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Riots and Urban problems

Presented Republican Party statement blaming Pres. Johnson for riots, but would personally be cautious about allegations

In a good many communities there is evidence of outside influences triggering riots

If conditions not ameliorated--will be "one of the monumental issues in '68"

Congress has not been "niggardly"--will read figures to Mayor Jerome Cavanagh before the Committee

Cincinnati police chief told Committee city was in good shape

Stokley Carmichael--treason is a sinister charge--must be proven

Vietnam

Supports President's policy--he has most expert advice

Gun control bill

Can better be handled at state level
Would go along with moderate bill
Senator Dirksen, a recent Republican Party statement read by you blamed President Johnson for the racial riots. Your Republican colleague, Senator Thruston Morton, denounced this as irresponsible. Do you agree?

Senator Dirksen: Well, I did not fashion that statement. I was a sort of an intermediary who was impressed into service to read that statement. But a committee actually fashioned that statement.


Mr. Agronsky: Senator Dirksen, though the statement was a Republican Coordinating Committee statement, you did read it, and you still really have not answered me, sir. Do you agree with Senator Morton's denunciation of it as irresponsible?

Senator Dirksen: Well, I have not gone as far quite as might be implied by that statement. I like to be rather cautious and careful about any allegations or accusations that I make. And so I think I would be content to let that answer drop just about there.

Mr. Lisagor: Senator Dirksen, the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which you are a member, has been spending some time
discussing or hearing on the anti-riot bill. I would like to ask you how that anti-riot bill would prevent riots of the kind that occurred in Detroit which has been described as home-grown or indigenous.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, of the witnesses that the Committee has heard thus far, it is quite evident that in a good many communities there were outside influences that came in and rather triggered these riots. Now, the bill before the Committee, which incidentally has already passed the House of Representatives, is designed to get at people who cross state lines with intent to undertake civil disorder, and by that means make them subject to very heavy penalties.

Now I think the bill is probably wanting in some particulars and to be effective would probably have to be tightened. It is a little difficult, of course, if you use the word "intent" in a statute to prove that intent as the reason for going across a state line.

MR. HART: Senator, there is one more summer to go through before the elections, a summer in which the conventions will be held in a large city. Aside from the people whose lives and property might be in danger from such a summer, what politicians, which parties, face a greater threat?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I don't quite know what you mean when you say threat to a political party. Are you speaking about a physical threat --
MR. HART: I am speaking of a political threat.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, by that, of course, you mean that they are not likely to succeed in November of 1968. Well, it is hard to tell. It is purely speculative. That is a long ways from now, as you know. We will have fourteen, fifteen months to go. So many things can happen that may replace the issues that are before us today. And who shall say what the dominant issue will be at that time.

MR. HART: Well, now, you said two weeks ago that this country was rapidly approaching a state of anarchy. Is this moderated in the last quiet week?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, it has been approaching a state of anarchy. But on the other hand now that they are giving attention to this matter, and obviously rioting and tumult and disorder is nearly on everybody's tongue, there will be an amelioration of that condition, I am sure, long before November of 1968. If there is not, then, of course, it is going to be one of the monumental issues in '68.

MR. LISAGOR: Yet, Senator, you have just been quoted as saying, in a WASHINGTON POST story which talks about the restless mood in the Congress -- and I quote -- "I have always gone on the theory that no political party is ever defeated by another; it defeats itself".

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That is right.

MR. LISAGOR: "And that is what is happening. Lyndon has
exceptional political skill, but there is always a first time."

Does that mean you think he has about had it?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I just mean that when you put into a bundle
the problems of Viet Nam and the dissidence that is developing
in the country, this question of rioting, and certainly there
are people who will feel that the Administration may in part be
at fault; and then of course the request for a 10 per cent
surcharge, and add to it a few other things, you have got
yourself quite a package. And it is by the accumulation of
those difficulties that parties ultimately defeat themselves.

It is like the old ship that gets enough barnacles to put it
out of business.

MR. AGRONSKY: Well, Senator, where do you stand on those
particular issues? Will you support the President on a 10
per cent tax increase, for example?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I take them as they come. I think my views
on Viet Nam have been pretty well known. I have supported
the President. I go on the theory that in his corner he has
the Chiefs of Staff, he has the best military talent we have,
he has these reports from Viet Nam, probably every hour on the
hour. And obviously he is in better position to know about
what the situation is than a layman back here 12,000 miles from
the scene of operations who has not been to Viet Nam in a long
time, and who is in no position to judge.

Now, take, for instance, these last rather massive assaults that
have been made in the last few days. How telling and how
effective will they really be? They may add up to something.
I am in no position to tell at the moment, on the basis of the
dispatches that come from there. It may be effective.

MR. LISAGOR: Your House colleague, Representative Gerald Ford,
has said of the Viet Nam war that it has been shockingly
mismanaged. He seems to know what is going on there. Do you
agree with that, or don't you?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I hope there is somebody who knows.
But I think it would be high pretense on my part if I tried to
undertake the role of an expert on Viet Nam. I have to take
it for what it is. And I try to be a realist about it. Who
do we have the Joint Chiefs? Why do we have the best that the
Army could offer by way of a staff under the leadership of
General Westmoreland out in Viet Nam? And then of course
either ignore or brush aside their demands and their advices?

MR. AGRONSKY: I find it hard to believe, Senator, that you
would abdicate in effect the role of the critic of Viet Nam
policy or any other policy because you feel the Administration
has the experts and you are not an expert. You certainly
do not subscribe to that, sir.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I undertake the role of a critic when I have
sufficient information on which to predicate what I think is
sound criticism.

MR. HART: Well, Senator, are you going to support the
President all the way on guns and butter, facing the deficit and the necessity of a tax as we face this year; are you going to support him all the way, or is there a breaking point?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Now, you are asking for a rather anticipatory conclusion.

MR. HART: Well, do you anticipate any breaking point?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Wait just a minute, until I finish an answer.

That tax surcharge proposal will go to the Senate Finance Committee. I am a member of the Committee. We will probably start with the Secretary of the Treasury. We will have witnesses galore. And I trust I can be at every session of the Committee and hear the testimony.

What I want to know is what will be the impact of a ten per cent surcharge upon the economy of the country, and what will be the impact of a possible $30 billion budget deficit on the economy. One must necessarily outweigh the other.

Now, I read the statement by the economist for the Bank of America this morning who thinks that a tax increase would be shocking from the standpoint of what it will do to business. Well, we will have to find out. And I want to find out. Then I am in a far better position to render judgment.

I would hate to think of a $30 billion deficit staring us in the face and what its impact will be on inflation, because we may have to pay more in the grocery store, in the clothing store, in interest rates, in tighter money, in nearly every
other phase of activity than you would if you had a tax increase.

But I just don't close the door -- why should I -- until
we have had that testimony.

MR. HART: Well the question is could the strain become such
that you would withdraw your full support of the war.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I have to see what the effect there
will be. What are the alternatives? Shall we withdraw?
Where does it leave us? Where does it leave our prestige
so far as the world is concerned? Will we have to make a
stand elsewhere at some other time? Because if we did, there
is no defense line between Saigon and Singapore.

Now, what do we do with our Pacific defense line -- pull it
back to Alaska and Hawaii? Then they are only 2,000 miles
from California.

There are some strategic and long-range objectives that have
to be evaluated before you come to that kind of a conclusion.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, clearly you support the President's
policy in Viet Nam.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I definitely have.

MR. AGRONSKY: OK. Now, what we have today everyone agrees
is a question of priorities. We must fight the war in Viet Nam.
You support that completely. And at the same time we must
deal with the problem of the cities and these riots.

Now, your junior colleague from Illinois, Senator Percy,
has said that if we can spend $66 million a day to save
16 million people in South Viet Nam, we have the funds to move up to highest priority the saving of 20 million urban poor in this country; and in conditions, as he points out, that we simply cannot tolerate. We have to assign the urban crisis in America, he now says, as the number one priority. Would you agree with Senator Percy?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, the fact of the matter is that the 1968 fiscal year budget had a billion dollars in it for urban development. And if you want to know how that was spent or allocated, just take a look at what the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee said with respect to Detroit. You will find it all in the record. And when I hear these stories that the Congress has been at fault, the Congress has been niggardly, the Congress has been nothing of the kind. And when we get Mayor Cavanaugh before the Committee -- and I trust we will have him pretty soon -- I will ply him with that line of questioning, and then read the figures to him out of the record and see whether we have been niggardly or not.

MR. AGRONSKY: Let me ply you with this line of question. Do you think that we have already spent enough and should not spend more on the cities?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Maybe we have not spent enough. I would like to see the rest of --

MR. AGRONSKY: Well, that is inconsistent, sir, with your argument before.
SENATOR DIRKSEN: Why?

MR. AGRONSKY: Well, your argument is that we did spend enough and it did not prevent the riots. I am asking you whether or not we should spend more. Many people feel we have not spent enough and must spend enormous amounts more, as Senator Percy, for example.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You are making it appear that this Administration has not been interested in urban development. Why did they ask for a billion dollars -- and we gave them a billion dollars. They are asking for a billion dollars now. And they will get a billion dollars for it. Now, do they need much more? All right -- let them come in from various places and ventilate their needs.

Now, to show you what I mean -- we had the Chief of Police of Cincinnati before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I said to him "Do you have a ghetto in Cincinnati?" He said "We do not." I said "What is your housing situation?" He said "Our housing is in pretty good shape." "What kind of recreational facilities do you have?" He said "We are proud of it." I said "What about your schools?" "Our schools are integrated and we believe they will match the schools of any part of the country."

Now, then, what other fields of activity do you think we ought to get into in order to spend some money? Is it jobs? I asked him about jobs. Cincinnati is a machine tool center,
made in the present Administration program.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I suppose if I had been on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I might have gone for a deeper cut than the Committee did. I think they cut roughly about $750 million out of that bill.

MR. LISAGOR: Are you talking about foreign aid now?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Foreign aid.

MR. LISAGOR: Yes.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Now, I might have added more. You will recall that last year I authored a cut of $250 million in foreign aid, which was approved by both the House and the Senate. Last year I offered an amendment to cut the poverty program, and I cited a lost of the waste, a lot of the lag in the poverty program, and the Senate and House both approved it.

Now, quite aside from whatever the good aspects of that program are, here you are constantly confronted with these individual instances and examples of where you get waste. Do we sit idly by and let them go, or do we discharge our responsibility and put the knife in if we think the knife ought to go in.

MR. AGRONSKY: Nobody argues against the need for economy and using the monies that are appropriated intelligently and well. That isn't the point.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: What is the point?

MR. AGRONSKY: Well, the question is have we spent enough?
Is it just hoodlumism and criminal elements that causes the
riots in the cities, or is it a deep-seated sickness in our
urban society?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, let people who speak with knowledge and
some degree of authority come and lay it on the line. It is
one thing to come before a committee and there openhandedly
sai "Well, you have got to add a billion here and two billion
there." What are the facts in every case? That is why I
alluded to Cincinnati. I could allude to Nashville, or to
Cambridge, or to Plainfield, or any of these -- in every case
I pursued that line of questioning before, as you say, I wanted
to find out whether there was a sickness there.

But what do you do when your chief law enforcing officer comes
before a Senate Committee and in response to these questions
says "We do not have that problem."

Now, from the other side, they are constantly using the
word "ghetto". "You have to get at the spirit of the ghetto
and get rid of them, and you have to meet the slum problem."
Alright. But there has got to be some specifics, and it has
got to be tied to ascertained amounts, not just something off
the top of somebody's head.

MR. HART: Senator, a moment ago you cited the Administration's
interest in urban problems.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes.

MR. HART: That sounds like a repudiation of the statement
blaming the President for the riots.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I didn't blame the President for the riots.

MR. HART: The statement you read --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I didn't blame the President for the riots. I made it clear as crystal that I read a statement that was brought about by a committee of three.

MR. AGRONSKY: How could you lend yourself to reading it, sir, if you did not agree with it?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Look -- you are a party functionary, and when you have maybe forty, fifty people around, and they think you ought to read what was agreed upon by the Coordinating Committee, and unanimously --

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator Morton, who is a former Chairman of the Republican National Committee, a member of your party, denounced it as irresponsible. He would not have read it.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Who else denounced it as irresponsible?

Who else? Now that you bring up an individual -- who else?

MR. AGRONSKY: No members of the Republican Party did that I am aware of.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Exactly.

MR. AGRONSKY: It was widely criticized throughout the country in editorials.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You say one man. Let it drop right there.

MR. HART: Well, Senator, you seem to be a little uncomfortable with it.
SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am not a bit uncomfortable.

MR. LISAGOR: Senator, may I ask you what Representative Ford --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: But you don't pursue these things to the end.

MR. HART: What is the end, sir?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: And I try to. Well, you talk about this
sickness. You mean these various urban problems. All right. We have had a look at them, and we continue to take a look at them. And when they cite the need, very well. And what would be the reason for exploring this line of questioning with the witnesses coming before the Judiciary Committee on this anti-riot bill unless I want to find out whether those economic factors are the push for civil disorder and violation of the law?

MR. LISAGOR: Senator, your colleague in the House, Congressman Ford, again, thinks that there is a conspiracy involved in these riots. Do you think there is one?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, conspiracy is a difficult thing to prove, to say the least. You see, it takes more than one man to make a conspiracy.

MR. LISAGOR: You would not accept that.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, unless you can find two with the same intent, operating with the same idea and the same direction, and in the same field of activity, at a given time. Then of course you can prove a conspiracy.

MR. LISAGOR: Senator, on the specific bill, I think that the
gun control bill has been languishing in the Congress for quite some time.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: So it has.

MR. LISAGOR: And I understand that you favor what has been called the more lenient bill, as compared to those who would include rifles that the snipers have been using in the cities, the rifle that President Kennedy was assassinated by. Why are you not in favor of a strong gun control bill which would prevent these rifles from falling into the hands of just anyone?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, if it's a reasonably predicated bill, and if it can be made effective, then very well and good. But I have often thought that that is a job that can better be done at the state level than at the federal level. Although with a moderate bill, I would be inclined to go along, I think. But I don't want them to put too much of a restriction upon our people.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, that kind of --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I think the real issue there is the control of hand guns, as much as rifles and shotguns.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, it was a long gun, not a hand gun, that assassinated President Kennedy.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes.

MR. AGRONSKY: And long guns that are being used by snipers in the riots.
SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, we raised that matter of long guns with one of the chiefs of police, and he did not know what we were referring to when we said long gun.

MR. AGRONSKY: We mean a rifle.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, a rifle can be longer or it can be shorter, as you well know.

MR. AGRONSKY: I am merely trying to point out that it is a rifle that the snipers have been using in the riots, it is a rifle that killed President Kennedy.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am inclined to agree with you, particularly.

MR. AGRONSKY: Then why not control them?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes -- if it is a long-range rifle. And I would not be averse to that, either.

MR. HART: Senator, you just said that conspiracy is awfully difficult to prove. And yet that is exactly what the anti-riot bill would need to be proved. You feel that that could be effective?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No. You don't have to prove conspiracy, because any individual, if you can prove his intent to go across the state line --

MR. HART: Is that easier to prove than conspiracy?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Certainly -- in the case of one man. But you have to show concert of action between two people if you are going to prove conspiracy.

MR. LISAGOR: Doesn't that require mind reading, and can you
SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, you know, when you try to establish intent to the satisfaction of the jury, you have to do it beyond a reasonable doubt. And that is not an easy matter. Now, in the case of an ordinary crime, the intent is inferred from the fact itself. But here you go a little bit further, because a man can go across a state line without such intent, but when he gets to his destination, he may get into civil disorder, but he did not have an intention to do so when he crossed that line.

MR. LISAGOR: On this question of intent, Senator, Governor Romney has said that people like Stokley Carmichael, one of the militant Negro leaders, now in Cuba, ought to be charged with treason. Do you think that ought to happen?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, treason is precisely defined as giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Now you have to prove it. And I would be the last man to ever put the finger of treason on anybody unless there was a pretty clear showing, because that is a terribly sinister charge to make.

MR. AGRONSKY: Does that mean you would not be against the naming of Carmichael as a traitor?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, if you can establish that fact. But you cannot put the tarred stick on anybody unless you pretty well know. Is it any easier than to say that a man is a murderer unless you have some reasonable ground for
such belief?

MR. AGRONSKY: You demonstrate a concern that is widely shared in the country that perhaps this bill on what is in effect an effort to read people's thoughts and intent may be open to abuse, may go too far, may threaten our constitutional processes. Doesn't that concern you, sir?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I have not examined too well into the constitutional aspects of the bill. I was thinking in terms of the language in the bill itself, and your difficulty in finding facts of probative value in order to establish such a charge. Because if you cannot do it, then why have it on the statute books. Or better yet, look for a modification that will deal with the problem, that would appear to be before us.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, don't you feel that perhaps this concern about the police approach to the riots and the restoration of law and order is going to obscure the underlying, fundamental need to do something about the cities? You kept pointing out what proof is there that we need to put in more. Well, there are statistics that demonstrate, for example, that forty per cent of the adult males in Negro ghettos in our cities are jobless these days; that one out of ten of Negro boys and girls are able to get a high school education. Aren't these demonstrations of the fact that we do need to do more, that this is what creates this element that goes out into the streets and riots?
SENATOR DIRKSEN: I will go so far as to concede that there is joblessness and particularly among the younger people. But I will admonish you at the same time that testimony we had last year before the Senate Finance Committee by people in the know, and by the research organization from Stanford University disproved the size of the figures that they were using. But I will concede that they are still substantial. Alright. Let's see what is to be done about it. I am quite willing. But when you say we let that be obscured by the tumult and the disorder, what do you want to do -- let the tumult and the crime and the looting be obscured by these other considerations? or do we come to grips? If survival is not the first responsibility of the country, then you just as well forget about this business.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, I wish I had an opportunity to respond to that question. Unfortunately, we have run out of time. Thank you very much for being here to FACE THE NATION, sir.

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

ANNOUNCER: Today on FACE THE NATION, Senator Republican Leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois was interviewed by Peter Lisagor of the Chicago Daily News; CBS News Correspondent Martin Agronsky; and CBS News Correspondent John Hart.