



*Youth Wants
to Know*

Founded and Produced by Theodore Granik

Vol. V

SUNDAY, JANUARY 20, 1957

No. 1

Youth Wants to Know Presents

SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

Republican of Illinois

STEPHEN McCORMICK

Moderator

RANDELL, Inc. • PRINTERS and PUBLISHERS • WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Announcer: YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW. The searching, provocative questions of today's young people, founded and produced by Theodore Granik. And here is your moderator, Steve McCormick.

Mr. McCormick: Tomorrow, Inauguration day starts the second term of President Eisenhower in the highest office of our land. This is naturally a week of great celebration for the Republican Party. Our guest today is one of the Republican leaders in Congress to whom the President will turn for advice and support in the four years ahead. He is Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois, Floor Leader of the Senate Republicans and member of the Strategic Appropriations and Judiciary Committees.

Welcome to YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW, Senator.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Thank you, Steve. It is good to be on the program, again. I always renew my youth when I see young people like you who are sitting here. And then I ought to express my double delight to see my old friend Ted Granik and Mrs. Granik. I haven't seen them in a long time and I am delighted to see he looks so well and there is a chance to renew the fellowship on this occasion.

Mr. McCormick: Senator, we have a few questions for you.

QUESTION: Senator, previous to elections during the campaign we were assured continually by the administration that our troops would not have to go into the Suez. And now the President is proposing that we do just that in the event of aggression, there.

Has the picture changed so much in this short a time that our plans have changed that much?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am afraid at first by the nature of your question, you are assuming that maybe troops will actually be used. It is in the nature of standby authority that he has contemplated in the resolution presently before the House and Senate. That doesn't mean that troops might not be used but it is always hoped, of course, that by this display of power rather than force that it would not be necessary to use troops in order to maintain the gateway in the Middle East.

QUESTION: If aggression occurred there or if our interests were jeopardized, would we go against UN consent and take our own troops into that area?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No, I think the resolution provides that it must be consonant of course with the principles of the UN and also with the treaty obligations that we have there. There is also the escape clause which states that it must be desired, which means that there has to be request on the part of the nation.

QUESTION: Virtually, there is no great change at all in our policy. It is just an outline of our previous policy?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It is a show of firmness that I think is consonant with the principles and with the program that we have been carrying on for quite some time, in developing initial resistance on the part of countries in all parts of the world. That is the real basis, of course, for the so-called Foreign Aid program.

QUESTION: With this show of firmness now, do you think Russia and Red China will react?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: The reaction is already evident from the

press. Mr. Khrushchev and Chou En Lai have already indicated how they feel. They condemn it very severely and I think also they are conveying their sentiments to all countries in the Middle East.

QUESTION: Do you think we have them a little scared?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I don't know whether we can frighten them particularly, but I do know that a country that is so influential and so wealthy and so strong as America when it makes plain its intentions, of course, it is going to gain and beget the respect, certainly, of countries like the Soviet Union and Red China.

QUESTION: Senator, since the Suez is being opened, don't you think speedy passage to vessels of all nations should be arranged?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It is hoped that can be accomplished. Actually as you know the Suez came into being under a treaty with Egypt which still has probably twelve or thirteen years to run and from time to time there has been talk about modification of the treaty terms, but certainly it has come to be an artery of commerce that ties up the Eastern and the Western world and obviously there must be free and assured passage through the Suez Canal.

QUESTION: Senator, do you think that Britain's calling for international control of the Gaza strip will insure peace in that area?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Not necessarily. Who can say peace will ever be insured by one fragmentary policy or another. It probably would be conducive to peace, but I think what they have in mind, of course, is to do something about that rather monolithic refugee problem that they have over there. You have, in round figures I would say, around 900,000 people.

QUESTION: Do you think that anything could insure peace better than an agreement between the two countries?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Agreement is always conducive to peace.

QUESTION: Senator, the breach has definitely been made between Britain, France and the United States in their move in the Suez. Do you feel that this breach should be sealed?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: If you feel that there has been an unhealable breach between Britain and France on the one hand and the United States on the other, of course to that I cannot agree. Policies in that general field always have to be fluid and what may seem like a breach is probably a sharp divergence of opinion. But it can always be healed and I think the healing forces have been set in motion, already.

QUESTION: Well, do you think, Senator, that the appointment of Prime Minister McMillan will increase good feelings between the United States and Britain?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I think it will help, but I go on the theory that it wouldn't make a great deal of difference who might be the Prime Minister. We are Anglo Saxon nations and obviously we must get along. I think, of course, there is enough in the temperament of the two peoples, there is enough prudence and wisdom, enough identity of interests so we shall get along.

QUESTION: Do you think, Senator, that it is important that—or rather imperative—that the two countries do get along, considering the differences that they agree on their foreign policies?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Very definitely so. I think it is our responsibility to get along with them and it is their co-equal responsibility to get along with us.

QUESTION: You mentioned the refugees a few minutes ago. Why is it that the United States did not accept as many as the other countries?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You are speaking now of Hungarian refugees?

QUESTION: Yes.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That is still another package of refugees quite aside from the 900,000-odd that you find in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and in the Gaza Strip. I don't know as a matter of fact why that figure of 29,000 plus was finally determined. It is estimated, of course, that we ought to take more than that but there are some limitations in the law. There is a limited number, I suppose, that we could take under the Parol provisions of the Nationality Act of 1948. And while I have not spelled out the details on it there had to be some reason for the figure of 29,800 or whatever it was.

QUESTION: Senator, on our own scene, you are known as a Republican Party Whip in the Senate. Now just what is a whip and what do you have to do to be one?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I suppose that is a derivation from the old House of Commons days. Among other responsibilities, he must try to insure a full membership of his party on the floor, particularly when you have a crucial vote and keep people oriented there, have them around to make responses to speeches and to allegations that might come from the other side and generally—and this is not the most elegant term—to sort of ride herd on your party members.

Mr. McCormick: Do you think a little cajolery or a little ultimatum or a little threat—which would work best, Senator?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I think the "sweetness and light" approach is always best.

QUESTION: Do you think with the presence of Senators Cooper and Javits there is more or less a liberal wing developing within the Senate amongst the Republicans?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, that is a rather interesting question and when you address it to me, I always resist the nature of the question because I haven't put my own party into compartments. There has grown up a tendency, today, to refer to the right and to the left and to the center.

I seem myself to be a middle-of-the-roader, and since we do not put restrictions upon the members of our party, I suppose they can be cataloged as a little more liberal or a little less liberal, but I still like the term "Republican" very much.

QUESTION: Senator, don't you think the vote taken on the rule change with regard to the filibuster was an indication that there is a sort of split present in the Republican Party?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Not necessarily, because it depends on what you might have seen in the proposed rule change.

Now of course it was admitted and freely conceded that the whole purpose was to get at Rule 22, but in doing so under the resolution that was before us, you opened up all of the 40 standing rules of the Senate

and you might have had a Donnybrook Fair before you got through.

There is an orderly way to go about it and that is to introduce the rule change, which was done. It is referred to the Rules Committee which is quite in accord with Senate procedure. I am confident that we are going to get a modification of Rule 22. And then of course we will get around to what the purpose of the modification was, namely to get the President's civil rights program under way in the present session of Congress.

Mr. McCormick: When do you think that might happen, Senator? You said a modification.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I hope it won't be too long and I am reasonably confident that it will not be too long.

QUESTION: Senator, do you feel there might be any dissent in the Republican Party as evidenced by the announcement of the intended resignation in 1958 of Senator Knowland, as well as Chairman Leonard Hall?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Not necessarily. I like to think of the Party as a cohesive entity, or a cohesive institution. People come, people go. New persons are elected to office. Those in office drop out at the end of their term, and it is only a testimony, I think, to the fluidity of a party as a political institution.

QUESTION: Are you saying therefore that you think Senator Knowland will drop out of politics?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I do not know, as a matter of fact. He has not indicated whether he is going to stay in or drop out.

I think what you have seen, however, in this ocean of analysis and interpretation, are mainly speculations because he has not said what he is going to do.

QUESTION: Sir, back to the filibuster ruling, you are known as a sort of a golden throated orator in the Senate. How do you feel about it, do you feel this would inhibit your speaking powers in the Senate?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No. You can file a cloture petition with sixteen signatures and under the existing rule you need a constitutional two-thirds to put it into effect.

What we are trying to do, of course, is to require only two-thirds of the Senators present and voting and make it applicable not only to a resolution to substantive legislation, but to the very initial motion for consideration so that we can get around to the business at hand.

My dear, there will be ample time under that proposal for everybody to talk to his heart's content.

QUESTION: Senator, you made some very eloquent speeches at the Republican National Convention in favor of civil rights. Why then did you vote to table the filibuster?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Because I think it can be done by the orderly procedure that is available to the Senate, namely, to simply take Rule 22, provide for modification of the rule, let it go through the hearing stage before the Rules Committee where it properly belongs, have it reported back, have the Senate vote on it, and then you have carried it out in accordance with long-standing rules of the Senate.

Mr. McCormick: Do you think if that had been done, Senator, the vote would have been any different than it was?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No, I am not sure whether it would or it wouldn't, but I think this can be done under the traditional rules of the Senate.

And so I was certainly disinclined to open up the whole rule book and then invite a real filibuster, as you consider every rule beginning with Rule No. 1. By the time you get to Rule 40, you may have had the President's program piled up behind a stone wall that would take an awful lot of time and delay consideration of very important matters.

QUESTION: Senator, considering that both Democrats and Republicans were for or against the filibuster legislation, do you believe that there is some hint of a split in the party at least on that particular point?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, definitely not. Definitely not.

QUESTION: Don't you think that some of that splitting or at least disagreement in the party is healthy, or good for the Party?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I think a diversity of opinion boldly asserted is always good for the party.

Mr. McCormick: That is well said.

QUESTION: Senator, in connection with this, Senator McCarthy has made quite a few statements referring to members of the White House staff and the President's Republican advisors, as hyper-liberals. Do you believe there is this hyper-liberal wing of the party?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I have no adequate or suitable comment to make. After all a Senator is an individual who is free to express himself. He may express himself in rather extreme fashion, but that doesn't mean that that represents the viewpoint of the party, or anywhere near a majority of the party. It may represent the viewpoint of a few people or even one person. But you always have to consider that a Senator comes here as an individual representative of his state and also of his country, but he is free to express opinions on every subject under the sun.

QUESTION: In respect to Senator McCarthy, do you feel he is still under censure by the Senate?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, no, that whole matter was thoroughly disposed of at the time the vote was taken when the censure resolution was under consideration by the Senate.

QUESTION: You feel he has a good deal of support in the Senate from his colleagues?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, that I wouldn't know. I suppose if he advances something that is constructive, it would have support. If it is something that is not on the constructive side or represents a wholly personal opinion, particularly about individuals, that, of course, is quite a different matter.

QUESTION: Senator, with the resignation of GOP National Committee Chairman Hall, who would you support as his successor?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am not on the National Committee so as a lawyer I would have to say to you that that is quite a leading question. I wouldn't know who I would support and as a matter of fact, I think there are three or four contenders and perhaps more and I am confident from what I know of all of these gentlemen that any of them would give a good account of himself as a national chairman.

QUESTION: What do you think are National Committee Chairman Hall's aspirations?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Frankly, I do not know but he has been the chairman for four years. That has been quite a chore indeed and it is quite understandable why he wants some surcease from the cares of the National Chairmanship.

What his political ambitions might be either at the national or state level I do not know because I have not had opportunity to visit at length with him about it for quite some time.

QUESTION: Do you think Senator Knowland's resignation is perhaps preparation for running for the governorship of California and then using that maybe as a stepping stone for running for the presidency?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, insofar as I know—and this may be telling tales out of school—Senator Knowland has certainly not confided to me or his other colleagues in so far as I know, whether or not he actually has political ambitions in 1958 or 1960. In the absence of an affirmative and clear-cut statement from him, anything I might say would be wholly speculative.

QUESTION: What other reasons might he have for resigning?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You see the family has a very substantial enterprise at Oakland, that is the Oakland Tribune which is one of the most influential papers in California. It may not be generally known but Senator Knowland's father is 84 years of age and I think there is a natural inclination on his part to go and conserve the property and keep it going and build the paper as an influential organ in a great state.

QUESTION: He is at the height of his political career. Why would he want to stop at the height of his political career and go into the newspaper business? That doesn't make sense.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: My distinguished young friend, the only way I can answer you is to say "why." I think you would have as good an idea as I.

QUESTION: I would like to hear yours though, sir.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I don't know about it. In the absence of anything in the way of a factual statement which may have been disclosed to me so I would have to speculate.

QUESTION: Sir, I would like to ask you about the recent flight around the world by the Air Force bombers. Do you think this could have perhaps been a sort of a double barreled effort to scare the Russians by a display of might and also to impress Congress for more appropriations for the Air Force?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I doubt it very much. In the first place we have never proceeded on the theory of trying to frighten any other nation and secondly I have such high regard for the people in the Air Force and those who operate its policy. They only come to Congress and ask for what they believe is necessary to maintain a sound, strong, efficient, strategic Air Force.

Now actually you see there is such a thing as strategy and there is such a thing as testing the wings of the nation. How do we know

that they could make a flight of that kind? The only way you know, of course, is for them to try.

In that whole realm of strategy and tactics, these things are just one of those normal components as I see it.

QUESTION: In getting back to something that you said, Senator, concerning the fact that there were two or three persons who have been sort of thinking about this taking the place of Chairman Hall now that he is leaving, I wanted to know, doesn't that sort of give you the idea that there are different factions within the Party, itself, since there are so many?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Indeed not. I remember, you see—and I am not such a very old man, although I never confess my age, but I remember a whole succession of national chairmen. You see once Congressman Recc of Tennessee was the National Chairman. That is quite a while back. Leonard Hall has been chairman. There have been intervening chairmen. And so that is not strange at all and besides it is a party job, as you see. It is not a federal job as such and where the man has done chores that long he is entitled to a respite.

Now may I take a half a minute to illustrate: I served for four years as chairman of the Republican Senatorial Committee. You see that was a campaign job. Normally a Senator only serves two years in that capacity. I served actually for four years.

Now in my departure from the job they might have read some unusual significance, but I know of no reason why. And so there is nothing very unusual about this.

QUESTION: With respect to these labor investigations, do you feel that the Congress does have a jurisdiction to investigate the racketeers in labor?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Definitely so and may I amplify that just a little to express a personal conviction. I think what is happening before Senator McClellan's committee is one of the most amazing things I have ever seen. That a very responsible labor leader will come before a committee consisting of elected public servants charged with a responsibility, to carry out their constitutional and legal duties, who refuses to answer what I regard as questions that are necessary in order for Congress to adequately legislate in that field.

QUESTION: How may these men be forced to testify? Through contempt proceedings?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You see this is a Constitutional safeguard, but whether even then you can compel them is quite another matter. You might want to threaten them with contempt but I rather think of the moral implications that are involved. That men who are headlines in the whole labor movement—and it is very substantial, and I have always been sympathetic to the whole collective bargaining idea.

Mr. McCormick: Senator, with precedents being set with this investigation and you are a leader now in the Senate, what will you do in the Senate, will you just sit back and listen to these statements made by the labor leaders and reflect on the whole labor movement? What actually can take place?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, actually legislation can take place of a kind. It may be in the form of an additional amendment to the Taft-

Hartley Act. It may be an amendment to our judicial code and more likely it would take that form. But certainly something has to be done about it.

I have always taken the position, for instance with respect to people who are on the Federal pay roll, that when they come before a committee and take refuge in the Fifth Amendment that they ought to be summarily discharged because they are appointees, they work for the same boss that I do, Uncle Sam, and if they will not freely divulge information that we think is useful and necessary, then they have no place on the public pay roll. And no responsible American citizen should have the leadership in the American labor movement unless he is willing to come and freely answer questions before Congressional committees.

QUESTION: Sir, I was reading in a recent article in *Reader's Digest* that Red China is one of the greatest and richest and the most densely populated areas in the world. Why, then, do we continue not to recognize it? Isn't it an eventuality that we will have to?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I think the best answer I can give is that Red China is in our eyes, and rightly so, an aggressor. The question is, do you put a premium on aggression and admit them into the sisterhood of nations?

QUESTION: We have to have some common ground to meet them on, do we not?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Has there been any expiation of the sin of aggression? Has there been any effort to restore and make whole what they have done before? Has there been any effort to make restitution of the fruits of aggression? Are we going to say, "Oh, well, we don't care. The eventuality is in this feverish world, that a big country must come in."

What will the people in Asia say? Wouldn't it after all be an invitation to even more aggression? "Go ahead and infiltrate. Subvert another country. Dominate it, because if you do, that is a manifestation of strength and you will get into the United Nations."

Do we want to leave ourselves morally weak in that respect?

QUESTION: Do you think it is a wise policy to have military blocs in the atomic age, after what you said about not letting China into the United Nations? That means China is going to be on somebody's side and there is only Russia left.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: My dear, I am not quite sure what you mean by "military blocs."

QUESTION: Well, you are building now military power in the United States. The Russians are building their power and of course they are building because they are afraid of war, and you are of course building for the same reason.

Mr. McCormick: So you feel the question is, should there be two blocs in the military world?

QUESTION: That is right.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It is almost inescapable if you look at it from a moral or philosophical standpoint. As the President has indicated you have international communism as the driving, vigorous, aggres-

sive force, today. Distinguished from that you have the free world. Now what we do is try to build up our own strength and develop initial resistance on the part of those who are willing to identify themselves with the free world. So that in the initial resistance there will be time for the free world to marshal its forces, in case conflicts should ever come.

QUESTION: If we consider Communist China an aggressor, don't we consider Russia an aggressor and still we recognize them.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: We recognized Russia, however, in 1933, as you realize. There has been no disposition to sever diplomatic relations and withdraw recognition. Of course, I think the State Department made the case that if you do, you have no eyes and ears over there at all.

Mr. McCormick: I know this is interesting, but our time is up and we must leave.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am sorry, Steve.

Mr. McCormick: Thank you very much, Senator Dirksen, for being with us today. It has been a real pleasure.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I have been delighted to see you all.

Mr. McCormick: And we'd like to take a moment to welcome Station WNBC, NBC's new owned and operated station in New Britain and Hartford, Connecticut.

Now, this is Steve McCormick, speaking for Theodore Granik and bidding you good-bye.

The Announcer: The questions you have just heard do not necessarily reflect the opinions of YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW, the National Broadcasting Company, or the National Education Association.

Join us again next week at this time when NBC will present THE AMERICAN FORUM.

The Proceedings of
"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW"

as telecast over the coast to coast network of the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed, and a limited number are distributed free to further the public interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare.

by

RANDELL INC.

PRINTERS

810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E.

PUBLISHERS

Washington 18, D. C.

(When requesting copies by mail, enclose ten cents to cover mailing)

The proceedings of "Youth Wants to Know" are held alternate Sundays from 2:30-3:00 P. M., E. S. T., on the National Broadcasting Company Television Network at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.

17  17

J-44833