

CBS NEWS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Broadcast House
Washington 16, D. C.
EMerson 2-9300

"FACE THE NATION"

as broadcast over the

CBS Television Network

December 15, 1957 - 1:00 to 1:45 PM

CBS Radio Network

December 15, 1957 - 9:30 to 10:10 PM

GUEST: THE HONORABLE MIKE MANSFIELD
United States Senate
(Democrat of Montana)

MODERATOR: Stuart Novins

PANEL: Chalmers M. Roberts
Washington Post and Times Herald

Howard K. Smith
CBS News

Carleton Kent
Chicago Sun-Times

PRODUCER: Ted Ayers

MR. NOVINS: The opening of the NATO Summit Conference in Paris tomorrow -- the attempts by the United States to catch up with Soviet scientific developments -- the increased temperatures of hot propaganda in a cold war -- all of these things lead up to one basic question: What do we do now?

The man who is the Senate Democratic Whip has many views on this question, and we hope to get some of those views.

Senator Mansfield is here now to FACE THE NATION.

Senator, your position on the Foreign Relations Committee, and as a leading Democrat on the Senate Floor, makes your views particularly important. We want to try to get at some of them, so, if you will, sir, let's take the first question from Mr. Kent.

MR. KENT: Senator, the NATO meeting begins in Paris tomorrow, in spite of intense pressure from the Soviet Union to weaken or break up the Western Alliance.

What do you think are the chances of that Conference?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I would say that the chances as of now are quite questionable. A good deal will depend upon the amount of effort put forth by President Eisenhower to really pull NATO out of the mud, because, in my opinion, NATO has been disintegrating for the past five years, and unless stern measures are taken, I'm afraid it will remain a symbol rather than a shield.

MR. SMITH: Senator, do you believe that the

Administration has approached this NATO Conference with a sufficient sense of urgency?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think on paper, yes; but I don't know what they have done in the way of details and specifics, and I will just have to wait to see what the results are before I can give a definitive answer.

MR. ROBERTS: Senator, you say that the President's job is to pull NATO out of the mud.

Now, the Republicans say they are getting a little fed up with Democratic generalities on this.

What specifically do you mean by that?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think that we have to recognize the facts of life for what they are, not as Madison Avenue would like to have the American people believe them to be.

I think, for example, that we had better get away from the idea that things are rosy and to recognize that conditions are extremely difficult and have been for a number of years.

We just can't place a balancing of the budget ahead of the security of this country, and we just can't, for example, ignore NATO and treat our Allies as inferiors. I am afraid that our Allies have awakened themselves to what the facts of life really are, because they know now that we are not as superior as we have led them to believe, and the result

has been that we are now on a more equal basis. I would point out, also, that we have done our share in reducing defense expenditures, in reducing our personnel, the personnel in our Armed Services, and we have done nothing to keep the European Allies of ours from doing the same thing.

Those are only a few instances.

MR. SMITH: Well, let's be specific, Senator. Would you be willing to vote for substantial tax increases to pay for some kind of crash program to deal with the situation?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, if need be, naturally; but I don't think a crash program is needed. I think we ought to move forward with deliberate speed. I don't think we have been doing that, because I think the American people have been lulled over the past five or six years, under both Democratic and Republican Administrations, as to just what the actual situation was.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, what is needed? Are you talking about military needs, political needs, economic needs, psychological needs?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think, for one thing, that the truth should always be told to the American people, insofar as it can be done. I think, also, we have to recognize that if we are going to remain secure, we are going to have to pay a high price for it. I think the Administration, and I would apply this to any Administration,

should face up to the fact that the American people are mature, are intelligent, are capable of being told the truth, and are willing to pay the cost which the truth may entail.

Now, these are a few of the things which could be done.

MR. NOVINS: But, Senator, you said a moment ago that on paper you seemed to sense a sense of urgency in the Administration, but that you didn't know the details of what action was planned.

Now you say that the American people should be told the truth. I get the impression from what you said that the Administration isn't telling anybody anything. Is that right?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, that's true. I think you have a good deal of secrecy in this Administration, and a good deal of news which the American people should know has been withheld.

I would also say that this secrecy has gone so far as to keep the American people -- knowledge which I'm quite sure is accessible to the Russians themselves.

MR. NOVINS: You are on the Foreign Relations Committee. How does it happen that you don't know what's going on?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, as a matter of fact, 95 per cent of the material which is told to us in Executive Session in the Foreign Relations Committee I already know, or should know, because it's carried in the press or over the radios in this country.

MR. ROBERTS: Why don't you open those sessions up to the press, then, instead of keeping us outside?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Mr. Roberts, you know me well enough to understand that my position has always been that there should be more in the way of open hearings.

MR. KENT: Senator, you said that NATO has been disintegrating for five years. Why, at some time during those five years, hasn't the Foreign Relations Committee tried to tell this to the people?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, the Foreign Relations Committee has told it to the present Administration, and some of us have been harping on this idea year after year. But, General Norstad, General Gruenther, the President, Mr. Dulles, always comes out and tells us in what good shape NATO is. NATO is not in good shape.

MR. KENT: In what particulars is it disintegrating? Can you tell us one or two?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Yes, indeed. I can point to the fact, for example, that there is trouble involving NATO's partners in Cyprus; there was trouble involving NATO's partners in Iceland; there is trouble now in Algeria, where we find 450,000 French troops allocated to NATO, fighting a war against a guerrilla uprising in that area.

MR. SMITH: Can you suggest any way in which these problems might possibly be handled by NATO? Let's take

Algeria, the toughest one of all.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think there that it is a question which NATO could well handle, because under the NATO Agreements, Algeria is considered a part of NATO. I would hope most sincerely that the good offices offered by President Bourguiba of Tunis, and King Mohammed V, of Morocco, would be taken up, that negotiations would be entered into, and that in time eventual independence of some sort would be given to the Algerian people.

STAT

MR. SMITH: Senator, some of the reports coming from Paris before this NATO conference begins say that the French are going to try to make a deal with us. They are going to let us establish missile bases on their soil provided we give them full diplomatic support in their war in Algeria.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, that is going to be pretty hard to do, Mr. Smith, because we are always being caught in the middle, and I think it's about time we began to take some definite steps on one side or the other.

MR. SMITH: Which side would you be on there, if I may --

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I'd be on both sides, but I would be on both sides to this extent; let me explain it:

I think that something has got to be done to give a greater degree of independence to the Algerian people, because I think Algeria, in large part, has been responsible in late months for the overturns in the French Government. I think it has been responsible, in large part, for the increased inflation in that country, and I think the drain on France is so great that eventually, if this question is not settled, the results for France will be bad, and if the results for France are bad it will be bad for this country and all of NATO.

I would point out that insofar as the situation there is concerned, the French have talked about some degree of greater independence for the Algerians, and I would like to see some-

so 2

thing done on the order of our relations with Puerto Rico as a model. At any time Puerto Rico wants to, she can become fully and wholly independent of the United States by a majority vote of its people, but at the present time it is a commonwealth within the United States. It pays no taxes to us. It can offer inducements to American and other businessmen to go down there, and it's a very satisfactory relationship.

I would think that something on that order might be worth considering in Franco-Algerian affairs.

MR. KENT: Senator, you have just returned from a tour of a number of Arab countries, Algiers, Tunis, Morocco, and Libya. Do you find, as a result of your inspection there, that the Eisenhower Doctrine has strengthened us in any of that part of the world?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: No, not at all. The Eisenhower Doctrine has been of no significance, in my opinion, except from a psychological point of view. It was -- it was in no way possible to use the Eisenhower Doctrine in the Syrian situation. As a matter of fact, I found out, on the basis of observations, that in Libya alone, where we have probably our biggest air base, Wheelis Field, outside the city of Tripoli, that 95 per cent of the people look towards Nasser, and the stabilizing factor there is the subsidies which the French -- which the British and the Americans pay to the Libyan Government.

ao 3

I also found out, for example, that at the end of April of this year the British will reduce their subsidy from four and a quarter million pounds a year to one million pounds a year, and that they will reduce their forces from 12,000 to 2,000.

Who is going to take up the slack?

There is only one country can do it, and looks like we are going to be stuck there again.

In Tunisia, you've got a good man in President Bourguiba, oriented to the West, doing a good job, and trying to keep the so-called Magreb, the North African area, from Tunis on west, in the Western camp.

In Morocco, as long as you have the King, you will have stability. When he goes, I don't know what will happen.

MR. KENT: Well, what do you -- in sum, what are you saying, that the Eisenhower Doctrine was useless in the beginning?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: It was unneeded, because the President he asked Congress to give him, and as far as the funds were concerned, which he wanted to spend there, all he had to do was to send a letter to the Appropriation Committees to get the date lifted from April the 30th, I believe, to July the 30th, and it would have been granted.

MR. KENT: In other words, the execution of our foreign policy in all that area from North Africa to the Middle East

ao 4

has just been found wanting?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: That's right.

MR. ROBERTS: Senator, let's get back to NATO and the big question: the relationship between the U. S. and the Soviet Union.

Do you favor the United States putting intermediate range missiles, the 1500-mile missiles, in continental countries; or do you, are you attracted by the idea that George Kennan has been advancing lately, that to do this is to forever freeze the Iron Curtain line, and make impossible a settlement in Europe with the Russians?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think there's a good deal to what Mr. Kennan says, but for the time being I would go along with the Administration in the hope that we could have missile bases created there, created in Western Europe.

However, I am not at all certain that the Western European nations, despite the publicity attendant on this particular matter, will be at all in accord with the idea which this Government is very likely going to propose. They recognize that there is a new change in the climate. They recognize that they are no longer inferior to us, and that all together we are equals.

They know also that on the basis of missile development, the ICBM, that once they become operational it will mean that we will be only fifteen minutes away from Western Europe and

ac 5

that, unlike the period covering the First and Second World Wars, the United States will no longer be a privileged sanctuary, we won't have the time to giro our resources and to develop our manpower and industry, and the net result, as I see it, is that with the advent of the missile on an operational basis, the United States is going to become the primary target, and not Western Europe, except where there will be SAC bases or missile sites.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then, you are opening up the possibility that Western Europe could go neutral, on the theory that the missiles would fly over their heads between here and the Soviet Union?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: That is a possibility, over a period of years; but not at the present time because of the multiplicity of SAC and other bases in that area.

MR. ROBERTS: You don't believe Khrushchev, when he says that our SAC bases are already obsolete because of the Russian missiles?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Absolutely not, because Mr. Khrushchev is entirely wrong in that conception. In time, the SAC bases will become obsolete as the missile becomes operational.

MR. ROBERTS: How much time?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I don't know, I'll have to guess, I am not an expert -- five to ten years. But I would say this: that at the present time the SAC bases in North

ao 6

Africa, in Spain, and in Western Europe, generally, are the only real punch this country has, and the development of the missile, the announcement by the Soviet Union on August the 26th has made us more dependent than ever on what the SAC has done, is doing, and may I say that after a survey of the SAC bases and seeing some of these 15-minute alerts during which time 20 B-47 bombers got into the air, I think we can have every confidence in the capability of SAC at this time, and I certainly would not agree one bit with what Mr. Khrushchev says.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you satisfied with the political control of SAC?

Now, Khrushchev has raised a question which already had been raised in Britain by the Labor Party against the Government, of the possible danger of these American bombers in the air, with hydrogen bombs, that some individual crew, or through some misunderstanding in communications, might actually take off on a mission on the basis of some false alert, thereby set off a war by mischance.

Are you satisfied that our control of these flights is adequate to prevent that kind of thing?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Nothing is absolutely perfect, but I am perfectly satisfied with the set-up the way the SAC has it at the present time.

MR. NOVINS: Well, Senator, apparently some of our NATO

ao 7 allies are not as satisfied as you are, and they would like a larger voice and more participation in the actual command to set the thing off, when it goes off.

 How do you suppose we could meet that challenge, if it ever comes?

o'c2f1s SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think that is one of the matters, Mr. Novins, which ought to be discussed and a decision reached on at the meeting being undertaken next week.

01 MR. NOVINS: Now, surely we haven't gone to Paris without some idea of what we might say when that question comes up. What will the United States attitude be?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I have no idea.

MR. NOVINS: Not at all?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: None.

MR. NOVINS: And you are a member of the Foreign Relations Committee?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: That is correct.

MR. SMITH: How far are you willing to go in granting the Allies consultative and decisive rights in settling problems like this, and other problems?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I would say a long way, Mr. Smith, because we are in this together, and this idea that we can carry the whole burden in all these fields by ourselves is, I think, outmoded. If nothing else, I think the missile and the Sputnik may have awakened -- wakened us up to the fact that we are mutually reliable, one upon the other.

MR. SMITH: Well, Dr. von Brentano, the German Foreign Minister, was here just a short while ago, and the story was that he asked to have virtually a veto power over any decisions or actions undertaken by the Alliance. Would you be in favor of going that far?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I think it ought to be given serious consideration, because the question is -- is Germany

o2 sovereign or not, and the same question applies to every other member of NATO.

MR. SMITH: But if everyone has a veto power and everyone will be dissatisfied with something, won't that simply paralyze all action by the North Atlantic Alliance?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, that's quite possible, and if that is the case then I think we will have to look for other means towards safeguarding our interests.

I would like to see, though, before that should occur, or would occur, I would like to see a greater degree of collaboration between the countries of NATO in Europe at the present time.

And I would like to see eventually the creation of a United States of Europe, which I think is not impossible to conjecture in the future, and certainly toward which good progress has been made in the Coal and Steel Community, your atom, and the common market.

MR. ROBERTS: Senator, a lot of people in Europe say, though, that the Americans want a one-way street on this business, we want the Europeans to give up sovereignty and join together, but when you talk about an Atlantic Alliance in which the United States and Canada, the two American members, are asked to give up any sovereignty, that we throw up our hands and say -- oh, no, we couldn't do anything like that, we will reserve all our rights.

Is that a fair criticism?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I think that is a correct assumption. I don't think that Canada or the United States should, but I do think that Britain ought to take a more active interest in the affairs of the Continent and perhaps be a lever in adjudicating differences which might arise.

I believe in the United States of Europe, but I certainly do not think, except in an economic and military sense, that Canada or the United States should be so closely aligned with it.

MR. ROBERTS: You are against any idea of Federal Union in the Atlantic Community involving the United States, then?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I think it is fraught with dangers at this time.

MR. NOVINS: Senator Mansfield, how much more economic assistance should we be giving, and how much pressure on the NATO members should we try to exert, or let me say influence, should we try to exert in order to try to achieve the kind of economic integration which apparently we are working for in military terms?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think we ought to give less in the way of economic assistance, not only in Western Europe, but throughout the world in general, with the possible exception of the Continent of Africa.

I think that we have gone a little too far in that. We

o4 have placed too much dependence on the dollar as a weapon, and we have, the result has been that we are bereft of ideas. Now, we haven't had a new idea in the field of foreign policy in the past six or seven years, and I think what we are trying to do is to get by on outmoded policies which were good at the time they were brought into being, but which have outlived their usefulness in the meantime.

MR. NOVINS: Well, do you think that the Military Alliance in NATO is strong enough so that it can go along and do the effective job we all hope it will do if there is not a solid economic basis under it?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, in the first place, I don't think there is a solid economic bloc in NATO at the present time. There is one on paper, but not in actuality.

As far as economics are concerned, I would like to see the NATO nations themselves get together and form an economic pool which could, along the lines of the Italian Foreign Minister, Mr. Pella(?), be used to bring about an alleviation of the difficulties in the Middle East.

I would like to see especially a South European grouping of economic abilities to which Germany would be a member, for the development of Africa, along the lines of the French-German proposal of some months ago, for a Eurafrikan set-up of some sort or another.

MR. KENT: Senator, I wonder, something you said a

o5 little bit ago, I wonder if you wouldn't agree that this changes the United States position in comparison with her European Allies, as we go into this NATO meeting. It's this question of sudden U. S. vulnerability to Russian missiles. Doesn't that mean that heretofore, put it, we were in the position of protector of Western Europe, primarily because we were not going to be hit or involved in the war, presumably. Now that we may be hit, aren't we in the position of having to ask Western Europe to help protect us by giving us IRBM bases, for example?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: For the time being, yes.

MR. KENT: Doesn't that weaken our position, then?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: It does, indeed, and it weakens our position to an extent which does not worry me, because I think the end results may be beneficial both for us and for our Western European Allies.

I think that this change in relative position could, can be a good thing in bringing the Administration, the Congress, and the American people, to its senses, as to just what the facts of life really are.

#4 fls.

MR. ROBERTS: Senator, the Soviet Premier, Bulganin, last week sent out a flurry of messages to practically every country on the face of the globe, including one to President Eisenhower, warning the West, warning many of these countries against accepting American missiles.

Now, what do you think of this, and are you worried about a Soviet attack on Western Europe, in a military sense, or are you worried about economic and political subversion and attacks by the Russians?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I have stated that I hope for the time being that we will be able to get missile sites in Western Europe.

As far as messages sent by Mr. Bulganin to this country and to the heads of other nations, I don't think we ought to brush it off. I don't think we ought to make any arrangements now for a Summit meeting, but I do think that some of the proposals which he submitted are worthy of some consideration, and it would be my hope that instead of another Summit meeting we would give our ambassadors the kind of work they have -- they are supposed to do, but haven't been doing over the years, and that is, to put them on a working level by means, at which, or by means of which they can establish the proper contact with the government to which they are accredited; they can work out on these, work these questions out, which are mutually difficult for both of us insofar as U.S.-Soviet

ao 2 relations are concerned.

And then, if they can come to any reasonable conclusions, then it is time to call a Summit meeting.

I think Summit meetings, by and large, are only for show and propoganda purposes.

MR. ROBERTS: Which Bulganin proposals are worthy of consideration?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, now, Mr. Roberts, I have read the letter in the New York Times. It takes a full page, and there are so many of them that it would be pretty difficult for me to mention more than one or two at this time.

I would say, for example, this threat which he used against Germany, perhaps that is the wrong word -- this proposal, by means of which Germany, both East and West, and the satellite countries would become neutral if they did not allow missile bases to be placed on their territory; maybe that is worth something in the way of consideration -- other questions, as well.

MR. ROBERTS: You mean, the atomic-free-zone, so-called, that he talks about?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: That's right.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you also in favor of considering the idea of pulling back with military forces, atomic or non-atomic, of the two sides from the East-West line?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: It might be worth considering,

ao 3

because I think the real -- the real weapon we have, as I have tried to indicate earlier, is the ring of SAC bases we have around the Soviet Union. Frankly, I do not believe that our five divisions in Germany, and the special task force in Northern Italy, are of great significance except from a psychological point of view.

MR. ROBERTS: But isn't that the basis of the shield concept of NATO? You are getting at the very basis on which NATO is established.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: That's right, but we were talking about NATO in the past. Now you are talking about a proposal for the future. There is a difference between the two.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you are saying, then, that we should junk, or reexamine at least our whole military posture in Europe with our allies, and that it might even be possible that Germany should be taken out of NATO, or let out of NATO, and neutralized?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: The first part of your question, I'd agree with; the second, you are making a postulate I didn't make.

MR. ROBERTS: But I was trying to find out --

SENATOR MANSFIELD: But certainly all these things are worth serious consideration, and we shouldn't brush off a letter just because we have no use for the Soviet Union.

There has to come a time when there will be a setting

ao 4 down to these questions which involve the future of mankind, not just ourselves and the Soviet Union, and I think we ought to give these ambassadors of ours work to do, instead of always putting it in the hands of the Secretary of State or the President of the United States.

MR. KENT: Senator, this business of giving ambassadors increased responsibility, I have heard the suggestion of that, from another source, Vice President Nixon, I believe, feels specifically that our ambassadors should be in charge of mutual assistance, too, they should be, in addition to being our diplomatic representatives, they should be the funnel for all economic assistance to match the Russians'.

Do you see eye to eye with him on that?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I certainly do, and I have felt that way for a long time, and I would go one step further:

Whereas you would have it done at the ambassadorial level in this country, I would have all these functions put within the Department of State, so we would all have one voice speaking in the field of foreign policy, one distributing agency, so to speak, and not the present set-up we have at the present time.

MR. KENT: You would mean exclusive of military?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Exclusive of military.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, --

MR. SMITH: There is a plan you once proposed, I think,

ao 5

that we should have a special Cabinet Secretary for another purpose, research and science.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: That's right.

MR. SMITH: Do you still hold to that?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Oh, yes, I do; because I think the educational picture in this country is a sorry one, indeed; when, for example, two years ago the Soviet Union graduated 50,000 scientists and engineers, and 50,000 sub-scientists and sub-engineers, compared to the American graduating total two years ago of 28,000.

And, if my information is correct -- and I think it is -- the curve of the Soviet Union is up, and for this country it's down. That indicates a lag, which is not to our advantage in this scientific era, and which we must do something to overcome through Government-sponsored and -subsidized educational benefits.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, how do you evaluate the appointment of Dr. Killian as Scientific Adviser to the President?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I don't think much of it. I think it's another gimmick thrown to the American people to make them believe that a czar has been appointed. Mr. Killian is not a czar. He does not have control. The inter-service rivalry in the missile program is continuing. Money is being wasted. There is duplication, waste and overlapping, and the result is we are just where we are at the present time -- we

ao 6 are -- where we are now we were two months ago.

MR. NOVINS: Well, Senator, just about two months ago, on October 8th, you are quoted in the Congressional Quarterly as having said:

"We need the same type of coordination and concentration of our best scientists and experts as developed our initial atomic bomb."

This raises a couple of related questions.

Why do we not have this coordination now; and, secondly, specifically, how would you achieve it?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think we don't have it because of the fact that under both Republican and Democratic Administrations this inter-service rivalry has been allowed to grow.

Now, inter-service rivalry is a good thing up to a point, but when it reaches the point where the Air Force, for example, within the past four months cancelled a contract with North American for \$850 million in the building of the missile NAVAHO, when the Navy within the same period cancelled a \$45 million contract for TRITON -- \$25 million for TRITON -- and a \$45 million contract for SPARE II, then I think you are getting a way out of line.

Now, this year, the Congress -- or last year -- this year the Congress gave to the Administration every single dime it asked for in research and development, and the total is

so 7 \$1,651,000,000. Every single dime the Administration asked for, it received. So it isn't a case of a lack of money. It isn't a case of increasing the budget. It is a case of coordination and cooperation, and I don't want to see a Manhattan Project coming into being because if you are for a Manhattan Project, per se, then you are for the Army taking over control.

I think it ought to be taken out of the hands of the services and put in a Manhattan-like project under civilian control, to carry out the research and development and then, when these things become operational or almost so, turn them over to the proper service for use -- the POLARIS to the Navy, for example, the NAVAHO to the Air Force, and so forth and so on.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, did you go along with the proposal or the suggestion made by General Gavin the other day, that the whole concept of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is outmoded, that we should do away with that?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I don't know enough about it, but I do think that there are some improvements which could be made in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I certainly am not in favor of the Prussian-type General Staff which has been advocated from time to time, but I do think that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as such, is a rather cumbersome way at the present time.

MR. NOVINS: Well, do you think the President of the

ao 8 United States, as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Services,
has done enough to push unification of the Armed Services?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: No.

MR. NOVINS: Why not?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I don't think he has taken
enough interest in that particular field. I think he has
allowed the services to go their own way, and he hasn't used
his prestige and ability to crack down.

o'c5f1s

MR. ROBERTS: Senator, before you knock the desk apart,--

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I'll be careful.

MR. ROBERTS: --I think it should be stated for the record that as far as I know you are the only member of Congress who was in the Navy, who has been in the Army, and who has also been in the Marines. I don't know how you missed the Air Force.

But when you are talking about this unification or Manhattan-type project, are you talking about doing this for the current missile program, or are you talking about the whole space age? People are saying we ought to go to the moon or Mars and spend billions of dollars to get in this. Is that what you are talking about?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Mr. Roberts, we have been talking about education, and I would like to point out that in this profession which I am in at the present time, I have to educate myself in a good many fields I know little or nothing about; and one of those fields is the field of space development and the field of missiles and the field of the Sputniks. I am trying to learn. I am confining myself primarily to the -- to the missile development project at the present time. I couldn't give you a definite answer about the whole field, because I am not qualified to do so.

MR. KENT: Senator, President Eisenhower has recently sent a letter to Prime Minister Nehru of India, which was

o2 published today, I believe, in which he is replying to a suggestion of Mr. Nehru that H-bomb and A-bomb tests be abandoned, and he says no, he can't go along with that until some international assurances are given, some inspection system that will guarantee us that Russia won't do something we aren't doing.

How do you feel about that?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I would go along with the President in that respect, because I have always advocated that there be a multilateral ban on nuclear and thermo-nuclear experimentation.

I don't propose, though, that it be done on a unilateral basis by ourselves, nor without safeguards. But I certainly am of the opinion that something should be done before we keep on -- developing weapons of various kinds way beyond the saturation point, and for which we may never have any use.

MR. KENT: I meant to say as part of my, part of my stating the case, that the President also said that this would go for stopping of production of weapons.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, that wouldn't be necessary, but I think the first part, the multilateral ban on -- on experimentation, should be put into operation as soon as possible, based, of course, on a good system of inspection and regulation.

As far as the production is concerned, I think that is

o3 something which could be considered later, because while we have far more than we know what to do with, I believe there are ways and means by which what we have developed could be put to a useful purpose.

MR. NOVINS: In the interest of clarity, Senator, are you saying that you think it would be a good first step to stop the nuclear tests and then go into discussion on how to stop production?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Yes, indeed, on a multilateral basis, and with good regulation and inspection systems.

MR. NOVINS: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Senator, I would like to ask you about the sense of urgency we were talking about earlier on. Many people suggested that the President, whatever he offers to the Allies in Paris, is going to have to say, add the phrase, "This is contingent on Congress passing legislation."

Would it not have added drama and efficiency to the occasion if he had called a special session of Congress before he left and gone with Congressional authorization?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: No, I don't think so, because I think too many of us would have used that sort of a meeting as a sounding board to make our individual views known. I think the President used good judgment, and I think he can depend upon the good judgment of Congress.

And may I point out that, as a Democrat, I think that

o4 since Mr. Eisenhower has been in office, he has received good and responsible cooperation from the Democratic Party during all that time, and he can expect that kind of responsible cooperation under the leadership of men like Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn in the future.

MR. SMITH: Do you think he should have tried harder to get some bipartisan evidence to go with him, for example, get some Senators to go with him to Paris, or get Stevenson to go with him?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: No, no. It is the President's responsibility, under the Constitution, and it is his job and Mr. Dulles' to go there to represent us.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. -- Senator Mansfield, let me ask you this: One of the key things that the President will have to come to Congress on, as he has already said, is a change in our atomic secrets law.

Now, he has taken the position publicly in one of his speeches, and Admiral Strauss, the head of the Atomic Energy Commission has said the same thing, that why should we hold out on our Allies things that our potential enemy already knows.

Is this a fair basis for allied cooperation, that you tell your Allies what your enemy knows, and nothing more?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I don't see what you've got to lose if you operate on that basis. If the Soviet Union

o5 knows it, then I don't see what harm it would do to tell our Allies.

MR. ROBERTS: I am trying to go beyond that question as to whether this basis -- this formula can be the basis of an alliance, of mutual trust.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I think it should be attempted; whether or not it could be a real and sound basis only time will tell. But I do think the attempt should be made.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, how far are you willing, as the Democratic Whip in the Senate, to go in changing this law?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, all I can say now, Mr. Roberts, is that any suggestion presented to the Congress by the President of the United States will receive every possible consideration by the Democratic majority.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that's very noncommittal. Do you mean that you haven't even made up your mind as of now whether you will favor changes to break down this wall of secrecy between the U. S. and its Allies?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Mr. Roberts, I don't know what you mean by noncommittal, but you are asking me a question about something which has not as yet been presented to us. I will be very committal when I know what the proposition is, but until I know, I can't be anything but noncommittal.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, I'd like to ask you a question that arises from questions that have been expressed in Europe

o6 over the last couple of weeks among our NATO members.

We have, I believe, three nations who are NATO nations, that are also members of SEATO, the United States, Britain, and France. If something in the Southeast Asia area, some issue occurred that would cause us to get involved in military conflict, does that automatically bring in all the other NATO members?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Not the other NATO members, but it does the SEATO members, because the NATO territory, as the SEATO territory is, is clearly delineated, and as I recall, the SEATO territory goes to 21 degrees north over as far as Pakistan, excluding India, and down south, I forget just where, but down in the region of the Southern Philippines.

#6 fls.

MR. NOVINS: Well, let's take another situation.

Britain and Turkey are members of the Baghdad Pact. They are also members of NATO. If some crisis in the Middle East involved Turkey in a shooting war, would that bring us into it as NATO members?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: It very possibly could, depending from where the attack came. If, for example, the Soviet Union in that area invaded the old provinces which they have laid claim to on occasion, Ars and Kardahan, there would be no doubt but that the other NATO nations would, under the agreement, go to its assistance.

MR. ROBERTS: Senator, do you think in this connection that it's possible to have, say, some action over two provinces in a far corner of Turkey, far from where we sit today, in which you can have a limited engagement, even with Soviet forces directly, or does that bring World War III, and everything that we fear it means?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: A limited engagement, Mr. Roberts, would be possible but, in my opinion, it would bring on World War III.

MR. ROBERTS: Do you rule out, as Bulganin does in his letter to the President, the idea of limited war?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: No, I do not. I think he is wrong in that, because the record will bear out the fact that there have been limited wars, there is still one going on at the

present time, for example, in Algeria since the end of the Second World War, and in spite of the development of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

MR. ROBERTS: But there has been no limited war with nuclear weapons.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I don't think, once you start using nuclear weapons, then I think you have made the final decision and you had better expect the worst.

MR. ROBERTS: But has the United States the capacity to fight a limited war without using nuclear weapons, in your judgment, today?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Without using nuclear weapons?

MR. ROBERTS: Without nuclear weapons.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: That's a question I find it difficult to answer, because if I understand the defensive set-up in this country now, we have been making atomic weapons more and more the conventional weapons, and it might be impossible to wage a limited war on that basis; and certainly I hold no brief for the propaganda being put out in favor of a so-called clean atomic bomb.

MR. NOVINS: Well, Senator, hasn't the President himself said that nuclear weapons were just another kind of bullet? I believe he was talking about nuclear warheads on artillery pieces.

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I don't know what he said, Mr.

Novins, but it was some statement he made which I referred to when I made the assertion that I believe atomic weapons are now considered in the nature of conventional.

MR. NOVINS: Well, what I am getting at is that what you are saying, as I understand it -- and I hope you will correct me if I am wrong -- is that any shooting war automatically becomes a big, full-scale, all-out job; is that right?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Any shooting war could become a world war.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, are you talking about any shooting war in which either or both of the two principals are involved, the U. S. and the Russians?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Yes; and it is quite possible that third-rate powers could become involved in a war which could spread, and which could involve the two major powers, and thereby the rest of the world.

MR. ROBERTS: One of the arguments being used by Kennan and others against putting nuclear weapons in the hands of our NATO allies is that you increase that danger. What do you think of that?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: It's a possibility.

MR. KENT: Senator, I wonder if I could get back to the more limited war of the Pentagon Building itself.

There has been quite a bit of criticism recently of Mr. Holaday, the Assistant Secretary of Defense in Charge of

Missiles Production. Do you agree with some people who think he should walk the plank?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I would say that his testimony before Lyndon Johnson's Preparedness Subcommittee has not been very clear. He makes statements outside the committee in public speeches, and then when he's asked about them in the committee he begins to hedge. I do think, though, that there is a need for a shakeup in the Pentagon. I think Mr. McElroy has made a good start with a new broom. I would hope that he would keep on swinging it, that he do away with the politics which seems to be inherent in the military organization inhabiting the Pentagon, and that out of this organization, with its 33 Secretaries or Assistant Secretaries, would come a greater degree of efficiency and cooperation.

MR. SMITH: Let me ask you --

MR. NOVINS: Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH (continuing): -- a more difficult question than that, Senator.

The President has now been seriously ill three times in two years. We have a great emergency on our hands, making the office a greater burden than it has ever been in recent times. Do you think that Mr. Eisenhower should retire from office?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: No, I do not. He is our President.

MR. ROBERTS: Would there be any circumstances conceivable under which you would think he should retire?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, if he became senile, if he lost his mind, or if he died -- the latter part, of course, would automatically retire him, but --

MR. KENT: Who would decide that, Senator?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: There is no way under the Constitution at the present time, but I will say this: President Eisenhower did call us down to his office a year or so ago and he urged us to enact some legislation which would take care of a possibility which Mr. Roberts and you have just mentioned, and Mr. Smith brought up in the first place.

He didn't find much support for his view on the part of the Congress, so I would say that the President has been forward-looking in this respect, and the Congress has been backward.

MR. SMITH: Now, you have said that he should retire only if he were senile or if he died. Suppose he is neither, but suppose he is ill and able to perform his duties only part of the time. Do you think he should stay in office then?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, I think he can keep on going that way in the future, as he has in the past.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, I think you have probably broken a track record for Senators on this program. We've talked about forty minutes and we haven't mentioned politics. What's going to happen in the next election?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: The Democrats are going to win.

MR. NOVINS: What makes you think so?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Oh, the facts of life; since Mr. Eisenhower was elected, all you have to do is look at the political campaigns, city, county and state since that time. I think also that the responsible attitude of the Democrats under Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn has been felt in the country, and I think that, by and large, the American people have more confidence in Democratic leadership and Democratic responsibility than they did have in the years when the Democrats were the -- were in -- in control.

MR. NOVINS: What are the issues going to be, Senator?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, foreign policy, missiles, the farm policy, inflation, recession.

MR. ROBERTS: Who is your candidate for the Democratic nomination in '60?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, we have so many, Mr. Roberts, I'll have to give you three or four or five of them. There is John Kennedy, there is Lyndon Johnson, there is Stuart Symington, there is Kefauver, there is Stevenson, there is Meyner. We have so many, we don't know who to pick.

MR. ROBERTS: Are you a candidate for Vice President --

SENATOR MANSFIELD: I certainly am not. I know when I'm well off, and I want to say that I am very happy in the job I'm in, and I have reached the objective in life as far as I'm concerned, so I'm a fortunate man.

MR. NOVINS: And we can expect that you are going to try to stay where you are; is that right, sir?

SENATOR MANSFIELD: Well, we'll see.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, many thanks for coming here today to FACE THE NATION.

And, thanks also to today's panel of newsmen:

To Chalmers Roberts, of the Washington Post and Times Herald;

To Howard K. Smith, of CBS News; and

Carleton Kent, of the Chicago Sun Times.

This is Stuart Novins.

We invite you to join us again next week at this same time for another edition of FACE THE NATION, when our guest will be the Indonesian Ambassador to the United Nations.

Our program today originated in Washington.

Produced by Ted Ayres.

Associate Producer, Beryl Hines.

Directed by Bill Linden.

- - -