agriculture, and justly so. They see farm prices going, and farm assets going down at the rate of three-quarters of a billion dollars a month. The farm economy will suffer a loss in real value this year, of over \$9 billion. Now when that happens to any section of the American economy, you can rest assured that people are concerned.

MR. HOLMES: You are an outstanding opponent of the Taft-Hartley Labor Law.

The Administration—or Senator Taft before his death—said there were about nineteen points, didn't he, that needed amending.

Do you believe that the secondary boycott clause should be amended or do you believe that it is all right the way it is?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, our studies on the secondary boycott clause of the Taft-Hartley law indicated it was not too operative or that it didn't work too well and I believe if my memory serves me correctly, that Senator Taft proposed a remedial amendment in that area.

The nineteen amendments proposed by the Senator are minimum readjustments in the law. I would support those amendments. Basically I think one of the amendments that needs support immediately is to improve the procedure of the National Labor Relations Board. A good deal of the trouble in the Taft-Hartley law is just a bogging down of fair procedure. Cases just get lost. They stay there for 300 and 400 days. In the meantime, the unions and management are injured.

MR. HOLMES: Would you feel that the Republican Administration is taking a fair stand, a stand that they can be quoted on in labor issues? For instance, in some issues they seem to have not taken any stand at all, and the labor leaders are not falling behind them as the administration hoped they would.

Do you think they will do or they are doing anything that will remedy this situation?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, sir, I think you helped me answer that question. The real problem here is that the Republican Administration hasn't taken a stand. Once they take a stand, then we will know just what the position is.

Now any stand taken by anybody is going to be subject to some criticism. If you are in politics you have to expect that. As a good friend of mine once said, if you are going to dish it out, you have to expect to take it.

It appears to me that the duty of the Administration is to present its proposals. They may be surprised how many of us will support those proposals. It is rather difficult to know what the Administration's stand is, when one day suggestions are made and the next day they are repudiated. It is like the Mexican jumping bean. You never seem to have quite ahold of it. It keeps moving around. I would like to have it stopped just long enough so we can identify what it is and then we can work at it constructively.

NANCY BEECRAFT: I would like to know if you think segregation will be abolished in the schools.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I certainly don't want to make a prophesy as to what the Supreme Court would do. All I know is that the Supreme Court of this country will give the fullest consideration to all the facts that are presented. I think it would be improper, as a matter of fact, for a member of Congress to try in any way to prejudice what the decision of the Supreme Court may be. I would hope that whatever it is, that we will abide by it. If we have any disagreements about it, then we can act on it in a legislative manner, but let's not have any uproar about something that hasn't yet happened one way or another.

MISS EAST: If anything like that should happen, what would be done about the plan of some Southern Senators with regard to this social integration?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: There is a good deal of stamping and pounding of the table before these decisions are made but once they are made, people have a way of settling down. This is to be expected in a free country where there are strong differences of opinion. Everybody is going to have their voice heard if they can get somebody to listen. They are going to stomp and roar and beat the table and say "We won't stand for this." I would imagine if segregation is abolished, it will be abolished, because the Supreme Court in its powers in the Constitution, has the right to interpret the meaning of the Constitution. As I understand it, the Attorney General is pleading this case on the basis of the 14th Amendment which was a duly-accepted and adopted amendment to our Constitution.

*Mr. Finley: Senator Humphrey, so far we have talked about labor, the farm, segregation and foreign policy. I thought the big campaign issue in 1954 was going to be Reds in Government.*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Some people may want to make that the big campaign issue.

*Mr. Finley: Is it?*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am of the opinion that the real campaign issues in 1954 will be the issues that directly affect the lives of the American people. Those will be the economic issues, the issues of foreign policy, the issues of our foreign trade, the issues of taxes and finances and to be sure, the great smokescreen will be the so-called Red Issue. This isn't to diminish the importance of a strong program against Communist infiltration. I only want to make this point: Every decent American ought to be opposed to any form of subversion and every reasonable and positive effort ought to be made to eliminate

it from our midst, not only in Government, but in society. But to be just "against" something is not enough. I would prefer to answer the question with: "What are we for?" We have to be for certain things; for a better program in education, for a better fair market price in agricultural commodities, for better management-labor relations, for a better foreign policy.

You can dig into the grave yards of the past from now until Kingdom Come and never be able to come up with the answers for tomorrow.

If Mr. Finley will permit me, I would like to say this: The Good Lord put our eyes in front, you know. I would imagine there was some reason for that in the Divine Plan of things. The reason appears to be that we should look to the forward. We should look to the tomorrows and at least to the present. It is rather difficult to get your neck all the way around, you know, so that you can look only to the back. The Congress, however, has developed a keen and outstanding ability for hindsight. We are taking post-graduate courses in hindsight. I would hope that we might pass the elementary courses in foresight. My appeal to the American people is to quit frightening ourselves to death by looking to the back, and looking to the past, because the problems that we are going to meet are the problems of today and tomorrow.

We can learn something from the past, but let's not become addicted to it. Let's not become bogged down in mistakes. We did make mistakes. Let's admit it and move ahead and learn from the mistakes.

MISS O'CONNOR: Do you think McCarthy is a threat to you in your campaign for reelection?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I should say not. The only threat to Senator Humphrey could be his own unfortunate votes, if he made any; his own policies, his own inability to express those policies.

I do not intend to let that happen. I am not at all concerned by the visitation of any outsider to the State of Minnesota. As a matter of fact, I want to tell you something: We in Minnesota are a hospitable people and I welcome everyone to come to Minnesota. I want our people to hear from these different folks in politics, and I would expect if Senator McCarthy should come, I will be one of the first to welcome him. I want him to see the fine people in our State and I want them to hear the Senator. Then I would like for them to listen to me, too. I think they will. I want them to hear anybody else. I would expect the President to come. When he comes he will be treated with all the honor and respect due a President of the United States.

After that is all done, after we have had the full treatment, then we are going to have to settle these issues ourselves and make our own determinations.

MISS O'CONNOR: Do you think Senator McCarthy has presidential ambitions?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wouldn't know that. I have had a lot of trouble trying to figure out what is in other people's minds. My main problem is to keep what is in my mind straight and orderly and I am

going to try to do that and let other people worry about what their ambitions may be or what their thinking is. I am trying to have a coherent philosophy of my own and a steadfast belief in democratic principles and democratic institutions. I think the American people have a way of taking care of ambitions. They are a very astute people and I have great faith in the judgment of the American people.

MISS HOLMES: Will you and your Democratic Party support the President's program in this session of Congress as you did in the last, or will you not support it because he hasn't set down McCarthy and has let the Harry Dexter White case get out of hand?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: First of all, in order to answer your question, I would have to know what the program is.

Now in the last session of the Congress, the President had a program, such things as the Emergency Refugee Bill which we supported because it had been initiated under the Democratic Administration. The continuation of Mutual Security; the continuation of the North Atlantic Treaty organization; the continuation of the build-up of our defenses, we supported those things. We supported the reorganization of departments of government. They had been initiated by the Democrats, before, like the establishment of the Department of Health, Welfare and Education. But before I can say whether we are going to support Mr. Eisenhower's program, I want to know what is his program; on agriculture, on labor, on civil rights, on foreign trade, on social security. We are not going to support a myth. They are too elusive. We would like to know what is the program. Then I can tell you this, that if it is a program that makes sense, and one that takes into consideration the needs of the American people, Republican or not, he will get support and get a lot of it.

*Mr. Finley: Thank you, Senator Humphrey.*

*Ladies and gentlemen, I wish we had more time for questions. Thank you Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, for helping provide the answers that Youth Wants to Know.*

*Next week, "Youth Wants to Know" will have as its guest, Governor Herman Talmadge of Georgia.*

*This is Stuart Finley speaking for Theodore Granik, bidding you good-bye.*

*The Proceedings of*  
**"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW"**

*as telecast over the coast to coast network of the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed, and a limited number are distributed free to further the public interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare.*

by

**RANDELL INC.**

PRINTERS

810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E.

PUBLISHERS

Washington 18, D. C.

*(When requesting copies by mail, enclose ten cents to cover mailing)*

---

The proceedings of "Youth Wants to Know" are held every Sunday afternoon from 1:00-1:30 P. M., EST, on the National Broadcasting Company Television Network in the Continental Room of the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C. The program is presented in cooperation with the National Public Relations Division of the American Legion who arrange with the schools to have the youths in attendance.

17  17

J-23474



# 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)