

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE"

RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE  
SUNDAY, JULY 27, 1958

SUMMARY

SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY APPEARS ON RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE.

1. Humphrey proposes a four-point program for the Summit Conference on Middle East, including police power, programs of economic and technical assistance and an arms embargo.
2. Senator Humphrey says "We should recognize the new government of the Republic of Iraq. In fact, we should have done it last week."
3. We should deal with Nasser in a prudent and just manner.
4. A Summit Conference is in the right place and at the right time to deal with the present crisis of worldwide importance. He sees it as one of the most critical and important meetings of the twentieth century.
5. He says the present administration has been derelict in not pushing for United Nations Police Force.
6. He will not support United States' entrance into the Baghdad Pact.
7. He calls Khrushchev a wily fox with wolfish instincts and the appetite of a tiger.
8. If the Summit should fail, we will need time and patience, hope and prayer.
9. Lebanon "has ceased to be a bridge to the Middle East and has become a bridge-head."

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE"

COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE

4000 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NORTHWEST

WASHINGTON 16, D. C.

EM 2-6969

KE 7-1100

- - -

SUNDAY, JULY 27, 1958

- - -

COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE PRESENTS

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

DEMOCRAT OF MINNESOTA

- - -

Panel:

RUTH HAGY, Moderator

IRADJ AMINI, George Washington University

HIKMAT NABULSI, Georgetown University

PAUL MEANS, University of Nebraska

SANDRA BREGMAN, George Washington University

HOLLY O'CONNOR, University of Chicago

- - -

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE"

ml

THE ANNOUNCER: Here comes the future. From Washington, D. C., we present COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE.

Our guest today, Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, who will meet our college reporters in their unrehearsed news conference.

And now here is our moderator, Ruth Hagy.

MISS HAGY: Hello and welcome to COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE.

Senator Humphrey, it is a great pleasure to welcome you back for another visit to our campus newsroom and I would like you to meet the reporters who will interview you at once.

From the University of Nebraska, Paul Means.

From the University of Chicago, Holly O'Connor.

From Georgetown University, Hikmat Nabulski of the Syrian Region of the United Arab Republic, a former vice-chairman of the Arab Student Organization of America.

From George Washington University, Iradj Amini of Iran, President of the International Students Society of George Washington University and from the same school, George Washington University, Sandra Bregman.

Students, as you know, Senator Humphrey is not only a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but he is the chairman of its Subcommittee on the Near East and has personally visited the region and consulted with many of the figures who are today making front page headlines.

MISS BREGMAN: Senator Humphrey, in your opinion has

Mr.Khrushchev so manipulated world affairs that he has forced us into a Summit Conference at the wrong place at the wrong time and on the wrong subject?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Miss Bregman, I would say that some-time ago I predicted that we would be in a Summit Conference this fall. I think it was an inevitability primarily because of world opinion. The people of the world are terrified by the prospect of nuclear, or thermonuclear war. Therefore, it was my feeling that we should have long ago prepared for this possibility of a Summit Conference.

Now, to get right down to the last part of your question, Miss Bregman, because that is quite a question that you asked, you know, it doesn't lend itself to twenty seconds of answering -- is this conference at the wrong place, at the wrong time and the wrong occasion or whatever you said.

It is not at the wrong place; it is at the right place. The United Nations is exactly where a conference that is dedicated to peace ought to take place. The UN is constructed to handle situations just like this, and as to the wrong time, no. It is in my way of thinking the right time.

The crisis in the Middle East is of worldwide proportions and of worldwide significance and therefore it necessitates the most important and most comprehensive treatment.

As to the auspices, as I said earlier, the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, is the proper mechanism.

MISS BREGMAN: Senator, it seems evident, I think, to everyone, that the Summit Conference had to come. Why then haven't the Democratic leaders in Congress been able to force the Administration into preparing for a Summit meeting?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Miss Bregman, the trouble is, in our constitutional system the Executive Branch is primarily responsible for foreign policy.

Now, it is true that the legislative, or in this instance the Senate, has a great deal to do in terms of giving advice and consent, as we say, but we do not make foreign policy; we do not initiate it and do not conduct it. The program must be under the control of the President and the Secretary of State.

MR. AMINI: Senator, do you think that any delay on the part of the United States as to the date of the Summit Meeting would turn to the advantage of the Soviet Union from a propaganda point of view?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Amini, it is very important that we look upon this meeting at the United Nations as one of the most critical and one of the most important events of the 20th century because it is dealing with the hot spot in the cold war, namely, the Middle East, where the problems are of centuries in duration and there are enmities and there is bitterness such as most people do not quite understand.

Now, as to the date, I think the date should be set in

terms of preparing an agenda. How long will it take to get an agenda worked out? How long will it take to get the invitations out?

We ought not to be rushed by Mr. Khrushchev who says, "I want to come on Monday. I want to come on Tuesday."

This isn't a birthday party. He isn't coming to a polo match. He isn't attending some great sport event. We must hold this conference at a time when we are prepared for it. When we have agreed upon the items to discuss, when the officialdom of the United Nations -- that is, the Secretariat, -- is able to really program such a meeting. So the date should be soon, but not so soon as to prejudice its success.

MR. AMINI: Senator, do you have any optimistic opinion as to the constructive work that this Summit meeting could do?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, yes, I do.

Mr. Amini, I am really pleased that we are having this meeting and I want my country to enter into it with enthusiasm, with spirit, with optimism, with confidence. The United Nations is the greatest instrumentality in this world for peace and the fact that we have been willing to use the United Nations will strengthen it.

You see, I have always believed that the Soviet Union would like to by-pass the UN whenever it could because it doesn't win in the UN. It has a difficult time in the UN because the people who attend in the United Nations are competent,



intelligent people, objective people.

Now, I am convinced that this meeting can cover a broad scope of items in the Middle East. We don't want to pin it down just to the matter of troops in Lebanon. That is what the Soviet would like. That might be catapulted or this would be the catalyst that made possible this meeting, but we need to talk about the political and economic problems of the Middle East.

We need to talk about the future of the countries in the Middle East. How do we protect the independence and territorial integrity of the states in the Middle East? What will be the role of the great powers in the Middle East? Shall we neutralize it, shall it be sealed off? What kind of economic assistance will be directed to the Middle East? And I have some suggestions on that which I have had for some time.

MISS O'CONNOR: Are you implying, Senator, that there can be a Middle East settlement without withdrawal of U. S. troops from Lebanon?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I didn't say that at all, Miss O'Connor. As a matter of fact, I know of no one who doesn't believe we should withdraw our troops from Lebanon as soon as we possibly can.

You know I had some great misgivings about our going into Lebanon primarily because I thought there were things we could have done long before the necessity of sending troops

was forced upon us. After all, when the government of Lebanon called its trump card, so to speak -- they said, "The mortgage is due."

The President had given a commitment to the Lebanese Government that when the Lebanon Government asked for troops we would send them. Whether that commitment should have been given or not is a question of yesterday. However, the troops are there and we want to get those troops out, but we want to get those troops out when we are sure that the new government of Lebanon after the coming elections will be secure, that there will be independence guaranteed, the territorial integrity.

There is no use of withdrawing troops only to have the state of Lebanon chewed up again by some force.



mml

MISS HAGY: You have brought us to the prize-winning question of the week for which Mrs. L. E. Harris, Box 413, Edgewater, Florida will receive a set of Encyclopedia Americana. She asks you, Senator, "How do we propose to be able to halt outside aid to Lebanese rebels? By use of the Marines now on Lebanon's soil? If so, how other than by force or shedding of blood?"

SENATOR HUMPHREY: First of all, in reference to your question, the United Nations observer teams were really halting outside aid to the rebels in Lebanon. There was aid coming in, there is no doubt about that. But the UN observer teams that were stationed in Lebanon following the action of the Security Council in June were cutting down on the flow of that outside aid and actually by the time of our sending Marines to Lebanon, that aid had been cut off.

So the Marines are not going to have to do much about that but if they are withdrawn we have to be sure that there is a system devised that will see to it that this kind of infiltration does not take place and that is what I was saying a while ago to Mr. Amini, that we need to look upon this conference in the Middle East not just as one of seeing how you get the Marines out -- even though I think this is important to do, but what from there? How do we guarantee the territorial integrity, for example, of Iran? How do we guarantee the territorial integrity of Egypt, of Israel, of Tunisia, of the Sudan, of Libya? There are many

states in the Middle East. It isn't just the United Arab Republic and it isn't just Lebanon. We have to look upon this area as a vital part of the world in which any form of aggression must be thwarted and checked and I say it is the responsibility of the members of the United Nations to devise a system that will thwart and check any form of aggression, whether it is the aggression of Radio Cairo or whether it is the aggression of Radio Moscow or whether it is the aggression of forces that move across boundaries. That has to be checked.

MR. NABULSI: Just to go back to the summit talk, Senator, you mentioned we have to go and talk and as a matter of fact show our point of view.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Negotiate.

MR. NABULSI: Do you have a positive policy when you are going to meet with Khrushchev about the Middle East?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I would say there are some suggestions that I would offer. I offer these only in the light of my own very limited experience but maybe they will be helpful.

First of all I think we have to understand the problems of the area. There is Arab nationalism which is a fact. There is poverty. There is political instability. There is the problem of the relationship of certain Arab states to their neighbor, Israel. There is the Pakistanian refugee problem.

Now these have to be faced up to and the parties who participate in the conference at the UN must be people and the leaders of nation states that are involved directly with these problems.

Now my first suggestion is this, that there is a need for some form of police power in the world and in an area such as the Middle East that need of a police power is very evidence because of the instability of the area. I don't want Russian troops in the Middle East. I don't want United States troops in the Middle East. I don't want Nasser to police the Middle East and I know any one nation state that tries to police the boundries of others could easily set off a war. Therefore I suggest that the community of nations provide the police force. And that means a United Nations permanent police force that can be dispatched on a moment's notice to any area where there is tangible evidence of outside aggression or instability that would in any way upset the balance in the world and cause World War No. III. Now, the second point --

MR. NABULSI: Just a moment, Senator, you said the UN observer team has indicated one way or the other,

there is no infiltration. However, the Unites States went ahead and sent troops. Can you explain that to me, please?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think we have to be very

candid about it. The revolt in Iraq caused the government of Lebanon grave concern. The government of Lebanon thought that this revolt could trigger off an even greater revolt in its own country and there already had been infiltration, there already had been supplies come in, there already were agents working within the country and there was a fear on the part of the Chamoun government that this was the end of the nation state of Lebanon.

That fear may have been justified or may not have been justified. The fact is that we made a commitment and the fact is that when a country makes a commitment they generally keep it.

I think it was unfortunate. You know what my opinion is, but we made a commitment. Now I want to go back to the other point. This program should be educational as well as inquisitorial, may I say.

The second point is, in the Middle Eastern area we need great programs of technical and economic assistance. For the United States to try to take on this responsibility alone is foolish. We just don't have the means and furthermore, if we try to do it alone, we will end up being despised.

I think we need a Middle East Development Agency which pools the capital of the nation states of the world, and particularly to the Middle East, with the United States,

mm5

and which has with it the technical assistance like -- let's say a World Bank and a TVA combination. I think you need to have an arms ban in the Middle East. A United Nations Arms Traffic Control Commission. And I think we need a UN Good Offices Commission on a continuing basis, with a mandate to seek settlement of the problems that seem to plague this particular area.

Now those are four practical suggestions and I say that all of them ought to be worked through the United Nations.

MR. MEANS: Senator, you have expressed optimism that we can reach some agreement with the Soviet Union on the specific problem of Lebanon in the Middle East in the general problem, and one of the proposals that you make is this permanent police force.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. MEANS: How can we reach agreement with the Soviet Union on these problems when in the past two weeks the Soviet delegate in the Security Council first vetoed the United States resolution for a UN police force in this area and they have also vetoed the Japanese resolution to increase the size of the UN observer group?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Means, your question is surely one that is in the minds, I am sure, of all of our listeners, but there is an answer to it. The Security

Council provides for the use of the veto and the 11 members of the Security Council -- any one of the permanent members can exercise that veto.

It just so happens that the Soviet Union has used the veto well over 80 times. Now how do you by-pass that? You go to the General Assembly of the United Nations and I recommended on June 26 of this year that we go to the General Assembly and seek establishment of a United Nations police force for the Middle East.

Now we have a UNEF that is operating there already as a result of the Sinai campaign and the Suez crisis of 1956. It seems to me on that experience we could build. Don't ever for a moment think that the Russian veto in the Security Council can prevent constructive action by the United Nations, because it can't. Because under the resolution for peace in 1951, the United Nations General Assembly can take action. And by the way, the United States Senate on two occasions has recommended unanimously to our government that we seek the establishment of a permanent United Nations police force. Now this is 96 Senators without a dissenting vote. And I say that our government, our Administration has been derelict, derelict in its refusal to expedite such action. And in fact we haven't pushed it at all at the UN and we surely should have.

MR. MEANS: The question I tried to put forth was that



you are optimistic that we can reach an agreement with the Russians?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I have never said that. I have said that I felt it was inevitable that we would have a summit conference and if you are going to have a summit conference you ought to make up your mind what you are going to do, rather than constantly hoping that it won't happen, retreating and dragging of feet. I have said "Look, it is going to happen. Anyone with good sense knows it is going to happen. The German government wants it, the French government has wanted it, the British government has wanted it, our main allies have wanted it, but our leaders, and particularly Mr. Dulles and indeed the President, have sort of been dragging their feet thinking, well maybe it won't happen." My theory is that we should have assumed it would happen. Not that we are going to get great results, I don't know, but that we should have entered it with specific purposes in mind, specific objectives to be achieved and enter it with the kind of agenda in mind we want and that we can work out with others.

Maybe the Soviet will agree because the Soviet knows that the United States of America is not going to be pushed around forever. And in fact I suppose you might say that the entrance of the Marines into Lebanon was a rather strong indication to the Soviet Union that there comes

a time when public opinion in the United States refuses to be shoved any further.

Now, the Soviet understands power and I suggest that we let the Soviet Union know that we are anxious for a peaceful settlement, that we want it, that we are willing to negotiate it, but we are not willing to appease, we are not willing to sell out other nations, we are not willing to bargain away the world, and the sooner they understand that, the better they are going to be off.

MISS BREGMAN: Senator, now you have given us four proposals. Have you been able to get the President and Secretary of State Dulles to accept any of these four proposals and agree to take them to the summit conference with them to use this as part of the United States policy at the summit conference?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, Miss Bregman, I have not. Could I just add that these proposals of mine are not new. The first listing of these proposals was in December 1956, while I was yet a delegate at the United Nations, where I worked with the representatives of the Arab states and other states. I concentrated my attention particularly on the Middle East. Then you may recall that after my trip to the Middle East last year I published a report or prepared a report for the Senate, as a document to the Senate, in which I outlined again these specific proposals.

I have talked all over America about these proposals but I am happy to note that many governments seem to endorse them.

When I went to the Middle East, I talked with seven foreign ministers and eight prime ministers about these proposals, and I found a great deal of acceptance.

You may have noticed that Mr. deGaulle has indicated some interest in this kind of a proposal. The Prime Minister of Ghana -- I was so pleased with his visit to Washington, D. C. He is a tremendous political force, one of the great leaders of a new, young democracy. He too outlined some of these suggestions. These are not necessarily original with me. They just add up to what I call common sense. I am going to keep talking about them. Senator Mansfield is talking about them and by the way, Senator Styles Bridges indorsed the Middle East Development type of authority or agency. We are beginning to make some progress and I think if we keep at it we will do it.

m1           MISS BREGMAN: Senator Humphrey, if they are not taking your proposals, do you have any idea what policy the Secretary of State and President Eisenhower are taking with them to the Summit Conference?

          SENATOR HUMPHREY: I do not, Miss Bregman, and I think this is the weakness of our position, going to the Summit, and I hope the American people will literally with one voice require of our Chief Executive and our Secretary of State that when we go to that conference at the United Nations that we go with program in hand; that we clearly understand what we are after and the kind of solution that we want and unless we do we will be made into mincemeat by this fellow Khrushchev. Khrushchev is a wily, cunning old fox with wolfish instincts and, by the way, he has the appetite of a tiger, and I would suggest that when you go and you meet with him -- and you are going to meet with him -- that you know what you are there for, what you want to do, how you want to accomplish it, and also go with the spirit of confidence in your program and yourself.

          MR. NABULSKI: How can you say this is a good time to go to a meeting since you said yourself they are not prepared, they don't have any foreign policy and they didn't ask you about your opinion to that effect. How can you suggest this is a good time, a good place and a good person to meet and discuss a foreign policy with him about the Middle East when the American State Department, to my mind, has no positive

m2

program.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is not quite that bad, Mr. Nabulski. I don't want you to give me the cold chills. I have a cold today anyway. Could I just work with you for a minute on your suggestion?

MR. NABULSKI: Certainly.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: First of all, it is the right place.

MR. NABULSKI: I agree with you.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The United Nations is exactly the right place. I have felt this and have said so for months.

Number two, insofar as the parties to participate, they will be the right persons or parties.

MR. NABULSKI: Who are the parties?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The large nations -- of course, McMillan of Britain, deGaulle of France, Eisenhower of the United States, Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, Nasser of Egypt, Ben-Gurion of Israel.

MR. NABULSKI: Ben-Gurion and Nasser?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think they should be invited and under the procedures of Article 28 of the United Nations the Security Council can invite them. By the way, this is reassuring that the machinery of the United Nations is sufficiently flexible to handle this kind of a situation.

m3           But you say is this the right time? The right time to do anything is when it is timely and this situation in the Middle East is so grave, it is so filled with potentiality for danger and for worldwide explosion that, of course, this is the right time. You can't afford to have undue delay because the problem will only get worse.

          And, as an American, may I say, we want to get our troops out of Lebanon, but we want to get them out of there when we have reasonable assurances that there is going to be stability in the area.

          I don't think our country ingratiate itself by a demonstration of troop movements throughout the world. Nevertheless, if you are not going to have troop movements, you have to have another force. You can't have a vacuum, and you know full well that a vacuum in the area would only produce greater troubles.

MR. AMINI: Senator, I would like to divide my question in three parts.

          As you know, the Baghdad Pact Meeting is going on in London.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. AMINI: First, I want to ask you, do you believe in the Bagdad Pact?

          Second, is the United States going to enter the Pact to strengthen it, if Iraq leaves the Pact?

          The third part is, do you think that in the case of a breakdown of the Baghdad Pact, a Federation of Iran, Pakistan and



m4 Afghanistan could stand against the United Arab Republic?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: First of all, I did not support the United States' entrance into the Pact when some people talked about it. I felt that if there was to be a Baghdad Pact it would be better to have it without Iraq at the time because the Iraq participation only lends itself to greater confusion in the Middle East Arabic countries.

The possibilities of a pact between Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, that is a natural -- that is what you call the old northern tier. I think that kind of a pact can be justified and I would hope that it would have more than military significance.

Secondly, should we join it now? No, I don't think that we should join it now. We have, of course, the closest relationships with the three countries, with Turkey, with Iran and with Pakistan. I do believe there is a way, however, in which we can give commitments to the countries as to their territorial integrity and one of the points I would stress in this Middle Eastern area, once we get any kind of an agreement on it, is that we give firm commitments as to the protection of the territorial integrity of the respective countries, and surely NATO, NATO gives Turkey protection; SEATO certainly takes care of the Pakistani situation because Pakistan is in SEATO, and we have a Mutual Assistance Pact with Iran and I want to say to you, sir, that I believe our relationships with

m5

Iran must be on a sound and constructive basis and I am pleased with the recent visit of the Shah of Iran and I hope we shall continue to have this kind of cordial relationship that is more than just good-will. That is economic and in a sense, yes, where we help build up their security forces.

MR. AMINI: I spoke of a federation which would include Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Of course, that is a Utopian idea, but I want to ask you your opinion about that.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it would be excellent. The only problem I see, of course, immediately, is the tremendous long term enmities between certain sections of Afghanistan and Pakistan.

You know more about that than I do. But recently we were able, through the good offices of the United States and others, to arrange for transit to a seaport from Afghanistan through Pakistan. There is a good sign. But I would hope our government would have as its policy for these northern tier countries the promotion of good will, particularly between Afghanistan and Pakistan. And then give to Turkey, too, a singular role in trying to act as a coordinator in this area.

And then can I just add that we need much more of the technical and economic assistance in the area. We are relying entirely too much upon the military pact idea.

MISS BREGMAN: Senator, instead of following a policy of

m6

attempting to limit the power of Nasser in the Middle East, don't you think the United States should accept him and make an attempt to get along with him?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Nasser is there and we recognize the United Arab Republic, but I think there is a tendency in the United States to confuse Nasserism with Arab Nationalism.

Now, Arab Nationalism, in my mind, is a reality. It is a legitimate thing. It is a wholesome, it is a good thing because this means the Arabic peoples want to make more out of their countries and out of their lives, but Mr. Nasser has symbolized this Arab Nationalism, but I think exploited it. I think he has exploited it. I don't think that we necessarily embrace Mr. Nasser. We deal with him in a formal, in a prudent and a just manner. But by the same token he has some responsibilities to the world.

One way that I see to be able to deal more effectively with Mr. Nasser is to make sure our attitudes in the Middle East are understood. Take, for example, I believe we ought to let the peoples know we do support the state of Israel, whether they like it or not; that we feel it is a friend to the United States. I think we ought to build a pipeline from the Gulf of Elath right across Israel into the Mediterranean and I will tell you why, because I don't think we should be relying upon pipelines going through territories where we are

m7

constantly threatened.

Now, I want to use the Suez Canal. I want to see the pipelines operate through Syria, but by the same token, the governments of this country must give us assurance that those pipelines are not going to be cut off and that the Suez Canal is not going to be stopped.

Now, Mr. Nabulsi undoubtedly has something to say about that.

MR. NABULSI: To carry what kind of oil, Senator, from which country?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: From Iran.

MR. NABULSI: At the same time you give up the oil from the other countries?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at all. May I say the United States should seek the most cordial political and economic relationships with the Arab States. For example, I believe we ought to recognize the government in Iraq right now. I think we should have recognized it earlier this week. I think this would be good. I think we ought to let them know we want to do business with them and we ought to have a continuing program of development in these areas. But I want to say with equal candor, as one, I am a little tired of the kind of abuse which the West and the United States must constantly take out of the vitreolic vituperation of radio Cairo, and I think this ought to be on the agenda, and I think at the

United Nations we ought to point out that this kind of incitement to violence is a form of aggression and any country, whether it is the United States, Moscow or Britain, whatever country it is should be held accountable before the UN.

MR. NABULSI: Does that apply to radio Jordan?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And radio Jordan. I thoroughly agree with you. I think it is just as bad.

MISS O'CONNOR: Senator, if the Summit Meeting fails to produce a Middle East settlement, then what avenues are open to us?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Time, patience, hope and prayer and constantly using the good offices of the United Nations. There is no guarantee that people will live in peace. I hope they do, however; I am for it.

MISS HAGY: On that temperate conclusion, we are going to have to end this program, sir, for our time has run out.

Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for a most spirited half hour. Thank you, panelists, for your interesting questions and we want to remind you at home that you can participate in this program by sending in your questions on national or international issues to Encyclopedia Americana, Box 83, Washington 4, D. C.

The winning questioner will receive a handsome thirty-volume set of Encyclopedia Americana.

Join us again next week and until then, good-bye and a

good week from Ruth Hagy and the college correspondents of COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE.

THE ANNOUNCER: You have just seen COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE where the citizens of tomorrow meet the leaders of today.

COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE is created and produced by Ruth Hagy. Assistant to the producer, Peggy Whedon.

Director, Richard Armstrong.

COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE originated in Washington, D. C.

- - -





# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)