

FROM: STEVENSON-KEFAUVER CAMPAIGN
204 Dyckman Hotel
Minneapolis 2, Minn.

For Release: Thursday PM
October 25

SECRETARY BENSON'S 'HALO' BADLY TARNISHED, SENATOR HUMPHREY CHARGES

Secretary of Agriculture Benson's self-adopted "halo" has been tarnished and discredited by "his neglect of his duty to protect our farm economy, his bungling mismanagement of the authority Congress has given him, and his obvious willingness to perpetuate fraudulent myths in a desperate attempt to hide his own failure," Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, declared in a Farmers' Market Day address at Stephen, Marshall County, at noon today.

"Any cabinet officer who brazenly distorts the facts in a futile attempt at self-justification, and who resorts to name-calling against his critics instead of being willing to debate the issues fairly and squarely, is unworthy of the confidence of the American people," Senator Humphrey declared.

"And any President who named such a cabinet officer and who reaffirms his confidence in him in spite of the overwhelming evidence of his incompetence is no longer entitled to your support, whether you are Republican or Democrat," Senator Humphrey declared.

He vigorously attacked Secretary Benson for characterizing his critics as "a few would-be Socialists whose names I would not mention" in a recent address before the Minneapolis Grain Exchange.

"If disagreeing with Secretary Benson makes a man a socialist, there are more socialists in the Midwest than I want to give the socialist party credit for," Senator Humphrey said. "If that is what Secretary Benson thinks of those who differ with him, then it is time the Republican Party did some house cleaning in its own ranks -- for he is rebuking and insulting Midwest representatives of his own party at the very time President Eisenhower is calling for their re-election."

Senator Humphrey said Secretary Benson has declined to face him in public debate "because he knows he is wrong, and he knows I can prove it".

Minnesota's DFL Senator assailed the "McCarthy" technique being used by Benson's son during the current campaign.

He quoted Reed Benson, son of the Secretary, and an employee of the Republican National Committee, as having charged in Bloomington, Illinois, that the Democrats "left the Department of Agriculture riddled with communists and a 'time bomb of socialistic practices', according to the Bloomington Pantagraph, while engaged in what young Benson described as a "truth campaign".

"If that's how little regard the Republicans have for the truth, nobody can believe anything they say," Senator Humphrey said.

"For if the Democrats left the Department of Agriculture riddled with Communists, as Secretary Benson's son says, then they must be still there -- for Secretary Benson has not got rid of any.

"For two days after that charge, newspapermen pressed the Office of the Secretary and the Department's security officials as to whether any communists have been fired since the Senior Benson took office -- and so far no one has given an answer.

"How do you reconcile such tactics with the myth of the great moral crusade Benson has created around himself, and with the halo he has adopted? How do you reconcile a President professing high principles, while embracing and supporting a cabinet officer perpetrating deliberate fraud upon the American people about the 'mess' he supposedly inherited?", Senator Humphrey asked.

"He did not 'inherit' any mess -- he created one, with our farmers suffering the consequences and our entire economy paying the toll."

FOREIGN POLICY

SPEECH SECTION

Monty
& Alex

Apparently the Republicans plan to make "peace" a partisan campaign issue. I regret this development deeply, because I agree with Secretary of State Dulles when he said (11/29/55), "I never knew that peace was a controversial or partisan subject with the American people."

Moreover I am astonished that Republican campaigners are making such extravagant pretensions in view of other statements by Mr. Dulles like these (4/30/56): "In Korea there is an armistice, but there is no peace ... In Vietnam there is an armistice, but there is no peace."

Of course this conflict between slogans and facts has beset the Eisenhower Administration ever since it took office. It partially explains four years of confusion in our foreign policy which have frightened our friends abroad and worried all objective observers at home.

Since 1952 we have experienced a repeated lack of candor in presenting the realities of the international situation. Often our official words have not squared with the facts. Equally often they have not squared with our deeds. Unable to resist its proclivity for publicity gimmicks, the Administration has extended these devices from the political hustings into the previously bi-partisan area of foreign affairs. Examples range from the fraudulent "unleashing" of Chiang Kai-Chek in President Eisenhower's first State of the Union message; to the bluff and bluster of the misconceived "massive retaliation" doctrine so hastily abandoned on its first test in Indochina; to the notorious newsstand diplomacy and self-serving inaccuracies of Secretary Dulles' "brink of war" disclosures in Life magazine; to the fallacious assertions before Congressional committees that the Soviet economy is on the verge of collapse and that the Soviet "new look" is a confession of weakness; all the way to the recent merry-go-round of Administration

C
O
P
Y

views on "neutrality" with Mr. Eisenhower defending it, Mr. Nixon taking both sides, and Mr. Dulles castigating neutrality as "immoral" but finding himself unable to identify any present-day neutrals of the immoral kind. The Administration has not hesitated to claim credit where changed Communist tactics really deserve the credit: the Austrian troop withdrawal, and the truces in Korea and Indochina.

In domestic affairs this Administration has systematically sacrificed leadership for popularity, and achieved some success in doing so. In foreign affairs, the effort to do the same thing has resulted in a loss of both leadership and popularity. We should not forget this even during a campaign season when all the reasons for Mr. Dulles' "agonizing reappraisals" are forgotten in the election-year chorus of "peace and prosperity".

Consider almost any portion of the globe today, and examples of the deterioration of our position can be found: In Europe our chief alliances have been badly strained by policy differences over Suez, Cyprus, North Africa, German rearmament, and East-West trade. On items of major importance to the future of Western Europe, like the strengthening of NATO and a long-term "trade-not-aid" program, this Republican Administration has paid lip-service to the objectives and failed to follow through.

In the Middle East a vacillating policy has alternately exasperated the young democracy of Israel and won us increasing enmity among the Arab nations as well. By her arms agreements with Egypt and Afghanistan, the Soviet Union has obtained footholds in the Middle East which have been Kremlin objectives for generations.

Our relations with India, the largest democracy on earth, have suffered many reverses since 1953, all of them aggravated by our ill-conceived arms agreement with Pakistan. Instead of working steadfastly to retrieve our position in South Asia, President Eisenhower has just withdrawn Ambassador Cooper from New Delhi for

political purposes in Kentucky.

Even our relations with Latin America have been marred by clumsy diplomacy like our effort to appease Peron shortly before the people of Argentina overthrew him. The Organization of American States remains weak and ineffective.

C
O
P
Y

In the United Nations itself, the decline in American prestige has frequently been reflected in the increased measure of voting agreement with the Soviet Union. 60% of the members of the UN agreed more with the Soviet Union in General Assembly votes in 1955 than in 1954. Here as elsewhere lately, the Soviet Union has registered diplomatic gains, while we, in a frenzy of official activity, have drifted and bided our time.

Peace is positive, not negative, and the American Society of Newspaper Editors recognized this more honestly and realistically than the Republican speech writers when the Society voted 2-1 this year that America was currently losing the Cold War. For while all this has been going on, our alliances have begun to crumble, and our reputation has diminished all around the world.

Four years ago American prestige was high. Democratic leadership had successfully sought and fostered bi-partisan support in foreign affairs. NATO and the Marshall Plan were monuments to joint effort with our allies. The Truman Doctrine, the Berlin Airlift, and our swift response in Korea had taught the Communists that we were serious when we said we intended to block aggression. The United Nations was being utilized, not by-passed. The Point Four program was well under way.

The world that we knew in 1952 has now been turned upside down. Revolutionary events have occurred all around us -- in technology, in politics, and in the hearts and minds of men. Since 1952 the dreadful thermonuclear weapons race has continued, nationalist-minded revolt is sweeping the remnants of colonial Asia and Africa, Stalin's successors are offering us far more astute and dangerous competition than he ever did, and a whole new arena of non-military, economic and

psychological competition is upon us.

C
O
P
Y

While I have been critical of many of the things that the Republican Administration has done in the past four years, I am even more critical of the many things they have left undone. Lincoln once said, "As our case is new, we must think and act anew." But these last four years have been wasted years -- years of holding operations and unexploited opportunities. In a time crying for imagination, we have exhibited little. In a time crying for creativeness and vision, there has been a poverty of new ideas.

Indeed we may say of our foreign policy since 1952: that which is new is not sound and that which is sound is not new. At best this Administration has borrowed the arguments and policies which were successfully devised by its Democratic predecessors to meet earlier dangers. At worst, if we are to believe our Secretary of State, it has practiced the "art" of going to the brink of war without telling us about it until afterwards; it has allowed our essential foreign economic assistance to become a political football by miscasting its appropriation requests and justifications before Congress, and it has struck unbecomingly moralistic, legalistic and militaristic postures, all of which have recently inflamed world opinion against us.

America is generous and humanitarian, but one would never know it listening to the present Secretary of the Treasury or the I. C. A. Administrator. America has been the symbol of anti-colonialism, but one would never know it reading Mr. Dulles' joint statement with the Portuguese Foreign Minister describing Goa as a Portuguese Province". America is peace-loving but today in the midst of the Suez crisis, it is disconcerting to remember that General Eisenhower thought a pistol was an appropriate gift for the Egyptian chief-of-state, and had Mr. Dulles present it personally in Cairo only two years ago.

During this Republican administration incidents like these have come to symbolize the distorted image we are presenting to the world. Under a Democratic Administration we may hope to recoup some of the ground lost during the past four years, and return to our own best traditions. It is our Declaration of Independence, the spirit of "We the People" of our own Constitution which is on march in much of the world today. We must re-identify ourselves with our own tradition. This is why Jefferson said that our revolution was fought for all mankind. This is what Lincoln meant when he called our experiment in democracy the last best hope on earth. This is what Wilson meant when he said that America was brought into the world to unify mankind. This is what Franklin Roosevelt intended when he announced the goals of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear everywhere in the world.

These are the principles which have enriched America and which have lately been neglected and forgotten. This is the vision without which the people perish. We must rediscover and apply it as we go forward with Adlai Stevenson

in a New America devotedly working toward genuine peace and real prosperity.



STEVENSON-KEFAUVER CAMPAIGN

John Kelly Sec.
General Headquarters: Dyckman Hotel
27 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis 2
FEderal 8-8796

77

For Release: Friday A. M., Oct. 26

GOP VICTORY WOULD BE 'GREEN LIGHT' FOR ATTACK ON CO-OPS: HUMPHREY

If President Eisenhower is returned to the White House, farmers' co-operatives will be threatened with destructive tax policies, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey warned last night in an address to a DFL rally at Climax, Minnesota.

"Minnesota's farmers, already at a severe economic disadvantage in trying to absorb high operating costs in the face of declining farm prices, will find there is still worse to come," Senator Humphrey declared.

"Our farmers are seeking to help themselves the best they can through their local and regional marketing and supply cooperatives."

"But big business interests are readying a new attack on the federal income tax status of the co-ops, and make no secret about plans to unleash it as soon as the new Congress opens if the Republicans retain the helm of our government."

"They know they have a sympathetic ear with Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey -- certainly no relation to this Humphrey -- and they are all set to drive co-ops to the wall as soon as they get the chance."

"The battle plans have been prepared by the National Tax Equality Association and the business groups which support it; all they are waiting for is to be sure they are backed up by an Administration that cares more about big business than it does about farmers."

"They know they will have that kind of an Administration if Ike is re-elected -- and they will regard it as a green light to ultimately destroy the effectiveness of all co-operatives in serving their patrons and the entire economy."

Senator Humphrey declared "every Democratic candidate is pledged to protect farmer co-operatives against such attacks, and to seek to preserve for our producers the right to help themselves by this legitimate extension of the free enterprise system."

"Secretary of Agriculture Benson", Senator Humphrey warned, "was already helping lay the groundwork of undermining co-operatives by labeling them socialistic."

"It is all part of the blueprint for once again returning our farm economy to the full mercy of the speculators under the guise of restoring 'free markets', a blueprint that includes pulling the rug out from under effective price supports, getting rid of our publicly-owned grain storage facilities that enable the farmer to avoid being forced to sell all of his commodities during depressed prices at harvest time, and invoking discriminatory tax policies against co-operatives to eliminate such farmer-owned competition in the marketing of commodities and the distribution of farmers' supplies," Senator Humphrey declared.

"If they succeed, they will set back our farm economy two decades -- and perhaps change forever the pattern of family farming as we know it and as we want to preserve it today."

Mrs. Larry Palmer



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