

[MARCH 14, 1962]

## YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

ANNOUNCER: American Security and Trust Company, one of the 100 largest banks in the nation, presents YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, has the United States' decision to resume nuclear testing frozen the thaw of the cold war?

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, has the Republican Party become a party of personalities rather than policies?

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, why should we even consider negotiating with the Communists?

BARBER: In just a moment, Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois will answer these and other penetrating questions on YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW.

### ANNOUNCEMENT:

BARBER: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW. Our guest, Senator Everett Dirksen of Illinois is one of the busiest men in the U. S. Senate. In addition to his duties as Minority Leader, Senator Dirksen is enjoying a second season of what is known in Washington as the Ev and Charlie show. This is a weekly news conference conducted jointly by Senator Dirksen and House Republican Leader Charles Halleck. Senator Dirksen, it's a pleasure to welcome you again to YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, it develops some nostalgia with me, because I was one of Theodore Granik's first patrons, I think, on a TV show long ago. And so it's good to come back and to see this very sharp panel.

BARBER: Thank you, sir. Now let's begin our questioning with Bob.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, hasn't the recent amity created by the Powers-Abel swap been destroyed by the recent resumption of nuclear testing--or the decision to resume?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I doubt it very much. I rather fancy the firmness on the part of this country in undertaking to resume nuclear testing has brought our so-called friends across the Sea to their senses. And maybe something good and objective and constructive will come out of it before we get through.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you feel that the resumption of these tests will cause the Afro-Asian voting bloc to vote against the United States in the U. N. ?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I know of no reason why it should. It's our own security that's involved, and they should be as much interested in our security as they are in that of anybody else.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you consider that there are other criteria other than preventing war of going to the summit?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, that's a pretty broad question and I'm not sure that I can give you a responsive answer. There are so many factors, of course, that are involved in the business of making or conducting war, whether war is declared or not. And you'd have to evaluate a great many factors in order to answer that question properly.

QUESTION: Well, should we first achieve something at the prime minister level before the President should. . . .

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh definitely so, because I think we've had our lesson in that respect. Too often the agenda was not firmed up and as a result, whatever our hopes were for achievement at the summit, just fell apart. And we ought to be positive and quite sure that we know what the agenda is going to be and that the agenda is going to be followed, even though in other times, it hasn't been followed, because that's the only assurance, I think, we can have that something conclusive can come out of it.

QUESTION: Senator, Khrushchev has pointed out a discrepancy in the U. S. confidence in its military prowess in its decision to resume testing. Is he right? Is the missile gap back with us?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I doubt whether the missile gap is back with us. I thought we had settled that issue quite a long time ago. And I think we're pretty confident about our power in the missile field. Now, Khrushchev may make most any kind of an observation that his rather vagarious mind will suggest, but that doesn't mean that it is a fact or he is uttering what is the truth.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, in view of the results of past negotiations, why should we even bother to negotiate with the Communists?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, there are probably a hundred million people who have asked that same question. In view of the fact that these other adventures have failed, and that so often we could have no confidence

in the oral or written word of the people who conduct the affairs of the Soviet Union. I've had some doubts on that score myself.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you feel that a fear of Communist China is forcing Mr. Khrushchev to negotiate more with the West?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That, of course, is a speculation. I do not know what's in the mind of Chou En Lai or Mao Tse Tung in Red China, who seem to be the directors of the policy. I can only evaluate it as best I can from the things I read in the press from time to time. There may be a schism between these two countries--who shall say?--but this much we know, that the Red Chinese are pretty well wedded to a rigid Marxist line, and in view of what happened to Stalin in the Soviet Union, perhaps they're not so hard bitten there on that same thing.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, on a recent television program Senator Goldwater expressed his approval of the ideals of the John Birch Society, but disavowed its leadership. Do you care to comment on his. . . .

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I have no comment on the John Birch Society. First, I know nothing about him. I have never seen a John Bircher in my life. I have no idea what they're achieving. I've seen some of these things in the press. That's as far as it gets. I doubt whether we have any John Birch factions to speak of back in my home state. And so I have given no attention, and since I have no knowledge, obviously, I could make no reasoned or durable or sustained comment.

BARBER: Would you agree with former Vice President Nixon, Senator Dirksen, that he would not support a Republican candidate who is a member of the Birch Society.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well I don't know what the exact situation was in California. I speak only for myself. Because I know what my own politics, my own policies are, and I never get off the trail because some of these rather strange and extreme phenomena should develop in the political scene. That's not new. That's been going on since the days of Abraham Lincoln.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you know how far the John Birch Society has penetrated into the Republican Party?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I would have any doubt that it's penetrated at all insofar as I know.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you believe that General Walker's running for the Governorship in Texas will aid the Republican Party?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I couldn't tell you.

QUESTION: Senator, George Romney has recently been hurdled into the spotlight, bringing the number of personalities in the Republican Party to four. Isn't that too many for a minority party?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I doubt it very much. I think our history will show that we've had a lot more personalities that far ahead of a Presidential election. But, of course, time has a way of dealing with them.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you agree with Senator Javits' recent comment that the current debate between the progressives and the conservative wing of the Republican party is the most critical crisis it has faced since 1932?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You mean the party has faced?

QUESTION: Yes.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh I doubt it very much. I didn't know that we had a crisis in the Republican Party.

QUESTION: How are you going to bring the conservatives and the more progressive wings of the Republican Party back together again?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You don't always do it, and never have you. I've always said that the Republican umbrella is a large one that admits of all shades of opinion. Don't forget that the Republican Party started as an amalgam of a half a dozen parties in 1856. But they had one objective and one great ideal--that was the preservation of the union, and ultimately freeing the country of slavery. They didn't agree on a great many other things, and so you never expect in these vagarious times for all Republicans to agree on all things. My hope as a leader always is that on the fundamental issues, and at the top of it I'd put freedom and individual liberty, that there we can use it as a measuring rod when we evaluate all the policy matters and all the programs that are advanced upon the Congress for attention.

QUESTION: Senator, recent polls show that President Kennedy's popularity is very high. Do you think this indicates that the Democrats will increase their majority in the Senate and House in next fall's election?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No I don't, because you have to dissociate, I think, the leader from the policies that are a part of the New Frontier. And I think you'll discover in the country that the popularity of those items is quite a different thing from the personal popularity of the President.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you feel that Illinois will be a safe Republican state in 1962?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I try not to be overly prophetic, but I hope so.

QUESTION: In view of recent party setbacks, of your party, on the state and national level, what do you think will be the fate of the Republican Party if the Democrats sweep the nation in 1962 and '64?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well first you'll have to tell me what these setbacks were.

QUESTION: Well, the Republicans have had a President in only two out of eight terms. Also, only 19 state governors.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, but you spoke about recent setbacks.

QUESTION: Well, I'm sorry. . . .

SENATOR DIRKSEN: We had done quite well, I thought. Obviously, there was a defeat in 1960, but when you talk about recent setbacks, I think of two Republican members who were elected to the legislature in the Carolinas. I wouldn't call that a setback. I think the advances we made in that Congressional District in Michigan, even though we didn't win, but cut the majority from some 25,000 to around 700 or 800, was anything but a setback. So you see life is swiftly moving and in the political field there's a great acceleration of events, and to be timely, we've always got to bring it up-to-date. And I think if you use the word recently, we have been doing all right.

BARBER: I think, Senator Dirksen, Douglas was referring to two recent special Congressional elections--one in New York and one in Texas--in which Democrats won both.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh well, of course, you must set Texas to one side. After all we've never felt that that's a state where we are strongest, by any means.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, it has been said that the Republican Party needs to strengthen itself in the city. What is the Republican Party doing in Illinois to lure voters in Chicago and other cities?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It's doing a great job of organizing, because the great problem of a political party is to get its voters to the polls.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, what are the Republican Party's expectations for former Vice President Nixon and the state of California as far as Governorship is concerned.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, are you speaking now of the hope of a victory?

QUESTION: Yes sir.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, obviously we hope for a victory.

QUESTION: What is your belief in the situation?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I not only hope so, but I believe he's going to win.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, speaking of getting the people out to the polls in the city, why, if the Republican Party wants the city support, didn't you back President Kennedy's Department for Urban Affairs?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It had nothing to do with it. The whole question involved there was whether or not a cabinet department of urban affairs could do the job and achieve the things that were set out in the Presidential message. Don't forget that we had that under consideration in the Eisenhower Administration. We thought it ought to be set up as an office in the Executive Branch, and not as a cabinet department. So, we're aware of the problem, and the question is how do you do it more efficiently.

QUESTION: But you do back an urban affairs, and you feel that this would. . . .

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, not a cabinet department.

QUESTION: But some type. . . .

SENATOR DIRKSEN: A kind of executive agency, and as a matter of fact, I have drafted a bill along that line. Whether I'll introduce it or not remains to be seen.

QUESTION: Did the Republicans in their decision to vote against the urban affairs proposal, did they consider that this would relegate the states to a rather minor position with regard to cities, and, therefore, strengthen the Democratic margin in these cities?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It was a factor, and I think probably the best statement I can make on this is that in the Senate, where we didn't actually vote on the merits of the plan, but rather on discharging a Senate Committee, that you found those who had served as governors of their state quite hard-bitten in their opposition to this reorganization proposal.

QUESTION: Senator, President Kennedy in pre-appointing Robert Weaver as Secretary of Urban Affairs was accused of exploiting the racial issue for partisan purposes. In a recent press conference, you stated that should he be nominated to take Abraham Ribicoff's place, not a single Republican would vote against him. Isn't this essentially the same thing?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No. We've had experiences with Mr. Weaver. He served on a commission of human relations in Chicago for about a year, and everybody who was associated with him thought he was a fine type of person with great capabilities, and so if the whole hope here and the problem was to find a cabinet spot for Dr. Weaver, then we believe that if Mr. Ribicoff goes to the state of Connecticut to run for the Senate, there'll be a vacancy, and I think I could assure the appointive powers that every Republican would vote for his confirmation.

QUESTION: Can you safely and with full confidence guarantee all those Republican votes?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I guarantee nothing, but on my own honor and responsibility, I think I could deliver every Republican vote.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you agree with Secretary Goldberg's recent statement that the government should be a third party at the bargaining table?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I doubt it very much. I'm afraid that if government becomes a third party, that it no longer remains collective bargaining, because if you're going to bargain, the principles, parties at interest have to do the bargaining. But if you have a third party as an intervenor, can you say that it's collective bargaining?

QUESTION: Then you do not feel that the national interest should have an equal hand?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, yes, but you're talking about a matter of procedure, not the national interest.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, do you look with optimism at the forthcoming Geneva Conference?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I haven't been too optimistic heretofore, I must say. I always utter my hopes, and I hope, of course, that something good will come out of it. But on the basis of past experience, those hopes may be just a little high. And yet it's in the nature of mankind always to advance and to nurse their hopes.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, how do you feel about the United States plan of trade assistance to underdeveloped foreign nations under Kennedy's Trade Expansion Bill?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Are you limiting your question now to trade with underdeveloped nations?

QUESTION: No, assisting these underdeveloped nations?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh well, we've been in that program for a long time. And we hope that insofar as we assist, it can become an efficient program and that it will add up finally to a better relationship and even a trade relationship between the United States and those nations that we assist.

QUESTION: To return to disarmament negotiations, France has decided to boycott the conference. Can the West really hope to negotiate accurately without one of its most principal allies?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well who shall say when President DeGaulle may come into the picture? If it has an element of success in it, if it goes forward, and if France finally discovers that it's in its own interest to do so, I would rather gather that sooner or later she would come into the picture.

QUESTION: Speaking with cold realism, has the whole affair become just a meaningless gesture, kept up for the gesture's sake?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You don't dare believe that it's a gesture just for a gesture's sake. Because, if that were the case, where would the hopes of mankind finally end?

QUESTION: Senator, should we ignore France's refusal to attend the conference?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You can't entirely ignore France. Look at the strategic position that she occupies, and look at the troops and the people and the instrumentality that we have in France at the present time. She can't be ignored.

QUESTION: How would our foreign policy be affected if we resume nuclear testing?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You say how would it be affected?

QUESTION: Yes sir.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I think it will be affected in a sense that there will be more confidence in the capacity of this country to deal with any situation that might arise, and when all is said and done, it is not so much love and affection as respect and confidence that finally makes the world go forward and brings them into a cooperative status.

BARBER: Senator Dirksen, speaking of respect, some critics are rather hard on you and Mr. Halleck at your weekly news conferences, and in the introduction to this program I made reference to the Ev and Charlie show. I asked you this a year ago and you were not offended by this tag. I would like to restate that question. After another year of the Ev and Charlie show and reporters reactions to it, are you offended when it's referred to as such?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh goodness no. And I was assailed way out on the West Coast, then I knew that the Ev and Charlie show had really penetrated the country.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, I would like to change the subject. Mr. Powers is said to have said as he was brought into a Russian courtroom "I have committed a grave crime and I realize that I must be punished for it." In view of the fact that he voluntarily accepted this well-paying job, why would he say this? Doesn't it seem a little unpatriotic?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, my dear, I must make you a confession. I try to keep abreast of nearly everything that goes on, but I'm afraid the days that I've been away from Washington doing a little campaigning incidentally, why that sort of got out of mind and out of eye with me, and I'd have to refresh myself a little more on that story before I could give you a proper answer.

QUESTION: Was the depression, Senator, in American prestige caused by Francis Gary Powers' U-2 incident. . . .

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I didn't get the first of your question?

QUESTION: Oh, was American prestige--the depression that was caused by Francis Gary Powers' U-2 incident--was this made up for by John Glenn's flight around the earth?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I think it has helped to rehabilitate our prestige in that field.

QUESTION: Senator, do you know when Mr. Powers will be brought before the Senate and House?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, he has testified at various places already, and how much more testimony he will give I do not know.

QUESTION: Is South Vietnam, Senator, becoming another hot spot in the world?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well it is a hot spot to say the least. And I can speak with some authority because I have been there three times and had a chance to evaluate the situation all the way from the Red River Delta up into Hanoi down to Saigon and south of Saigon. And to say the least, it is a hot spot.

QUESTION: What can the United States do to alleviate some of the hotness of this spot?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, of course, we are privileged to send equipment in there, and we are privileged to give them some training up to a point because we did subscribe, I think, in a general way, to the Geneva undertaking that was subscribed to in 1954. And so we hope that means of the coaching and the instruction and such equipment as we can give them, that they can at long last hold their own and maintain the integrity and the sovereignty of South Vietnam.

BARBER: Would you favor committing American troops, Senator Dirksen, in order to save South Vietnam?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I do not believe there is any desire to commit American troops there, and you have to rationalize that against what was written in that undertaking in Geneva eight years ago.

QUESTION: Senator, in toughening our defense stands from all out nuclear war to the twilight zone as Secretary McNamara called it, are we in danger of crossing the line from a defensive policy to an aggressively defensive one?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well that's one of those amorphous and vague lines that you never can tell until you're confronted with it. I suppose you mean whether we go from limited conventional war into nuclear war. Obviously, you can't tell until you're confronted with the realities of a condition. And then those best versed and schooled in that field have to come up with the answer.

QUESTION: Senator, to get back to legislation problems, would you support a federal aid to education bill if it provided aid for parochial schools specifically?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I doubt it very much because I've been congenitally against aid to education from the federal level as was envisioned in the omnibus aid to education bill, on the grounds that I believe it will inevitably result in federal control of school curricula.

QUESTION: Senator, has Congress found it a necessity for the federal government to step into education in Congress?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: In what respect?

QUESTION: Has Congress seen a necessity that warrants President Kennedy's bill which is not up?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No I don't believe the viewpoint of Congress has materially changed since last year.

QUESTION: Can the Russians use a threat of war as a gambit to force us into conditions which we will not--we do not exactly approve of?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well that question is too vague and I just can't give you an answer to it unless you particularize.

QUESTION: In other words, if Russia would threaten a war and demand certain terms concerning Berlin--the divided city--the removal of Western troops from Berlin--and as a threat uses threat of war against us, would we take up their gambit, or would we withdraw?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It depends on how far they go. They've been threatening for the last 20 years, and we've become more or less accustomed to their threats. That's part of their propaganda stock in trade.

The question is do they implement it with some kind of action that makes it a real threat that would require some definite action on our part. And you see that's a rather undefined line and obviously no one could give you an answer to it unless he knows what the conditions are.

BARBER: Senator Dirksen and panel, I'm afraid our time has run out for our answers but we'll be back with a final word from our guest in just a moment.

ANNOUNCEMENT:

BARBER: Senator Dirksen, it's been a pleasure having you on YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, coming back on the show is like a salute to an old friend, Ted Granik, and I'm delighted to see you all.

BARBER: Thank you sir. And our thanks to our panel members and thank you, ladies and gentlemen for joining us. Now this is Julian Barber inviting you to be with us again next week when our guest will be another well known figure of prominence in the news.

ANNOUNCER: Tune in again next Sunday at 6:30 for YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW, presented by American Security and Trust Company where greater Washington banks.