

The National Broadcasting Company Presents



M E E T T H E P R E S S

America's Press Conference of the Air

Produced by LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

Guest: SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY
Democrat, Minnesota

VOLUME 2

SUNDAY, JUNE 1, 1958

NUMBER 20

National Publishing Company Printers and Lithographers
301 N Street, N. E., Washington 2, D. C.

10 cents per copy

Panel: JACK BELL, *Associated Press*

NED BROOKS, *NBC News*

MAY CRAIG, *Portland (Maine) Press Herald*

RICHARD WILSON, *Cowles Publications*

Moderator: LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

© 1958 By National Broadcasting Company, Inc.

Permission is hereby granted to news media and magazines to reproduce in whole or in part. Credit to NBC's MEET THE PRESS will be appreciated.

MEET THE PRESS

MR. SPIVAK: Welcome once again to MEET THE PRESS.

Our guest today is Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. His interests in the Senate have been wide, but recently he has devoted a great deal of his attention to foreign policy and, particularly, to the question of disarmament. President Eisenhower appointed him a delegate to the Eleventh General Assembly of the United Nations. He is a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Disarmament, which has been conducting extensive hearings.

Senator Humphrey is a college professor who has mastered the art of politics. He was twice elected Mayor of Minneapolis and twice elected to the United States Senate. This week at their convention, the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota unanimously endorsed him for the Presidential nomination in 1960.

Now, Senator Humphrey, if you are ready, we will start the questions with Mr. Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: Senator, we have seen over the weekend that the Soviet Union has now agreed to the first step looking towards a suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons. That would be a meeting of the scientific experts to study methods for policing any such agreement. Your Disarmament Subcommittee has been looking into this matter. I am wondering what you think about how extensive a detection system would have to be in order for us to make sure that the Russians keep their part of any such agreement?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: First of all, I am very gratified that the Soviet has agreed to this initial—and it is a very much preliminary and initial—step of the technical studies which are required for an inspection and detection system. You have asked, how big a system would this have to be. It could be a system that was surely manageable within our scientific limits to

undertake and to establish. I would say, without being committed to a definite figure, that at least 100 or more seismic stations properly placed around the periphery of the Soviet Union as well as deep into the Soviet Union, plus, those that we have in our own country and presently being used, might well be adequate.

MR. BROOKS: What do you understand, Senator, to be the greatest distance at which we could detect a nuclear explosion inside the Soviet Union.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It greatly depends upon the type of explosion. Underground explosions are difficult to detect. Above ground explosions are really not difficult to detect with modern apparatus such as we now have. In fact explosions in the high atmosphere, in high altitude, are not too difficult to detect. It is the underground one which is the problem. Now, I believe, however, that there is evidence that indicates that we have been able to detect underground explosions as far away as almost seven thousand miles—6,800 miles, for example. There was about a nine kiloton underground explosion in China, in the Lanchow area of China, which was detected at Hungry Horse, Montana, six thousand eight hundred and some miles away. That same explosion was detected in Sweden some 4,000 miles away and, also, in Alaska, a little over 5,000 miles away.

MR. BROOKS: Isn't that a higher figure than any that has been given to the public so far?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is higher than has been generally reported, but it is not higher than is known, if you dig for it.

MR. BROOKS: Just one more question along that same line. You mentioned the number of stations we would have over there, how many do you think they would be allowed, or would they require of us?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think there would have to be mutuality or reciprocity on this, and, very frankly, if you are going to have an inspection system, you ought to have enough stations to make sure that it is going to work. I would, also, want to include, and I think we ought to bargain for this, the number of seismographic stations which are in the Soviet Union. There are approximately 75, and those are grouped around the area that is known as the earthquake area. We would want those, plus, more within the heartland of the Soviet Union where earthquakes are not common, in fact, some areas where there has never been a recorded earthquake, but I still think we ought to have them there. And then if you could tie in a few other nations, I think you would have a pretty good foolproof system. For example, Japan. I want to underscore, here, the importance of Japan in this, because the Japanese are experts in seismographic activity. They are the best seismologists, I believe, in the world. Their country has been plagued with earthquakes, and they have been able to ascertain more tests of explosions, both nuclear and non-nuclear, than any country. In fact, they have reported on both Soviet and U. S. explosions, so Japan could play a strategic role in here, particularly if you had an international agreement.

MR. BELL: There is another kind of explosion coming in this country in 1960, and it is not quite so technical. Your state convention has endorsed you as a Presidential nominee. Are you running?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The members of my party at home, the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, are very kind to me, very understanding and almost, sometimes, too charitable. They did endorse me for the office of President. I am sure this was done in the spirit of good will and friendship towards their Senator, and I am very grateful.

MR. BELL: I have never known you to be coy.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am not trying to be.

MR. BELL: Are you running? Are you a candidate for President?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: My term for the Senate expires in 1960, and I shall attempt to get re-elected to the United States Senate.

MR. BELL: You are not running, then, for President?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am not running for President, that is correct.

MR. BELL: You don't care to have the Democratic nomination?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is not what I said. I said I am not running for President. It would be a singular honor for any person in public life to have the nomination of either political party. It is an honor which I would only hope that a man might merit and deserve.

MR. BELL: As a man who is not running, would you say that the Democratic Platform in 1960 is likely to include some provision calling for enforcement of the Supreme Court's order for school integration?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am sure that it will have a strong civil rights plank in it, because our Party stands for that.

MR. BELL: Would you ask for such a plank in the platform, if you were the nominee, or if you were not the nominee?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I shall not go out of my way to be a trouble-maker, but I surely would insist that our Party stand up to the responsibilities of public service and of public policy, and one of the public policies in this country is that of integration and desegregation. I believe it should be carried through.

MR. BELL: Some of your Southern colleagues think that you went out of your way in 1948 to be a trouble-maker and that you did it again in 1952 on the civil rights issue. Are you changing your stance on that? Do you now want a very strong civil rights plank in the platform?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I feel exactly about civil rights in 1958 as I felt in 1948, as I felt in 1938. I believe in human equality, I believe in equal rights under the law; I am opposed to segregation. I believe that people ought to be treated on the basis of their own qualifications without regard for race, color, creed or religion. If I seem to have changed any since 1948, I can only say most humbly and respectfully that I think maybe the country has gone ahead a little bit in civil rights, and what we stood for in 1948, which may have caused some commotion in the Democratic Convention, is pretty well accepted now by even moderate people in 1958.

MR. BELL: You don't think that the 1960 Convention is going to accept a Civil Rights plank with a basis of enforcement of integration without a Southern walkout, do you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am not a prophet. I do feel that the Democratic platform will have enough in it so that it will satisfy the great needs of our country, and one of the needs of our country is to fulfill our responsibilities in the field of civil liberties and civil rights. That is not the only need, may I say, and I doubt that the Democratic Party is going to be broken apart over this issue or any other. There will be some who call themselves Democrats who may be a little unhappy, but that only makes those who are happy appreciate the joy of that all the more.

MRS. CRAIG: Do you think that Britain will stop her own nuclear tests until she learns all she needs or until we give her our know-how?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You are presuming that we will have a test ban; is that what I understand?

MRS. CRAIG: I am not presuming, but you have to have some idea what our allies are going to do, don't you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would hope that all through these negotiations relating to the possibility of a ban on nuclear bomb testing we would have been in the closest consultation with our allies, and may I say that we have been. In fact, the proposals which were advanced last year in London included proposals that were subscribed to by our allies. One of those was the suspension of bomb tests, so I would imagine that the British would continue to carry through in that agreement.

MRS. CRAIG: I ask you again, do you think she will give up her own testing unless we give her our know-how?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would imagine that the British would be willing to comply with a ban on nuclear testing. I would, also, imagine that in the interests of our own national security, we would share some of our atomic information with the British.

MRS. CRAIG: That takes legislation?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is right, and I doubt that there would be very much difficulty, if it came just to the British.

MRS. CRAIG: Can you give it to the British without giving it to the French, and how can you give it to the French at this moment?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know how we could give it to the French at this moment, but may I say we surely could be able to share with the British on a bilateral arrangement, if that were required.

MRS. CRAIG: Are you willing to give it to France?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would want to see what the composition of the French Government will be and how she will act in the immediate future.

MRS. CRAIG: Is it your opinion that the President is holding back agreement until he gets the legislation?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know. I really do not know on that.

MRS. CRAIG: Do you expect it at this session?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think the most important thing is to get a ban on nuclear testing *with inspection*, and I want to underscore "with inspection." I think this is much more important than talking about sharing the know-how of the creation of more atomic bombs. I think the public and the people of the world and of the United States would like to know that a real sincere, conscientious, persistent effort was being made to get a ban on nuclear bomb testing with an adequate system of inspection. If we must share the technology of the atomic bomb, I would say we ought to share it very, very carefully with the most trusted of allies.

MRS. CRAIG: Are you willing to stop our tests unless Britain and France, also, do?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, indeed not. This would have to be more than a bilateral arrangement, and I am sure that it would be because we had an agreement among our allies last August, and last July, in London at the UN Subcommittee Disarmament Conference.

MRS. CRAIG: Then, you've got to get the legislation.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, we don't need legislation for that. You are talking of another matter—to share the technology we would—

MRS. CRAIG: That is what I have been talking about all the time.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We would have to have legislation for that; you are entirely right.

MR. WILSON: Senator, I would like to clear up one point. Did I understand you to say earlier that there had been an atomic explosion in China?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I did not. I said there had been an explosion of 9-plus kilotons. Atomic or non-atomic, I do not know. I would say, of course, that this poses a real problem as to what to do about an area such as China, under an agreement.

MR. WILSON: You doubt that it was an atomic explosion?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know. I don't doubt nor do I affirm. I only know we were able to detect an explosion of some 9 kilotons some 6,800 miles away, and it was an underground explosion.

MR. WILSON: In China?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir. We were not only able to detect it, but to locate it. The reason we know this is that by examining literature which was not security but which had been lying around here in the files in our government. This was done by our Subcommittee on Disarmament. We found that in December 1956 such an explosion had taken place in China. It was reported in Soviet journals which we had translated and then placed down for study. We then asked the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Government of the United States and our seismologists as to whether or not they had discovered anything on their graphs during that period of time which indicated any explosion of any consequence. They were able to detect such on their seismographic graphs or charts, and detect not only the size of the explosion but its location.

MR. WILSON: What I am trying to get at is whether you think there may have been atomic development in China itself.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I do not know, but I would say this is a definite possibility, and we ought not to fool ourselves into believing that this could not happen. There is reason to believe that the Chinese may be making substantial advance in the field of nuclear power and energy.

MR. WILSON: In that case, you've got to include China in any agreement for a test ban, don't you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at the initial stage. I used to think so myself, and I said so about a year ago, but upon much more careful consideration, I came to another conclusion. This would be particularly true if you would include in your international agreement countries such as Japan where they have, as I said, the most intricate system of seismographic stations. This would, also, be true if you would include India, and Burma. In other words, if you make this an international agreement and call upon the United Nations to supervise it and then have these seismographic and acoustical and electromagnetic stations—you need all three—if you have those spread around the periphery of China, you are able to detect well enough, also, asking that there be registration of all non-nuclear explosions. The UN would have to ask for that. When you went into a broader system of disarmament, indeed, I think, you would have to include China, and I wouldn't want to disarm my country very much until China were included.

MR. WILSON: Since Russia and the United States are clearly the two leading atomic powers, what would be wrong, today, with a bilateral agreement with Russia to stop testing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not one thing. It would be very helpful. It would not, however, be disarmament. It would be only the initial stage of working out certain matters with the Soviet Union. I think we ought not to fool ourselves at all. This would still mean that other countries could test, and it would open up the door for some cheating. I cautioned some of our governmental witnesses on this. This suggestion has been made, as you recall, by Mr. Stassen, and it has been made by others in the government.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Stevenson, also.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I believe Mr. Stevenson made that. I think that the best that you could say out of such an arrangement would be that it might improve some relationships between the USSR and the USA. The Soviet Union isn't going to be giving too much nuclear material away to the satellites because it doesn't trust them that much, and I think that is even true of China. We are in a better position to be able to share nuclear information with some of our allies because we can trust them. When it goes to the satellites, I doubt that they would be very trustworthy.

MR. WILSON: Haven't you seen signs in your contact with members of the Administration, in the military field, in the general policy field, that we are moving toward this bilateral agreement?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Absolutely. I think those signs are unmistakable. They have been very clear the last two months.

MR. WILSON: And probably sometime this year?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say sometime before the end of this year such an agreement will be arrived at. I think it may very well be the topic of a summit discussion or a summit meeting.

MR. BROOKS: You were quoted recently as saying that the Soviet Union is catching up with the United States economically at what you call a frightening speed. If that is true, does it make any sense for us to give millions of dollars to the Russian satellites, as is now proposed in the bill which has been approved by your Foreign Relations Committee?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Let me just clarify the statement which you indicated I had made. What I intended to say, and what I did say, was while we were still way out ahead of the Soviet Union economically, that the rate of growth, of economic growth in the Soviet Union, is far beyond that of ourselves. For example, our rate at the present is in decline, and theirs is [increasing] at the rate of about 10 percent a year. So they are moving up fast, particularly in certain areas such as electrical power, the energy field, in heavy goods, and in certain types of transports, steel, et cetera. You asked, what about some of the satellites, should we share with them? I think only if it appears to be in our national interest to do so, provided that the President and the National Security Council find that by some economic aid you may promote a greater degree of independence on their part. We should have, I think, as our present policy, a very realistic one. We are not going to be able to liberate these satellites, as much as I would like to see it done. We saw that go down the drain in the Hungarian revolution, and what a tragic day that was for all lovers of freedom. So don't you think it would be better if we started to have a much more realistic policy where we sought ways and means to loosen the hold of the Soviet upon its satellites and maybe take a longer term look of, let's say, the next decade, where you have a group of Eastern states in Europe that are much more independent of the Soviet Union than they presently are?

MR. BROOKS: Have we ever caused a breaking away of any satellite from the Russian orbit by the granting of economic aid?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I doubt that that would be the one way it could be done, that is, standing alone. I would say in the instance of Yugoslavia, Yugoslavia is able to stand up and talk back to the Soviet Union a little more forcefully today because of the aid which we have given to her, than if she had had no aid at all. I am confident that if Yugoslavia had had no aid at all that, today, she would have been literally under the bootheel of the Kremlin. Right now she is able to spit on the boots of the Kremlin, and believe me this is a mighty good sign to people around the world. It has shaken the Communist parties in Asia and Africa right down to their very toenails.

MR. BELL: Your Democratic leader, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas, said in Houston last night that we have lost the leadership of the free world, that our prestige is down, that our friends are not with us any more. Do you agree that we are in bad shape in that particular situation?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You are a newspaper man, and I read the newspapers. I must say from what I read in the newspapers that our profile and our image abroad doesn't look to me as if it is very charming, startling or strong.

MR. BELL: Who is to blame?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The country is in the hands of the President of the United States, and the present Secretary of State and the present Government, and I must say that, if you are going to take credit for the rain, you've got to take credit for the drought. In this instance, it appears to me that the President and his Secretary of State have not given us the leadership that this nation needs in the field of international relations.

MR. BELL: You are going to have the President until 1960. Do you think the Secretary of State should be removed, or should resign or be replaced?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say that the Secretary of State primarily carries out the mandates of the President of the United States. There have been times that I have spoken very critically of Mr. Dulles, and I want to make it crystal clear: I do not play partisan politics with foreign policy. I think we can debate the issues of foreign policy, but we can submerge our party below the level of what is the need of our nation in the field of foreign policy. I am critical of our foreign policy not as a Democrat, but I am critical because I am heart-sick at times over what I consider to be the failures and the lack of initiative. It isn't that we do too many things that are wrong. It is just that we don't do enough things that are right.

MRS. CRAIG: Do you think Vice President Nixon should have gone to Latin American countries where he knew he would meet a hostile reception?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That was a decision that only the President and the Vice President could make. I am not ducking your question; I know what information was available to the Vice President, because of our hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. There is always information that indicates there may be trouble. I happen to believe that the Vice President went because he felt it would be good, and I am sure that the President sent him there because he thought it would be helpful. It is regrettable what developed.

MRS. CRAIG: Do you think it is safe for the President's brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, to go?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I do, and I hope he will go. I hope that when he goes he will go with a message and a program and a policy, just as when he came to the World Health Organization Conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Dr. Milton Eisenhower gave a splendid speech there, and he

outlined an affirmative policy on the part of our Government. That is what counts. It is when you go not only to pay visits and to pay these diplomatic courtesy calls but when you go with a program and a message.

MRS. CRAIG: The Vice President is scheduled to go to Europe soon. Do you think he should go? Do you think a Vice President's life should be risked in a foreign country when we have a President whose health is precarious?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Politics is a risky business, and if the Government of the United States and the President feels that the Vice President's presence in Europe would be helpful to our country, then the Vice President ought to go. He will have to make his mind up on that, but, again, I hope he will go, not merely to explain America—this is what we are always doing, we are always going to explain ourselves. Let's go with a message. Let's go with a program. Let's go with a challenge, and let's go as brave men and not just brave in the sense of personal courage, but the kind of bravery and courage that comes from a bold, national policy. This is what has been lacking, and I have some ideas of what we could propose, too.

MR. WILSON: Has the Democratic leadership in Congress considered adjourning, when it does in August, at the call of its leaders, so that after the Congressional election it might be possible to come into session again to consider tax reduction and other questions?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I do not know. I hope that many of these questions will be taken care of before we adjourn. I have a feeling that is what the American people would like.

MR. WILSON: Tax reduction will not be taken care of, will it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it should be.

MR. WILSON: You think there should be tax reduction?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I surely do.

MR. WILSON: You disagree with some of the Democratic leaders?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I do, and I have before, but I do it respectfully.

MR. SPIVAK: France's economy is bordering on bankruptcy, we are told. Do you think the United States ought to do anything about it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The first thing we ought to do is to let the French get their Government back in order again, and I think they shall. There are good signs today from France, and, indeed, if the French economy is in the dire straits that the newspapers indicate, and if the Government of France seems to be making real forward strides in attempting to strengthen its economy, then we ought to help. I say this because we have already got so much invested in this great country of France that we can't afford to back out. She is our real ally in NATO, and we must never underestimate the importance of France in our whole program of international security.

MR. SPIVAK: Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for being with us.

Next week: MIKHAIL A. MENSNIKOV
Ambassador of the U.S.S.R.

The Proceedings of
M E E T T H E P R E S S

as broadcast nationwide by the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed and made available to the public to further interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare. Transcripts may be obtained by sending a stamped, self addressed envelope and ten cents for each copy to:

National Publishing Company, 301 N Street, N. E., Washington 2, D. C.

MEET THE PRESS is telecast every Sunday over the NBC Television Network from the NBC studios in Washington, D. C.

Television Broadcast 6 pm EDT

Radio Broadcast 6:35 pm EDT



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