

TRANSCRIPT
OF
AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

Produced by

THE WESTINGHOUSE BROADCASTING COMPANY

in association with

THEODORE GRANIK

x- - - - - x
:HOLD FOR RELEASE:
:9:30 p.m. SUNDAY:
:Jan 29, 1961 :
x- - - - - x

with

SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY (D. Minn.)

and

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT (R. Pa.)

Subject

"Our Future Foreign Policy"

Presented by

WTTG Washington, D. C.

and

Westinghouse Broadcasting Company Stations

THE ANNOUNCER: This is The American Forum of the Air, America's first discussion program.

Meet Senator Hubert Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: America's foreign policy has suffered because of the loss of our national prestige abroad.

THE ANNOUNCER: And Senator Hugh Scott.

SENATOR SCOTT: The test is national strength, not polls taken among about 800 or 1,000 Europeans.

THE ANNOUNCER: Who will discuss "Our Future Foreign Policy".

(Announcement)

THE ANNOUNCER: And now here is the Moderator of the American Forum, Theodore Granik.

MR. GRANIK: The Cold War truce is threatened by crises in the Congo, Cuba, Laos, Berlin and Algeria.

Has the United States failed to provide the necessary leadership throughout the Free World? Can the new administration maintain peace in these troubled areas?

What will be the future course of America's foreign policy under President Kennedy?

To debate this important issue we are pleased to have as our guests Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, Assistant Majority Leader of the United States Senate, and Senator Hugh Scott, Republican of Pennsylvania, former chairman of the Republican National Committee.

And now won't you join our discussion, which will begin after this important announcement.

(Announcement)

THE ANNOUNCER: Here again is Mr. Granik.

MR. GRANIK: Senator Scott, the polls of the United States Information Agency indicate that this nation experienced a sharp loss of prestige overseas in the latter part of the Eisenhower Administration. Now, what can we do to regain our lost prestige throughout the world?

SENATOR SCOTT: Well, I, of course, Mr. Granik, don't accept the premise that we have lost prestige. I merely accept the fact that some poll-takers in a career service of the United States Government found some Britishers and some Frenchmen, and so on, to say that they didn't think America was, in their opinion, as high in its standing as it had been some years previously. I don't contest that. We are not as powerful as we were when we had complete domination of the world, if we chose to use it when we were the sole proprietors of the atom bomb.

But if I were an American asked what I thought of British prestige over the past few years, I would say they've lost their empire. They are a commonwealth. If I were asked about France I would say "Look at Algeria." If I were asked about any foreign country I would react about the way a Britisher and a Frenchman react when he is

j 4

asked about the United States. Prestige polls, in other words, in my opinion, are phony, Ted. The real thing is, are we strong, and will we stay that way.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I don't believe that it is right to judge one's -- the nation's power on the basis of a prestige poll, but by the same token I do not believe that you ought to ignore what a public opinion survey might reveal.

Now, both Senator Scott and myself are political people -- they call us politicians -- we surely do watch polls. The candidates for national office use polls -- not only watch them.

In my State, the public opinion polls, which were nothing more or less than a scientific sampling and survey, were uncannily accurate in the most recent election, in every office, those that Democrats won and those that we lost.

I would say that the prestige polls of the U.S.I.A. indicate, quite accurately, that we have suffered some loss of prestige throughout the world. We have surely lost it in Latin America. There isn't any doubt about that. Whether this came from the Sputnik period or not is debatable, but it is a fact, I am sure, that with the Russians putting into orbit what they called Sputnik, this did have a great impact upon world public opinion. It meant that the Soviets had really moved into the era of advanced technology, and it sort of exploded the myth that this was a nation of peasants

j 5

and backward people. They became all at once almost overdramatized.

You know, I don't look upon the Soviets, Senator Scott, as supermen at all, and I certainly don't look upon ourselves as weaklings, but by the same token I think we have to recognize that the prestige battle today is not between Britain and France, it is not between France and the United States or Britain and Germany, it is between the United States of America and the free world allies and the Soviet Union and its satellites. That is the struggle.

SENATOR SCOTT: Of course, that is the struggle, but the struggle is not a prestige battle. The struggle is to be so strong and so sure of your strength that your allies, too, recognize that without you and without your being at a full stage of preparation, their deterrent of the enemy is not as great as it should be, and that is why I think it is a pity that the new administration seems to be continuing an old campaign argument; namely, what is our prestige?

I don't go for this sort of thing. I think that it is nice to be loved in the world, it is far better to be respected and it is far more important for us to ask ourselves: Is the Kennedy Administration going to do something to make this country ever more stronger?

I believe they are. I mean, I am not here just as a petty political critic. You and I are politicians. I believe

the Kennedy Administration will do many things, to strengthen our Army, Navy, and Air Force, and they should. Each administration must carry on where the other one left off.

Speaking of prestige, I will say this: When we came in we did a great thing for our prestige. We ended a war. Now we didn't leave a war for you people to end, but you are starting off very well, as I see it, in the few actions of the President in the foreign affairs field. In domestic affairs we may differ.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator, my only point was that Mr. Granik asked the question as to whether or not we had lost prestige.

MR. GRANIK: Have we lost confidence in American leadership?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think the fact is, whether prestige is important or not, you can still argue its relative importance. It is of some importance. Because it is an instrument, it represents -- prestige is the word that represents the view that other people have of us. Not only our military power, not only our diplomatic ability, but our political stability, our economic power, it is all tied up in this, and I really believe that it is incontestable that during recent years, because of the rise of Soviet power, which was to be expected, in a sense, because of her increase in tech-

j 7

nology, and because of the challenges that were faced by our country, that we did suffer some loss of prestige.

Now, all that Mr. Kennedy has done as President was say, "Let these facts come out", and, Senator, one of the great complaints I have of the previous administration is its unwillingness and was its unwillingness to let the American people face up to the hard facts of life. We were always told that everything is rosy.

Look at the Eisenhower State of the Union address: Everything is wonderful. And we wake up to find out five and a half million people unemployed.

The gold reserve problem suddenly landed on our doorstep. And we find that there were many things that were not properly attended to.

Now, the job is to get on with tending to the business of this government and of this nation.

SENATOR SCOTT: I think you made a point, Senator Humphrey, when you say that the Government ought to see that the people have a right to know. Yes. Release these polls. Let's evaluate them for what they always have been, which is, to my mind, a very unimportant facet of our defense and of our posture in the world.

Let's get the truth. But the first thing I read in the papers is that Pierre Salinger says "Perhaps we will give you less information than more" in the defense area.

"We need to tighten up security", he says.

What happens to the right to know? Everything we have heard since the new President came in has been a tendency to limit the dissemination of news, except when the President himself, from a high dias or rostrum, addresses a press conference, who now sit respectfully below him -- not in the old folksy, cozy way of the Eisenhower conference.

I am a little afraid that this administration is going to actually tighten up on news and deny people the right to know things they should know.

That is where you come in. You don't believe in being suppressed.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We have only been in about a week. Please don't jump on us too soon.

SENATOR SCOTT: I am trying not to.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Might I add that the press conference is still maintained. The department heads will still hold their press conferences, and I don't think it is very easy, even on a show like this, to withhold information if you have somebody prodding it. And the American newspapermen and women, the TV reporters and radio reporters are quite capable in this country of being able to direct questions to the President of the United States, and these questions come in on the natural -- and by the way, there is no editing of the script. You know, when you are on TV, once you have said it,

you have said it.

This is a little different.

SENATOR SCOTT: Yes, but they have the right to ask questions. The problem is, will they get the answers. Don't you remember your Shakespeare when Glendower says "I can call spirits from the vasty deep." And Hotspur says, "Why, so can I, or so can any man; but will they come when you do call for them?"

Will the answers come when the press calls for them?

MR. GRANIK: Well, gentlemen, Senator Bridges has demanded a full disclosure of events leading to the release of the two American flyers from Russia. Do you know of any commitment the administration has made, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I know of none, and may I say it seems rather peculiar that when an act that we hoped would take place -- we have been asking for months for the release of these prisoners, prisoners who were illegally held, prisoners who were the result of an act of aggression on the part of the Soviet Union, and for months and months the previous administration and now this administration asked for the release of these prisoners. Now they are released, and somebody says there must be something wrong.

May I suggest, don't be so unhappy. I think we should rejoice in their release, if for no other reason than the reunion of man and wife and their families.

j10

SENATOR SCOTT: Senator Humphrey, don't try to send across the United States the impression that any single American is unhappy because these people are released. On the contrary, this is a national day of rejoicing. Everybody is delighted they are released, and everybody knows that negotiations have been going on for months.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Correct.

SENATOR SCOTT: And everybody knows there is no magic in the new administration or lack of magic in the old one that did it. It is Old Man Khrushchev, again, up to his tricks. He has indicated for a long time that he is going to have a little present or a little package for the Kennedy Administration for the obvious purpose of softening them up. I don't believe Mr. Khrushchev's tactics are going to work, and neither do you.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I certainly do not.

SENATOR SCOTT: But you and I both recognize that the release of the flyers is Mr. Khrushchev's will, and not the will of this administration or any other.

MR. GRANIK: Do you think it is a propaganda effort on his part?

SENATOR SCOTT: Of course it is propaganda. And I don't go along with this business that it is a deal, either. I want to be fair about this. I don't think it is a deal. I think we have nothing to gain by over-flights any more,

and if President Kennedy says we are not going to over-fly, that is fine. Most Americans agree with him.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is a continuation of the policy of the previous administration on the over-flights, when President Eisenhower said there would be no more over-flights.

The point that I make to you, Senator Scott -- and I think we ought to make this to the American people: We have to expect that Mr. Khrushchev is going to do everything he can to advance his cause. You have to expect this man to be a wily, subtle character. You have to expect him to use every means of propaganda to forward his cause, and not to be shocked because he does it.

What I want to make sure now, and what you want to make sure is that we do as well or better, and we ought to have, may I say, a psychological offensive, a propaganda offensive. We need to get this country geared back up to moving ahead. We can not tolerate $5\frac{1}{2}$ million unemployed. We can not go along with this draining of our gold reserves. We can not have a situation in which the balance of power may be precariously shifting away from us.

It is the duty of the American people and their government and our allies to get what we call the Free World in motion again, in forward motion. And I think that we can.

SENATOR SCOTT: The only place I would disagree with you is that you have an understandable tendency, as do

j 12

members of your party, to imply that the world began with the new administration. This country does move forward. Its history is the history of a strong, advancing country. We move from war into peace. We move from one area of gross national product into a higher one. We have moved up with the problems of employment. We have suffered occasions when we go down, and we go up again.

These are phases. These are cycles. But the orderly progress of America is neither going to be stopped nor started by any given administration.

The Kennedy administration did not discover America. That was Christopher Columbus. The Kennedy administration did not found America. Those were the founding fathers.

The Kennedy administration did not make America great. Those were men like Jefferson and Lincoln. But the Kennedy administration can help this country, and I am going to help them wherever I can. Whenever I think they are wrong I am going to call the turn on them.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator, I couldn't agree with you more. We did not discover America, but we are at least, may I say, attempting to unleash some of the spirit of America to put this country back on what I call a courageous, forward-moving program.

Now, we have done some things. Let me give you just one little example, in a week. This is a very simple one. This is a domestic example: People in America were without adequate food. The Government of the United States had adequate supplies of food. I know of what I speak.

The previous Administration sat there and guarded this storehouse of food and pieced it out little by little, and the new Administration came in and the President's first Executive order was, "Vary the diet. Add additional items, proceed to give larger quantities of food. It is bought, paid for, stored. The money is there. It doesn't require any new appropriations. Use it."

Now, this is the difference between what I call a static type of administrative philosophy and one of action.

Mr. Kennedy's program was one of positive action, laying down legitimate goals and getting a directive to his administrator -- in this instance, the Secretary of Agriculture -- to proceed.

SENATOR SCOTT: Now, Senator Humphrey, I am glad as you are, whenever we can expand the area of help to people

without involving additional appropriations. But under the Eisenhower Administration, you should have heard the mayors of the various cities -- you used to be a mayor of Minneapolis -- you should have heard the mayor of my city and of all the other cities, telling people how much they were getting at different times of food as if the city's mayors were distributing this food.

I grant you there should have been more. I grant you the nutritional power should have been higher. I am glad that ways and means have been found to do it. I assume that this has been done through finding some unexpended authorizations and allocation.

When this runs out, I hope you will continue to do those things which are necessary for the American people.

I won't quarrel with you on that. Where you are right, I am going to praise you. I am not going to condemn you.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you.

SENATOR SCOTT: But you also have made a bad start in the Congress by breaking the very first promise you made, which was to change the rules of the Senate and as has been noted in many a newspaper, your platform and your candidate both said that the first thing you would do would be to end the filibusters by changing Rule 22. The first thing you did -- and you were one of the leaders of it, although your heart wasn't in it -- was to get this thing off the front

pages of American newspapers and pigeonhole it in the Rules Committee.

So in the Congress you broke your first promise. In the White House, you did a good thing.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator, may I add that both parties made that pledge, and a very solemn pledge about the change in the rules.

SENATOR SCOTT: But you had a 2-to-1 majority.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And Senator Humphrey was the leader, along with Senator Kuchel in your party and the Republican from California, and your Minority whip -- we were the leaders of the majority-rule provision to provide that we could close off debate by majority. I kept the faith of my platform promise right to the bitter end, voting even against the majority of my party --

SENATOR SCOTT: I must not do an injustice to you, because you kept the faith --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We needed a little more help from your party. This was a bipartisan commitment, Senator. Your party was even more explicit. I recall Mr. Nixon's statements about how we needed to change these rules and the then Vice President, I supported his rulings in the chair, as you know.

SENATOR SCOTT: And if you hadn't postponed it, and you were the Majority whip --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And voted against postponement.

SENATOR SCOTT: Your heart wasn't in it --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I voted against postponement.

SENATOR SCOTT: But if your party had not postponed this, the ruling of Vice President Nixon would have applied and debate could have been brought to an end by the application of a change in the rules.

Now, you can't change Rule 22 until January 3rd or 4th, 1967.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator, we will be able to change Rule 22 at the beginning of the next Congress which will be the 88th Congress which will be 1963; we can try that.

SENATOR SCOTT: I am assuming Lyndon Johnson is against you. If Lyndon is with you, you can change it any January you want.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And we also will be able to report back to the Rules Committee appropriate rules changes and take it up as a part of the regular legislative program, but the most important thing about rules is whether or not you get things done in the Congress of the United States. And I think before we judge this Congress and this Administration, we should permit its program to be unfolded and I have a feeling that in the areas of civil rights, sufficient action will be taken at the Executive level of government to satisfy most of the observers of this vital

area and in the areas of domestic and foreign policy, we have yet to judge the Administration which is rather new.

MR. FRANK: As a former member of the House Rules Committee, Senator Scott, do you agree with the plan to enlarge its membership?

SENATOR SCOTT: Well, I believe that measures can be brought out on the Floor of the House by other procedures, like Calendar Wednesday, and by discharge petition and so forth. On the other hand, these are long and often obstructive delays which are involved.

If I were a member of the House --- and I have no right to get into this except by commenting as a former member of the House Rules Committee -- I would support the proposal to enlarge the Rules Committee, because I believe that the party in power which has the responsibility to get legislation ought to be able to say -- ought to be deprived of any excuse for not doing it, let's put it this way. The Democratic Party has the President, they have the Congress, they have the Committees. Now, they should not have the excuse that they can't do something because one Rules Committee refuses them the right to do it.

I would favor their having all of the authority they want in the Rules Committee to get their bills to the Floor, because my experience tells me that anything they really want, they get, but they get it late and they blame the

Republicans for the delay.

I would rather deprive them of any chance of blaming the Republican Party for anything and then I would rather hold their feet to the fire when they fail and, as I said before, praise them when I think they are right. Therefore, I would favor the enlargement of the Rules Committee if I were a member of the House.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I want to say that whatever may be my esteemed colleague's motives for this very worthy decision of support of a change in the Rules Committee, I want to thank him. He is an experienced legislator and I think his observations about the importance of being able to process a program, that those observations are very valid. And I want to agree with you, Senator, that the Democratic Party has this majority; it has the responsibility; it ought to have the opportunity to bring its program to a vote without any excuse of being able to blame someone else if it doesn't succeed and if we can't succeed, I know that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is a very able man, will be able to tell us where we have faltered.

MR. GRANIK: Senator Humphrey, can we expect to see any really serious change in United States relations with Red China, under President Kennedy? You made a proposal recently about sending food to China.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, my proposal was not to send

food to the Chinese government.

MR. GRANIK: To the people?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would be unalterably opposed to placing in the hands of the Chinese Communist Government, the government on the mainland, any supplies of American food or material, because I feel those supplies would be used for political purposes and for purposes of their own national policy, of their own Communist Party policy.

I did suggest that since we had this abundance of food, that we ought to make it available wherever there is need and starvation and that we ought to not use food as a political weapon, but rather, as a means of humanitarian concern and consideration.

Therefore, I suggested that we offer to the International Red Cross, or in one instance, the Indian Red Cross, or the CARE organization, or any other responsible private volunteer organization, the food to be used wherever it was needed, such as in Red China, if they were able to get in. I think that this is a legitimate proposal and it does not violate our political responsibilities or our political policy, and it does fulfill our Judaic-Christian principles of caring for the needy, feeding the hungry.

SENATOR SCOTT: Our moral duty to be prepared to help disaster and famine is one thing. Our right to shore-up a Communist Government when the only hope of overthrow of that

government is the evidence in the minds of the people that the government has failed, is another thing.

China has gone through periods of distress and short crops. If China is to overthrow Mao Tse Tung and the Red Government, some day it will be because the Red Government has not taken care of the people.

Now, if we offer to go in to handle a situation which we couldn't begin to do adequately, not 3 percent, and in so doing attempt to shore-up the Chinese Reds who will come in and say, "We got you this food" -- they won't put "U.S.A." on it --- then you may postpone the possibility of a revolution in Red China and bringing that nation back into the Free World.

May I go into something else ---

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Now, on this point, this is the difference between what I call the rather conservative philosophy of Republican thinking and what I would say is the more liberal philosophy of Democratic thinking. I don't think for a single minute that the Red Chinese Government is going to let the United States of America get one person, ten people, inside of Red China. I don't think they are going to let the people of Red China have gifts that are earmarked from the American people. But I will tell you this, I think that it would be a body-blow to the prestige of the Chinese Government, the Red Chinese Government, with

its own people, if they did turn it down. And I'd like to see us test them once --

MR. GRANIK: Do you think recognition is inevitable, Senator?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No.

SENATOR SCOTT: Now, there is where I think you are naive.

In the first place, you assume if we offer food to China, the Chinese leaders are going to tell the Chinese people.

On the contrary, they will tell them that we offered poisoned food, that we offered microbes and germs, as he did once before.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am talking about having Americans and having people with our food going inside of the country, not relying on the government. And furthermore, may I add, we ought to use this food first at home for our own needy and thank goodness, this Administration has seen fit for an airlift of food to the Congo.

MR. GRANIK: I am sorry, gentlemen, I must interrupt. We will return after this announcement.

(Announcement.)

MR. GRANIK: Thank you, gentlemen. Now, this is Theodore Granik, bidding you goodbye from the Nation's Capital.



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