

Reporters' Round-up

FROM THE . . .

PRESS INFORMATION OFFICE

MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

1627 K ST., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

STerling 3-3500

RADIO BROADCAST TRANSCRIPT

*do not remove
from file*

PRESS RELEASE PRODUCED AND RELEASED
BY JACK A. GERTZ
NATIONAL DIRECTOR
OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

FOR RELEASE 3:00 PM EDST, SUNDAY, JULY 27, 1958.

U. S. Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, is the newsmaking guest on the unrehearsed nation-wide Reporters' Roundup radio program for Sunday, July 27, 1958.

Senator Humphrey is questioned on the Critical Foreign Relations Situation by well-known and able Washington reporters: Mr. Ernest K. Lindley, National-International Political Analyst and Director of the Washington Bureau of Newsweek; Mr. Joseph Loftus, veteran Washington correspondent for the New York Times.

- LINDLEY: SENATOR HUMPHREY, HOW COULD THE UNITED STATES SEIZE THE INITIATIVE FROM RUSSIA TO SHOW THE WORLD WE DESIRE A SETTLEMENT OF ALL WORLD PROBLEMS?
- LOFTUS: SENATOR, IS THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP AS ANXIOUS TO AVOID WAR AS WE ARE?
- LINDLEY: SENATOR HUMPHREY, DO YOU THINK ALL NATIONS OF THE MIDDLE EAST SHOULD SEND REPRESENTATIVES TO THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE?
- LOFTUS: SENATOR, DO YOU THINK PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ACTED WISELY IN SENDING TROOPS INTO LEBANON?
- LINDLEY: SENATOR HUMPHREY, WHAT SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE PROPOSED SUMMIT CONFERENCE AT THE UNITED NATIONS?
- LOFTUS: SENATOR, WHY IS THE UNITED STATES SO UNLOVED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD AND WHAT CAN WE DO TO AMELIORATE THE SITUATION?
- LINDLEY: SENATOR HUMPHREY, HOW SHOULD THE UNITED STATES DEAL WITH NASSER?
- LINDLEY: SENATOR, IN WHAT MANNER CAN WE CURB INDIRECT AGGRESSION SUCH AS WAS MANIFESTED IN LEBANON?

Attached is a complete transcript of Reporters' Roundup, a weekly nation-wide feature of the Mutual Broadcasting System. This program is heard at 5:05 PM and 7:35 PM EDST and is broadcast on some 500 Mutual affiliates from coast-to-coast.

ADVANCE RELEASE 3:00 PM EDST, SUNDAY, JULY 27, 1958.

Reporters' Round-up

FROM THE . . .

PRESS INFORMATION OFFICE

MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

1627 K ST., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

STerling 3-3500

RADIO BROADCAST TRANSCRIPT

GUEST: U. S. SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY,
DEMOCRAT OF MINNESOTA

PANEL: ERNEST K. LINDLEY, WASHINGTON
CORRESPONDENT, NEWSWEEK

JOSEPH LOFTUS, VETERAN WASHINGTON
CORRESPONDENT, NEW YORK TIMES

MODERATOR: ROBERT F. HURLEIGH, MUTUAL
COMMENTATOR

ANNOUNCER: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, where by-lines
make headlines! In a moment hear U. S. Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of
Minnesota, answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters.

HURLEIGH: Senator Humphrey, how could the U.S.
seize the initiative from the Russians to show the world that we want a
settlement of all Middle Eastern problems?

LINDLEY: Senator Humphrey, what should be the
American policy toward Nasser?

LOFTUS: Why do you think we're in Lebanon
Senator?

HURLEIGH: The Middle East crisis; a UN summit
meeting in New York; foreign policy investigations; possible national debt
increase; a new farm bill; trade; defense; government economy and mid-term
elections . . . and these are only some of the major issues confronting Congress
and the Administration these days in Washington.

Our distinguished guest tonight is
U. S. Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, Senator Humphrey is
a prominent member of the Senate's Foreign Relations, Agriculture and
Government Operations Committees. He is a former U. S. delegate to the United
Nations and now heads the Middle East sub-committee of the Senate Foreign
Relations Committee.

And, while the Federal Government
considers some means of retrieving at least a part of the initiative grabbed
by the USSR in Middle East negotiations, Senator Humphrey takes time away
from his mid-East problems to direct a Senate drive in the development of the
kind of national farm legislation American farmers may expect in 1959.

HURLEIGH: (Cont'd) Senator Humphrey was elected to the Senate in 1948 and re-elected in 1954.

In a moment, our distinguished guest will be ready!

ANNOUNCER: Reporters' Roundup, which comes to you transcribed from the Senate Radio Gallery in your Nation's Capital, is presented by the Mutual Broadcasting System as part of its public service programming to stimulate interest in current public affairs issues. Reporters' Roundup is devoted to encouraging a desire in all Americans to listen, read, and think more about public affairs. When the American people inform themselves from sources of their own choosing, they make wise decisions. May the opinions you will now hear expressed prompt you to further thought.

Our guest, U. S. Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, is prepared to answer the challenging questions of this panel of well-known and able reporters: Mr. Ernest K. National & International Political Analyst and Director Wash. Bureau Newsweek Lindley, ~~Washington correspondent for Newsweek~~; and Mr. Joseph Loftus, veteran Washington correspondent for the New York Times.

Your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh, Mutual commentator.

HURLEIGH: And now, Mr. Lindley, let's have the first question for Senator Humphrey.

LINDLEY: Senator Humphrey, I believe you favor the immediate summit conference under the jurisdiction of the United Nations as now proposed. What should be the subject matter of this conference?

HUMPHREY: Well Mr. Lindley, first of all I do favor as you've indicated a summit conference under the auspices of the United Nations and have so said for several months. You've asked about the subject matter - I believe the subject matter should be limited. It is for that reason that I have advocated that we have a very carefully prepared agenda. A limitation of items to be discussed. And I would hope that this summit conference would direct its attention essentially to the Middle East. And when I say the Middle East I don't mean just American troops in Lebanon. I mean the total complex of problems in the Middle East. It's very important that it be limited to that area.

(MORE)

LINDLEY: How should this be set up. Who should participate in your judgment Senator:

HUMPHREY: I fully concur with the proposal made by the President that the United Nations Security Council should be the scheduling instrument. In other words a sub-committee of the Security Council or the Security Council using the office of the Secretary General of the United Nations should program the meeting, and this would include even the invitations of those to attend or any special ad hoc committee which may be set up for the purpose of private and in secret informal consultation.

LINDLEY: Well you would favor hearing the representatives of the Arab nations as well as other nations in the Middle East would you not?

HUMPHREY: Oh yes indeed I surely would. And, may I say that I think that we missed an opportunity on the occasion of Khrushchev's original invitation when Nikita Khrushchev said we ought to have a summit conference and he included the major powers and then added India - the Prime Minister of India. It seemed to me that was the time that our Government should have said listen we're not about ready to talk about the Middle East without having representatives of the Middle East present. We're not going to divide up this world into a sphere of interests for the Soviet Union and the United States. We want to be the protector of the legitimate rights of nations and their independence.

LINDLEY: Do you want Colonel Nasser to attend?

HUMPHREY: I think that Nasser should attend. I think Ben Gurion of Israel should attend. Those are two of the most prominent figures in the Middle East area and both of them should be present.

LINDLEY: Well, should the representatives of some of the other Arab states be present also?

HUMPHREY: I'm sure that they will be present, because, as you know, under Article 28 of the Charter - any member of the Security Council can have its Prime Minister or its Foreign Minister as a delegate and also under the apparatus of the United Nations itself there is nothing that would prevent any Prime Minister or any head of state attending as an observer, and I'm sure that those observers could be worked into the general discussions if you permit the United Nations Security Council to set up the program.

LOFTUS: Senator, let's go back a minute - you have read that we are going to the wrong meeting at the wrong place at the wrong time. Do you believe that? Do you think Khrushchev has hornswaggled us into something that he can make propaganda/of ^{capital} - defeat us on our home grounds?

HUMPHREY: I do not agree with this Mr. Loftus. I have said since early this winter that a so-called summit meeting was an inevitability. The public opinion of the world was demanding it. Now it's one thing for Americans and American spokesmen to sit over here and argue academically about a summit conference. But make no mistake about it - the Western Europeans are for one. This is why Adenauer's Government has stated that it is for one. This is why MacMillan in Great Britain is for a summit conference. Now we should have taken this and understood it. We should have therefore moved quickly to outline the agenda; to lay down the items that we think ought to be discussed and to put this kind of a conference under our wing so to speak. And this is why I've advocated it be in the United Nations where we have considerable influence and where we have a host of friends. And, by the way, we're going to need some of those friends. That's one of the reasons I want this at the United Nations.

LOFTUS: Well then Senator, aren't you saying that we are going at the wrong time - if not the wrong place - since the initiative is not ours - it's Khrushchev's.

HUMPHREY: May I say we're not going to the wrong place - we're going to the right place. I once said here in the Senate that if Mr. Khrushchev wants a summit conference he can have it on the 32nd story of the United Nations Secretariat Building. That's high enough for Khrushchev or anyone else. But the summit conference should be at the U.N., which is designed for peaceful and diplomatic negotiations. Now - the only thing that I think it wrong is not when or where but it is the attitude with which we enter this conference. And, if we're going to go into this conference complaining and griping and sort of against our will, we're going to go in with two strikes on us before we even get up to bat. We ought to welcome the opportunity of the conference and immediately stake out its dimensions to the best of our ability and let the world know that our case is sufficiently solid so that we can stand up before any group of officials or statesmen and plead our case.

LINDLEY: Senator, you're an authority on the problems of the Middle East. Probably you know more about it than anybody else in the Senate.

HUMPHREY: Well, that's not true Mr. Lindley, but I appreciate your confidence.

LINDLEY: --- I'd like to direct your thought to the substance of the problems there. How are we going to deal -- how should we deal with Nasser and his particular brand of pan-Arabism, which seems to be indulging in indirect aggression of a rather vigorous sort?

HUMPHREY: Mr. Lindley this isn't a matter of trying to just scratch eachother's back, but I've read your many articles on the Middle East, as you know, you traveled there yourself and you wrote some very wonderful and very enlightening pieces about that area. It's one of the most difficult areas in the world to understand. I'm sure you'd agree with me. The complexity of the problems is beyond almost human comprehension. There are enmities that are centuries old. It's really almost incredibly difficult to deal with. Now to get specific to your question - First thing we have to do is to recognize that Nasser is there. And, by the way, we ought to realize that we kept him there. In 1956 he was on his way out right down the Nile, and we stopped the Israelis, the British and the French. And, after having done that, which you can surely justify in terms of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations to which we adhere - after having done that we never had a program as to what we were going to do from there on out, and we never quite made up our mind as a nation how we were going to deal with Mr. Nasser. We sort of pretended and we said well he's a bad fellow. Well, he may be. He's part bad and he has also some points/that are that you might call/commendable. So how should we deal with him properly? Deal with him in a formal manner; deal with him not to embrace him - on the one hand, - but also not to shun him on the other. Because you can't shun him, he's there. And if you embrace him you're apt to be embracing what I think you pointed out so well - to be not Arab nationalism, but Nasserism. And, Nasserism is a compound of Arab nationalism, which is a kind of imperialism of its own, and I don't want us to embrace that. I think we have to deal firmly but properly with Mr. Nasser. Not to pat him on the back on the one hand, but not to kick him in the pants on the other; to try to get him to understand that we're not going to be fooled with; that we have our responsibilities and we'll fulfill them.

HUMPHREY: (Cont'd) Take for example the use of the Suez Canal - rather than just talking about this. I think we -----

LOFTUS: Senator can we come up to date - instead of the Canal what about Lebanon? Do you think we did right in sending troops in there? At this time?

HUMPHREY: You know that my feeling about Lebanon was expressed several times - that I thought in the first place we should have had a UN security force in Lebanon. I suggested this in early June 1958 and felt that we missed the boat in the United Nations. It is never good for our country to land troops into an area such as the Middle East, particularly when we don't quite know what we're landing them for. It wasn't as if we were going to meet an overt enemy, where there was a sharp conflict of arms. We have the Marines there in Lebanon and we don't know what to do with them. We don't quite know how to get them out. We don't know how long they ought to stay and we don't know really for what purposes they're there except that they^{re}re there to protect a Government which will soon be out of power by our own diplomacy. We're trying to get the Chamoun Government out of power. At least Mr. Chamoun. We're trying to get a new force in. Now should they be there? Well, we had a set of alternatives that were the result of a policy of vacillation and of indecision, and I think that once that the Chamoun Government asked for our troops and once that the President had given his personal commitment that if such a request were made that we would come, the mortgage fell due and we had to deliver. I don't like it, but that's what actually happened.

LOFTUS: Well, Senator, on this question of protecting the Chamoun Government - our paper carried a story from Beirut the other day that you could get in a cab outside the St. George Hotel on the waterfront there, take a ten minute ride and be in rebel headquarters where the Chief would serve you tea. Headquarters that could be mowed down with two tanks. Now how do you explain that?

HUMPHREY: I explain it simply because the so-called revolution in Lebanon was a revolution that had within it the political desires of many people to become President of the Republic of Lebanon. It was not the kind of a revolution where there was massive street fighting; where there was great destruction of personnel and property - that actually the Chamoun Government even its own forces were unwilling to destroy the rebel power, because the leader of the military of the Chamoun Government, I gather, wants to be President of the Republic of Lebanon himself.
(more)

HUMPHREY: (Cont'd) Also, he doesn't have a desire to be shooting fellow Moslems.

LOFTUS: And we go in there to shoot them?

HUMPHREY: Oh, no. That's why I said in the very beginning that the force that should be in there was not a United States force, but a United Nations force. Don't misunderstand me. I oppose the sending of marines to Lebanon. I said, however, once they were there and once the decision was made by the President, then we had the problem of what to do from here on up.

LINDLEY: Well Senator, you would agree would you not, that Lebanon has been and is the target of indirect aggression, which involves a number of instruments including propoganda, assassination, open urging to assassination, training of terrorists outside Lebanon to be sent in and various other ----

HUMPHREY: If all of that happen Mr. Lindley, but I also think it made itself susceptible to the effectiveness of this indirect aggression by the fact of the political situation within Lebanon itself, which did not need to develop.

LINDLEY: Well, let us grant that. I ~~want~~ want to get to this question of how do you curb indirect aggression in an area of the world where assassination - other means of force enter in as well as propoganda and infiltration in the milder form -- meaning of the world?

HUMPHREY: Well, we've had this for years as a matter of fact. We've experienced some of this in our own hemisphere, but let me say not in quite as lethal a dose as you're experiencing in the Middle East. I don't think you handle it by dispatching American marines to every country where somebody is assassinated, or where somebody is threatened with assassination. I think you really deal with it by stabilizing the Governments or strengthening the Governments in those respective countries through their own action primarily through some help from ourselves economically and politically, so that they can deal with their own subversion. I don't believe that the United States of America can run around the world every time ~~that~~ they hear that a radio broadcast says overthrow Government of country X and when that Government wires to us or calls the President and says come help me that we've got to go. We've got to have a better policy than that.

LINDLEY: No, but you favored having the United Nations take the responsibility in Lebanon. What about using the same mechanism in other countries in the Middle East that are threatened by Nasser? But then how should the U. N. go about it? (more)

HINDLEY: (Cont'd) Let us take the case of the Sudan, which we know does not want to be - at least the majority - the Government doesn't want to be absorbed by Egypt, but is under great pressure from Egypt.

HUMPHREY: ^{yes} /Sir.

LINDLEY: What do you do about Bourgiba of Tunisia who's another democratic leader who's against Nasser? How do you provide people of that sort and countries of that sort with protection against the tactics of Nasser, which you agree are aggressive?

HUMPHREY: First of all Mr. Lindley, let me say this. Let's take a country like Tunisia. One of the ways to help Tunisia is to help Bourgiba who is a powerful political leader; to help him economically; to help him psychologically; to show our interest in him. And also to have a policy within the U. N. which says that because of the dangers in this area, because of the uncertainty and the insecurity in the area that there shall be ready and available at all times a United Nations Emergency Police Force which, if requested, by the state that's in trouble, can be sent there once that the General Assembly or the Security Council agrees to it for the purpose of protection of the particular area. I happen to agree with you sir that there is a need for a police power in an area of the world such as we're now discussing. But I don't want to see the United States of America become the world policemen. I don't want to see a Soviet Union become the world policemen either and I don't want Nasser to become it. So, since there needs to be a policeman, I suggest that we make the community of nations the police power. And, that's why I believe that we need a going, on-the-spot, existing United Nations permanent police force that can be utilized in these areas.

LOFTUS: Senator, you talk about helping Bourgiba and others - let me ask you a double barreled question. We've helped a lot of people since 1946. Why do you think we're so unloved throughout the world? And, point two, doesn't this situation fortify the isolationist view that we should have stayed home long ago and built a high wall around our borders?

HUMPHREY: Well first of all Mr. Loftus, if the American people think that everything we do is going to turn out happily than we ought to get out not only of the international scene, but we just ought to get out of the world, because there is no guaranty that the things that we touch and the plans that we have will always work out beautifully.

(more)

HUMPHREY: (Cont'd) There is no personal guaranty in ones life, in ones business, ones profession and there surely is no such guaranty in international relations. That's number one. Number two - yes, we've helped some people that have more or less turned their back on us or have literally insulted us and at times turned on us, but sometimes we've helped people who have had no real political force at home; who have not represented the aspirations of their own people. We've done this as a matter of expediency and sometimes have become trapped by this expedient policy. In the main though, I'm unwilling to agree that the Americans are not liked throughout the world. The trouble is we not only want to be liked, we want to be loved. What we really ought to want is respect, and not even friendship - just respect. If we conduct ourselves in a manner where we realize that other people are not always going to agree with us, but may respect us, we'll be better off.

LOFTUS: Well do you think the Soviet leadership are as anxious to avoid war as we are?

HUMPHREY: I think the Soviet leadership has made up its mind that it's not going to try to blow the world to pieces - it would like to pick it up piece by piece. It understands the terrible destruction that can come from thermo-nuclear war, and I have said, and I will continue to say that the Soviet Union - at this particular time at least - does not want to mix it up with the United States in any thermo-nuclear war. And I would hope that we have no aspirations for such a struggle. Therefore, the conflict must take place - and there is a conflict taking place - on the political, on the economic, on the social, on the propaganda lines, and that's why I think we ought to gird ourself for this struggle. We're constantly girding ourselves for the military struggle, which is important to do, but we need trade policies, economic policies. We need political policies, which strengthen us and which are able to defeat the Soviet wherever we join them at issue.

LINDLEY: Senator, it's often said that we or our State Department and the Administration almost always allow the Soviet Union to seize the initiative. Do you think that's true and what can we do about it?

HUMPHREY: All too often. One of the classic examples is this summit conference. Now look Mr. Lindley, once in a while there are some things in life that you just have to face - like death and paying taxes and occasionally a tragedy and sorrow. So my feeling is that you ought to prepare yourself for these things.

(more)

HUMPHREY: (Cont'd) And in the instance of this summit conference, it was coming. There wasn't a living mortal that I know in or out of Government that didn't know that it was going to come one of these days. So we should have looked upon it as an opportunity rather than as a sort of a curse or a problem, and we should have prepared for it. And we should have championed certain causes. The very night, as I said, that Khrushchev said to us, look let's have Britain, France, the United States and Russia and we'll bring in India for window dressing - let's talk about the Middle East. What Khrushchev was saying was, let's divide it up. That was the time for us to say, look we're not about ready to divide up the world. We're ready to defend the world; we're ready to protect people, their rights and their aspirations and there are no deals Mr. Khrushchev. But if you want to talk about a peaceful world in which there's dignity and freedom, we're prepared to talk. But instead of that we said, Well, I don't know, we don't want to go to these conferences and we destroy ourselves before we go. Lets be Americans - and that means with faith and confidence and a kind of spirit, instead of going around like tired, sick old men.

(over)

HURLEIGH: I'm sorry, gentlemen, but I am going to have to cut in here. Our board of judges has selected the prize-winning questions submitted by our listeners for this broadcast. In a moment Senator Humphrey is going to answer these questions. Stand by for the names of the winners.

ANNOUNCER: When you're traveling in your car, make it a habit to carry a litterbag. It will help to keep your car clean and tidy.. help to keep litter off the highways. It's amazing how much trash and debris we can collect on even a short drive -- used paper cups and napkins... apple cores, fruit peelings... crumpled cigarette packages.. There's almost no end to the list -- and all of these things have to be put somewhere. Make a note right now to keep a travel trash container in your car for all this discarded material. Then, dispose of it later, either at home or in a proper receptacle along the way. Remember, last year it cost more than fifty million tax dollars just to clean up our primary highways alone -- fifty million dollars that could have been spent for new highways or to improve old ones. Be a good citizen. Keep a litterbag in your car... and use it! Let's all do our part to help keep America beautiful!

AND REMEMBER, MUTUAL IS YOUR NETWORK FOR NEWS.

HURLEIGH: And now, Senator Humphrey, here are those prize-winning questions from our listeners.

ANNOUNCER: First Senator Humphrey, from Mable Jerva of Los Angeles, California; Don't you think Congress should make a complete investigation of the Central Intelligence Agency? Of late they haven't been functioning. And Mrs. Jerva says -- I have reference to revolt in Baghdad, Iraq.

HUMPHREY: I would answer your questioner by saying that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is going to undertake such an investigation, but I want to caution both my colleagues and the citizenry. We must be careful. An Intelligence Agency is a very delicate instrumentality and you can ~~destroy~~ the effectiveness of an Intelligence Agency by having a sort of flamboyant investigation. Yes, we need an inquiry; we need a careful study of the Central Intelligence Agency, but let's not make it a plaything or just something to get headlines with here in Congress.

ANNOUNCER: Alvene Safarik of Jackson Heights, New York asks: Since the unrest in Lebanon seems to be Soviet inspired, is there any danger of a "Nuclear Pearl Harbor" from the Soviets?

(more)

HUMPHREY: Well, there's always a danger that the Soviet leaders could attack, but I think the danger is less obvious -- or it is less of a danger than the kind of an attack that the Soviet is launching in terms of subversion, conspiracy, propaganda, infiltration and economical fencing. That's the real danger right now. Now we always have to keep up our guard, keep our shield strong and in place, but don't forget this other attack, and Lebanon is not only the matter of --- it's not only Soviet influence in Lebanon, it's just the complexities and the difficulties of Middle Eastern politics and the Soviet finds this a very fertile field in which to operate and they move in and kind of edge it along.

ANNOUNCER: Finally from Douglas Gosserand of Glendale, California: Nasser says the complete annihilation of Israel is a must on his timetable; the United States says Israel is here to stay. Does this mean the U. S. will go to the defense of Israel with force of arms whenever necessary?

HUMPHREY: Well, I want to say that whenever a leader of a nation says that one of his policies is the complete annihilation of somebody else that fellow's a dangerous man. Because if it wasn't Israel it'd be somebody else, and as was said here on this program - Mr. Nasser would like to have Sudan. I think he'd like to have the whole Middle East, and I think somewhere along the line you just have to tell Mr. Nasser, now look Mr. Nasser this isn't going to happen. And, this is why I've said that you must set up security forces to see that it doesn't happen. Furthermore, I have always believed that we should have certain guarantees of territorial integrity and sovereignty for the nation states of the Middle East, and putting it under a U. N. umbrella with the strength of major powers to make sure that it is carried out. Nasser's aspirations about Israel will never be realized because the Israelis will fight him to the death.

ANNOUNCER: Thank you Senator Humphrey. For submitting these prize-winning questions, we are sending Mable Jerva of Los Angeles, California; Alvene Safarik of Jackson Heights, New York; and Douglas Gosserand of Glendale, California, a gift of beautiful silver - exclusively designed by the Michael C. Fina Company of New York - one of America's outstanding silversmiths.

-10-

ANNOUNCER: Mutual has brought you this program with the hope of stimulating your interest in the matters you have heard discussed and in all other issues.

Next week our newsmaking guest will be U. S. Senator William F. Knowland, Republican from California, and the Minority Leader of the Senate, who will be questioned on the Historic UN Summit Discussions and Foreign Relations Problems.

The writers of the three most interesting and timely questions for our guest will each receive a piece of beautiful silver, exclusively designed by the Michael C. Fina Company - one of America's outstanding silversmiths; Send in your questions on a postcard with your full name and complete address. Mail it to Reporters' Roundup, Mutual Broadcasting System, Washington, D. C. The decision of the board of judges will be final. All questions remain the property of Reporters' Roundup.

HURLEIGH: I want to thank U. S. Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, for being our guest on Reporters' Roundup, which came to you transcribed from the Senate Radio Gallery in your Nation's Capital.

And, my thanks, too, to the reporters on our panel: Mr. Ernest K. Lindley, ~~Washington Bureau Chief of Newsweek~~ National-International Political analyst and Director of the Washington Bureau of Newsweek; and Mr. Joseph Loftus, veteran Washington correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune.

Be sure to send in your questions for our guest next week, U. S. Senator William F. Knowland, Republican from California and the Minority Leader of the Senate, who will be questioned on the Historic UN Summit Discussions and Foreign Relations Problems.

Until then, this is Robert F. Hurleigh.

ANNOUNCER: A safety message for motorists from the Highway Visibility Bureau. On many cars one year old and older, the wiper arm pressure falls far short of the minimum specified by leading car manufacturers for new cars. They specify arm pressures for their new models of at least one ounce to every inch of blade length. For example, a 12-inch blade calls for 12 ounces of arm pressure. Weak arm pressure permits wind lifting and skip-wipe that cause slow-down and loss of valuable driving time. But here's some big news! There is now available to service stations, a precision instrument that accurately tests the pressure of your wiper arms in a few seconds. This can be done while your gas tank is being filled, and if your pressure is below standard, you can replace your wiper arms with new, pressure-adjustable arms and live, fresh wiper blades that will mean a safe, clean wipe in any kind of weather. Ask your service man to test your wiper arms next time you stop for gas.

(ANNOUNCER in an "aside" manner) And if he doesn't have the pressure scale you can inform him that it is available from regular automotive wholesalers. And further information on this important safety program can be had by writing to the Highway Visibility Bureau, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The Highway Visibility Bureau, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Next week, and each week thereafter, Reporters' Roundup will seek out the top news and the man who makes it. You'll get the story behind the headlines as our guest answers the questions of Robert F. Hurleigh and a panel of veteran newsmen.

Reporters' Roundup is under the personal direction of Robert F. Hurleigh and Jack A. Gertz.

This is Jaffray Ford speaking.

- 0000000 -



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org