

Linnell-//1

CBS NEWS  
2020 M Street  
Washington, D.C. 20036

rb-1

FACE THE NATION

as broadcast over the

CBS Television Network

and the

CBS Radio Network

Sunday, September 19, 1965 -- 12:30 - 1:00 PM EDT

GUEST: THE HONORABLE EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN (Illinois)

Republican Leader of the Senate

NEWS CORRESPONDENTS: Martin Agronsky  
CBS News

Ben H. Bagdikian  
Saturday Evening Post

Roger Mudd  
: CBS News

PRODUCERS: Ellen Wadley  
Prentiss Childs

DIRECTOR: Robert Vitarelli

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator Dirksen, in the light of the Chinese Communist ultimatum to India, the Indians have asked for aid from the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union. What should our country do?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: There are several things we can do. We can make an entreaty not to go any further with this aggressive move.

Secondly, we could issue a formal warning not to go any further.

Third, we might offer some kind of aid.

Fourth, we might offer our good offices as an intermediary in the hope that all sides will accept.

If you ask me what kind of aid, that's probably a question that experts should answer, because obviously in a situation of this kind it would almost have to be military aid.

THE ANNOUNCER: From CBS Washington, FACE THE NATION, a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with the Senate Republican leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois. Senator Dirksen will be questioned by CBS News Correspondent Roger Mudd, Ben Bagdikian of the Saturday Evening Post, and to lead the questioning CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky.

We shall resume the interview with Senator Dirksen in just a moment.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator Dirksen, former Vice President Nixon has charged that President Johnson has proved himself impotent to stop the war between India and Pakistan. How do you feel about that accusation?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, can an outside country ever stop a war? We probably came closer to it in the Congo where we offered planes and I presume some weapons. That went a good ways in order to bring that to an end. We did not stop a war in Vietnam. I am not sure when you have major powers like Pakistan in India that you can categorically say that by our intervention we can stop a war, because there are the conflicting parties to be taken into account, and perhaps they will not yield in principle on the position they take. Then what does the United States or any other country actually do?

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, I take it you disagree with Mr. Nixon?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I am just trying to give you a factual answer to the question as I understand it, and I try to project myself into the position of the President of the United States in determining what course to pursue in the hope that the war may be stopped, but a hope is one thing, actually stopping conflict is quite

another.

MR. BAGDIKIAN: Well, Senator, pursuing that same point, Richard Nixon has also said that he thinks that American foreign policy under the Johnson Administration is properly going to be an issue in the 1966 election campaign. You have been forthright in support of the President's foreign policy. Is this another serious difference between you and Mr. Nixon?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, not particularly, because there are many facets to foreign policy.

You remember in 1960 one of the great issues was the low prestige of the United States in all parts of the world. I do not believe that prestige has been improved. In fact, I think it has been impaired. That, of course, is one of the things that comes out of this crucible of differences between countries that are located ten, twelve thousand miles away. But since that issue was made in '64 it will be a recurring issue in the days ahead.

MR. MUDD: Senator, specifically on Mr. Nixon's comments, do you think that President Johnson will succumb to the temptation in South Vietnam to agree to a coalition or neutralist government?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I can only say I hope not. That's a tremendous lure in order to bring hostilities

to an end and stop the blood-letting. But will it have been a durable answer if it's done, because if it's neutralist obviously it can go in one direction or another.

MR. MUDD: By hope not, do you hope against hope or do you have some feeling that the President would succumb to the temptation?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I do not know what the President will do. I can only say I hope he will not succumb to it until every other device, every other possible remedy has been tried. Where has a state of neutralism ever gotten us? Laos is a classical example of where embracing that doctrine has failed and it has only aggravated our troubles in the Far East.

MR. AGRONSKY: Well, Senator, suppose, to use your own words, the President had tried everything else and felt that this was the only solution. Would you then support him?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I would prefer not to cross that bridge until I came to it, but I would like to see every other device, every other approach tried first and tried effectively before you get that far.

MR. BAGDIKIAN: Well, are you saying, Senator, that you are not in your own mind ruling out a possibility of a negotiated peace or a coalition government, that

you might accept it under some conditions?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, maybe it is the ultimate end to this thing in place of continuing conflict, but this conflict can spread and finally engulf the entire world. That makes, of course, a better choice between really two extremes. That's why I say I don't like to project myself that far into the future and come up with what seems like a categorical answer.

MR. MUDD: Senator, Mr. Nixon also said that by 1968 unless Mr. Johnson suffered a major foreign policy crisis or a domestic economic upheaval the President would be in an even stronger political position. Do you agree that as yet the President has not suffered a major foreign policy crisis?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Up to this point I do not believe he has.

MR. MUDD: What do you do then with the Dominican Republic? How do you categorize South Vietnam?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, first of all, the Administration's policy in Vietnam is in a nature a continuation of what we tried to undertake in a limited way before. That goes back to the Geneva accord in 1954. And under that accord we were permitted to send in something less than 700 advisers. But as this problem took on new dimensions in Vietnam, we had to make a build-up there

and try to train the Vietnamese army, and that's the old story. You move a little further each time and finally you are in difficulties up to your neck, so that today I think it is pretty conceded that we have more than 125,000 troops of all kinds, meaning maintenance troops, operational troops, and so forth, in Vietnam. Now there is speculation as to whether or not we need even more, and I am not prepared to say whether they will be sent or not. It is being discussed. That I can say.

MR. AGRONSKY: But you don't feel that this will be an issue in the campaign? You would exclude it?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, you can't laugh this thing off entirely, but it is a fact that we made some pledges to Vietnam more than eleven years ago and we certainly do not want to be in a position of having any country say that we repudiated our pledges and we welched on the promises that we made.

MR. BAGDIKIAN: Well, Senator, do you agree with what is commonly said that President Johnson is very strong and able on the domestic side of policy and practices, but that his weakness is foreign policy, and do you think this is true and do you think this will make a difference in the coming elections, that this is his vulnerable point?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, now, when you talk about strength on the domestic side, you are talking, I suppose, about the capacity and facility of the President to get his program through Congress, but there is another stanza to that whole story, and that is if it is taken through Congress successfully, it still has to be made to work. And the question is will it work?

I cite as an example the so-called poverty program. I addressed myself to that at considerable length on the Senate floor and pointed out some of the peculiar and almost silly undertakings, like 437 young ladies, if I may use the term, ages 13 to 15, being taken around and shown how to drive a truck, how to dance the ballet, and so forth, to give them a hint as to what kind of future occupations they might want to pursue. Well, what a lot of academic nonsense that really is.

# 2

Now, you can multiply it in a lot of quarters. So it's not the fact that Congress approved the anti-poverty program. They have to take responsibility for making the program work and that's quite a different thing.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, one area in which you are completely at odds with the President is on the right to work amendment that is being proposed, so-called 14(b) to the Taft-Hartley Act.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You are quite right.



MR. AGRONSKY: Right. Now, you have said that you are prepared to filibuster that 'til the snow flies. Do you intend to keep Congress here 'til Christmas? Is that the thrust of your observation?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, Martin, first I must correct you. I never used that odious word "filibuster." I like to think of it in terms of extended discussion.

MR. MUDD: Why is it so odious, Senator? Why is that word odious?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, somebody attached a rather odious connotation to the word and so I like to avoid it, but extended discussion is a far better term. Moreover, it's more readily translatable into giving information to the country. You see, Thomas Jefferson once said, "To inform the minds of the country and then abide by the judgment of the people is the duty of a public servant." So I am just trying to inform the people.

MR. AGRONSKY: How long do you intend to inform the people? Let's put it that way.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, it depends somewhat on what the issue is, the time of the year, and so forth, whether there is something --

MR. AGRONSKY: Well, let's talk about the right to work amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes, it's going to come at about

the right time of the year. The children are in school. People are back from their vacations. They now address themselves to more serious business and they read more critically than they have before and they listen to your programs more critically. And as a result they will be doing a lot of thinking. So we want to only lay out foundational material that will be a guideline for them to think through.

MR. MUDD: Have you got some information, Senator, information come to you that perhaps the Administration will not push 14(b) this fall? Mike Mansfield the other day indicated that the decision to call it up was not irrevocable.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes, but I have no information, that is to say, I have no exact knowledge on that point. Sometimes I get feelers from one side or another.

MR. MUDD: Have you gotten feelers on this?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: And all too often there is always coupled with one of these probes a little tag, whether you will do a certain thing in January or in the second session of the 89th Congress if this issue is thrown overboard.

MR. AGRONSKY: Do you now have reference to the reapportionment decision, is that it?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Both, reapportionment and also

14(b).

MR. BAGDIKIAN: Well, Senator, it's commonly thought that on reapportionment on which you were defeated this time on the attempt to water down the Supreme Court decision on one man, one vote, that you did get a concession from the Administration in having that the first order of business when Congress reconvenes in January, and many people have supposed that there was some kind of arrangement, some kind of deal on which you got this and there was a little tag connected. Is this true? And, if so, what was the tag?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I am afraid on that issue you are a little too polite. I do know that I got a concession. I knew that I went into the Judiciary Committee armed with everything I needed within the compass of the rule book and said, "No reapportionment, no immigration," because in a committee you can put a bill to sleep. It only takes two people, and I had two or three at my right hand to help, because in a morning's session you get practically a good hour in order to debate an issue. And once you get the floor they can't take it away from you. So we could have kept that going until Christmas easily. At long last the vote was changed. I do not know what extraneous force was intruded to change that vote. I only know that when I said, "It's either this or

else," that suddenly there was a change and instead of a tie vote in the full committee the vote was 9 to 7 and the reapportionment issue went on the calendar. I made this one concession. I would not try to have it called up until January.

MR. BAGDIKIAN: Do you think you will win in January where you were beaten this time?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I never go on a long trail like that without feeling that when you get to the end of the trail you can hoist the flag of victory.

MR. MUDD: To return just briefly to the 14(b) extended debate, you have said that you have got 25 men you can count on to run this filibuster. Most people can't count but 17. And in your office last week when you had a meeting on it only 11 showed up.

Now, the fact is, Senator, that what you got willing to filibuster are some old men and some Midwest Republicans who have never gone through a filibuster before.

Now, do you really think you can mount an all-out oratorical display that will require the Administration to roll back?

MR. DIRKSEN: First, Roger, I am sorry if my strategy threw you off track. You see, I only invited as many to that strategy meeting in my office as were

there. Everyone I invited was there. I didn't ask for the rest of them. I knew where they were and who they were.

MR. MUDD: You have tricked me before, Senator.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I am sorry. But I know how many we got on both sides.

MR. MUDD: Well, how many do you have?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, must I disclose --

MR. MUDD: You said 25 once.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, if I said 25, then I can still stick by 25.

MR. AGRONSKY: Are there enough to hoist the flag of victory, Senator?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It might be more.

Well, I think so.

MR. AGRONSKY: When?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I begin to see the steam column rise all over the country on this issue of 14(b), and believe me, that's not limited to people unidentified with unions. You would be surprised at the number of card-carrying members in labor organizations who are writing in constantly day after day against the repeal of 14(b). So we believe we have got the country in our corner, and I do believe that the national polls that are carefully taken will sustain that observation and

that judgment.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, despite your resistance to the Administration and the President on 14(b), the Right-to-Work Act, many people feel that the President has you unequivocally in his corner any time he really wants you. Do you think that's fair?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am never unequivocally in anybody's corner. When I think the President is right, then I am in his corner. When I think he is wrong, I tell him so and I tell him in language I am sure he understands.

MR. AGRONSKY: He seems to demonstrate a remarkable --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Because we learned a sort of a common language when we were leaders together in the Senate and we could talk to each other freely at his office or in mine, and you could throw in a few expletives, you could throw the punctuation series out of the window and use an emphasis that doesn't always sound good in public. But when we got through we knew where we stood.

MR. BACDIKIAN: But, Senator, I don't think that there is another important Republican leader who has had as casual relations with the last two Democratic Presidents as you have and with the Democratic leadership on the Hill. Is this a reflection of the fact that the

Republican strength is very weak at this time in numbers and we perhaps don't have a real two-party system but, as someone said, a one-and-a-half party system, and does this cordiality and frequent cooperation that you have with the Administration a matter of conviction or is it, well, expediency, the best you can get under the circumstances?

3

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, now, that's a very involved question and maybe we ought to parse it like you do a sentence.

First of all, is there any reason why I shouldn't maintain that long-standing friendship with the President and still be able to disagree with him and do it violently right in his presence when we have a session? He understands fully and so do I.

Very often, you talk about one and one-half parties. I remind you that those very catchy cliches that are in the air today you could reproduce from the literature of 1928, when after that election they said the Democrat Party is done. Isn't that what they said? Why they had all the wreathes ready, the hole was dug in the cemetery, the marble slab was prepared: Here lies the Democrat Party. But parties are rather viable and durable institutions and they don't die on the vine quite that way. And it only takes events to infuse new interest in a party.

The Republicans are still here. Sometimes they temporarily switch to the other side. You got the independent vote to work on and to lure back into the Republican Party.

Now, I will give you an example. In 1950 I rang all the changes in the campaign against the majority leader of the Senate, who is my friend and has always been my friend and who comes to see me, and you know that I am referring to the Honorable Scott Lucas formerly United States Senator from the State of Illinois. But the day that the word came that the troops were moving into Korea that put an entirely different face upon the campaign. From then on there was only one issue.

So when I say events, those are the critical things that give direction to a party and give direction to the thinking of the people when they go to the polls to vote.

And finally, just this broad observation. Who was the professor at the University of Wisconsin years ago, I think his name was Monroe, who said, "Parties don't defeat each other. Parties defeat themselves." And I think that's pretty nearly a political truism.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, there are many more things that we would like to ask you and we will resume the questioning in a moment.

- - -

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator Dirksen, you have indicated



that you refuse to be discouraged about the prospects for your party in the forthcoming elections in '66 and I presume in '68. Who do you see on the Republican scene who could lead your party in 1968?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, you cause me great distress of spirit when you ask that question, because it would be necessary then for me to figure some person out. I can give you names.

MR. AGRONSKY: That would be interesting.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That doesn't mean that they will go anywhere with the party when the chips are down. But former Vice President Nixon is still out in front, that is to say, in front, I mean in front of the public. There is Governor Romney of Michigan who gets around the country a good deal. There is the Governor Pennsylvania. Whether he has ambitions in that field I do not know, but I presume there will still be others when the time comes, and it's quite a long ways to 1968.

MR. MUDD: Will your party go through in 1968 what it went through in 1964, that is, a show-down between the moderate wing of the party and the conservatives, or is that fight over in your party in conventions?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I believe, Roger, that to a considerable extent that's over. If we had to have a lesson, and if you can call it a lesson, then let 1964

stand as that lesson.

MR. AGRONSKY: What was the lesson you got from '64, Senator?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, you had a popular candidate who had been courting this country for a long time. And, frankly, I do not know how you would have assembled any group of delegations and denied that nomination to Barry Goldwater. He traveled early and late, before clubs and groups and political meetings all over the country day and night, rain and shine. Nobody from the standpoint of energy and hard work could ever match that record. And a candidate doesn't build himself up in a day. You don't do it in newspaper headlines.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, is zeal and energy a substitute for capacity?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, no. It requires all of those, but I am speaking only now of what happened in San Francisco, because these people had seen him. They had shaken hands with him. They knew him. They didn't know some of these other candidates except that those were names that appeared on the front page or over radio or on television. But beyond that -- you know, it has a deep impress if you see a man's name and say, "I know him. I saw him. He grabbed my hand and gave me a vigorous handshake." And here you had the fruits of many years

of endeavor, because he was at it all the while that he was a member of the United States Senate.

MR. BAGDIKIAN: But, Senator, haven't you said that even in hindsight you would do it all over again in nominating Barry Goldwater and presumably knowing the disaster that would come from that?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, acting and speaking from hindsight puts me in some difficulty, but I think I would have done precisely what I did before. First, because I thought he was going to get the nomination, but more importantly as a colleague he asked me to nominate him.

MR. MUDD: Senator, in just the brief moment we have got left can I pin you down on a flat prediction as to when the first session of the 89th Congress will finally get out of Washington?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I could give you a half a dozen dates. I could say, "Get your Thanksgiving turkey now," or "Buy the trimmings for your Christmas tree." Who knows?

MR. MUDD: What do you think?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: We have got some vitality and if 14(b) is going to be dished up I can assure you that there is going to be extended discussion.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, I am awfully sorry,

gentlemen, I am awfully sorry but our time is up.

Thank you, Senator Dirksen, for being here with us on FACE THE NATION.

A word about next week's guest now in a moment.

- - -

THE ANNOUNCER: Today on FACE THE NATION Senate Republican leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois was interviewed by CBS news correspondent Roger Mudd, Ben Bagdikian of the Saturday Evening Post. CBS news correspondent Martin Agronsky led the questioning. Next week Under Secretary of State George W. Ball will FACE THE NATION.

FACE THE NATION was prerecorded in Washington.

-----