

Sp. File - July 31st
Reporters Roundup
[Aug 1?]

* MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM *
* 1627 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. *

REPORTERS' ROUNDUP

Mutual's Washington News Bureau
Sterling 3-3500

ATTENTION: EDITORS AND CORRESPONDENTS

(ADVANCE PRESS RELEASE)

(IMPORTANT! Please do not release before 7:00 PM EDST (6:00 PM, CDST),
Monday, August 1, 1955.)

United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota,
and member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, is to be Mutual's
news-making guest on REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, Monday, August 1, 1955, 9:30 to
10:00 PM EDST, (8:30 to 9:00 PM CDST).

Senator Humphrey will be questioned on the subject of foreign
relations.

He will be interviewed by Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post
and Times Herald White House Correspondent, and Warren Duffee, United
Press Senate Correspondent in Washington.

Attached is the complete advance transcript of REPORTERS'
ROUNDUP as moderated by Robert F. Hurleigh, Mutual's Washington
Director of Operations and well-known nation-wide commentator.

REPORTERS' ROUNDUP is a weekly nation-wide network feature
produced by Mutual in Washington. It is heard coast-to-coast over most
of Mutual's 548 affiliated stations - 9:30 to 10:00 PM EDST (8:30 to 9:00
PM CDST).

This week's program originates from the Senate Radio Gallery
in the nation's capital.

Please do not release prior to 7:00 PM EDST (6:00 PM CDST),
Monday, August 1, 1955.

FOR RELEASE 7:00 PM EDT (6:00 PM CDST), Monday, August 1, 1955

"REPORTERS' ROUNDUP"

GUEST: United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Democrat of Minnesota

MODERATOR: Robert F. Hurleigh

PANEL: Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald
Warren Duffee, United Press

---O---

FISKE: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, where by-lines make headlines! In a moment hear United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota and member of the Senate's powerful Foreign Relations Committee -- answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters.

HURLEIGH: Senator, how does Russia's easing cold war tactics affect the Nationalist Government of China which is our ally under a mutual defense treaty?

DUFFEE: Will the release of the American fliers by the Red Chinese affect the outcome of the talks beginning today in Geneva?

FOLLIARD: Senator, do you think Secretary Dulles is trying to bring about diplomatic recognition of Communist China's regime?

HURLEIGH: Now that the Russians are giving the impression of easing cold war tensions -- the United States seems prepared to make at least a start on negotiating extensively with Red China in an effort to ease Asian tensions. The new conference, which began in Geneva today, is in part a continuation of previous contacts between the United States and Communist China on the liberation of Communist-held Americans. As cold war tensions seem to subside in Europe, the Far East is bound to give greater concern to the Congress, the administration and the American people. Our guest tonight is a forceful and dynamic Democratic leader on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is Minnesota's Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, who was elected to the Senate in 1948. Senator Humphrey, former Minneapolis Mayor, has been a strong advocate of strengthening ties with our allies in the free world and vigorous opponent of what some claim are go-it-alone tactics in international relations. In addition to his position on the Foreign Relations committee, Senator Humphrey also serves on the Government Operations

and Agriculture and Forestry committees in the Senate. And now, our guest is ready.

FISKE: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, which comes to you transcribed this evening from the Senate Radio Gallery in your nation's capital, is presented by Mutual and Facts Forum as part of Facts Forum's effort to stimulate interest in current issues. Facts Forum, nation-wide adult educational organization, is devoted to encouraging a desire in all Americans to listen, read, and think more about public affairs. Facts Forum has faith that if the American people will inform themselves from sources of their own choosing, they will make wise decisions. May the opinions you will now hear expressed by our guest prompt you to further thought. United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, has served in the Senate since 1948 following his re-election as Mayor of Minneapolis in 1947. REPORTERS' ROUNDUP has invited Senator Humphrey, who serves on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to discuss some of the foreign relations questions asked by many Americans since the recent Big Four talks at Geneva. And now, Senator Humphrey is prepared to meet the challenging questions of this panel of well-known and able reporters: Mr. Warren Duffee, United Press Senate Correspondent in Washington, and Mr. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald White House Correspondent. Your moderator -- Robert F. Hurleigh-- Director of Mutual's Washington Operations.

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

DUFFEE: Senator, as you know just today the Red Chinese announced that they are releasing the 11 imprisoned American airmen. What significance do you see in this announcement and how will it affect the outcome of the talks beginning today in Geneva between the United States and Red China?

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Duffee, this was in my mind a very clever and well-timed strategic maneuver on the part of the Red Chinese. Needless to say, the 11 imprisoned airmen have caused a great emotional disturbance and concern in the minds of the American people as well it should. Frankly the the Chinese should never have imprisoned these airmen. They were military personnel, they should have been respected under the codes of conduct that relate to nations as we would have expected under formal protocols or conventions that nations abide by. But I am sure that the release of these 11 airmen touches a sensitive emotional nerve on the part of the American people and it will have the tendency of sort of preliminarily easing tensions before they get to what I call the important items of international negotiation.

(more)

DUFFEE: Yes, but these talks were supposed to concern primarily negotiations for the release of these airmen and also other imprisoned Americans.

HUMPHREY: Well, we are hoping that the other imprisoned Americans will be released and our government should demand their release and a respect on the part of the Chinese Communist Government for the rules of conduct between nations. I would expect however, that as these negotiations proceed that you would see the Chinese Communists make overtures towards the release of civilians that are imprisoned or held against their will in China. In other words, they are going to use -- when I say they I mean the Red Chinese are going to use the American personnel that they are illegally hold as a means of trying to promote their ultimate objective which relates of course to Formosa.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Folliard.

FOLLIARD: Senator Humphrey, concession by the Communists seems to be to undo something that they never should have done in the first place.

HUMPHREY: That's correct.

FOLLIARD: I think Mr. Churchill has remarked on that. If that is the case is there any particular significance to the release of these American prisoners? It's no great sacrifice on the part of Red China to let these men go. We can ever suspect that they've been holding them for bargaining purposes.

HUMPREY: I would agree with that, Mr. Folliard, that they have been holding them for that purpose. Also as a kind of new arrogance which a new powerful organization or nation demonstrates to sort of indicate to the rest of the world that they can get by with this sort of thing. This is like a delinquent that suddenly starts to act like he's reformed. That always makes good, ah news -- I won't say good news, that always makes news. I think, however, we have to take it as it comes. The reality is now is that they have released these airmen, and to the families of these men, of course, this means a great deal and it means a great deal I think in terms of the emotions of the American people because our emotions were justly aroused by the illegal holding or incarceration of 11 American airmen and to release them is going to have a tendency, I think, throughout the United States and the world to indicate that things are better.

FOLLIARD: Senator, do you think this suggest that there is a sort of a team-play as between Moscow and Peiping?

HUMPHREY: Yes, I think so. I think we would surely be in error if we didn't feel that the international Communist apparatus had very clear lines of communication. I've been of the opinion for some time that the Soviet and her satellites have come to the conclusion that by bluster, and threat and actions of brutality -- that they merely solidify the Western alliance. Every time it seems as if we and our Allies were beginning to part or to openly disagree we could almost

HUMPHREY CONT: methodically depend upon the Soviet Union or one of her satellites to do something which drove us back together again. I think now by the exercise of smiles, sweetness and light in talk, discussion and negotiations, that they are hopeful that they will be able to permit the little disagreements which exist amongst free nations to enlarge and to have our emotions strained amongst friends rather than friends as against enemy.

FOLLIAN: Senator, as you know, there is some skepticism here in Washington about the Communist motives and there's also some concern that we will go too far in -- oh, relaxing, let's say -- and a further fear that we might weaken our armed strength. Now you as a member of the United Senate certainly expected to see, along with your colleagues, that we don't weaken our armed forces. Do you think that there is serious danger in that respect?

HUMPHREY: There is a potential danger. I say that because I think everyone throughout the world hungers for peace and I am sure that everyone throughout the free world would like to see the burden of heavy costs of armaments lifted from the backs of the taxpayer and from the people. There will be considerable pressure as the so-called Era of Good-Will seems to build up...to remove and to limit our expenditures for armament and for defense. Now all of this, of course, is in relationship to what the facts of the situation justify. I think that we Americans have to look upon what is going on now in a very objective manner. Let's ask ourselves one or two questions. Has the ultimate objective of the Soviet Union of international Communism been changed. I don't think so. I think this is a change in tactics, change of methodology and of strategy. Now this change is welcome, don't misunderstand me. I think we ought to recognize that we have to deal with the situations as they come up and when the Soviet wants to talk we should be willing to talk. But that doesn't mean that you hand over to them something that you have held as important to your own national security or to the principals in which this country believes. I think that when you talk about concessions that this is a two-way street, and we ought to recognize that some of the things that the Soviets are supposedly giving up they haven't given up at all. They didn't give up a single thing at Geneva, except to say that more tourists could come to the Soviet Union. Their principal in terms of Germany is exactly the same. The objective of the Soviet Union is to drive the United States out of Western Europe, to dismantle the American airbases...to have a neutral Germany. Now those are the three ultimate objectives. They conceded on none of these. Now it is entirely possible that in the months to come they may find it necessary to make some concessions. They may find that they can't get the United States out of Europe and rather than having continued tension in the Western European area they may settle for just the situation as it is.

(more)

HUMPHREY CONT: I happen to think that the Soviet Union is anxious for what we and they would call stability in Western Europe. I happen to believe that the Soviet Union feels that they've gotten all out of Europe that they can get. And what they would like now is a sort of motus vivendi, a working operation in Western Europe and then to be able to shift their power to the Far East and I think that's why these talks with China at the present time are ^{of} the utmost importance because it is in the Far East, I most respectfully suggest, where the little differences between the United States and our allies will come to the forefront. We have a common objective in Western Europe. We work together, we understand each other in Western Europe. But our policies in the Far East have been different in detail, and sometimes in fundamental principal. Now if the Soviet can relax, the tensions in Western Europe, the tendency will be to take things for granted there and then as we get into difficulties or meet more difficulties in the Far East, to see the differences between Great Britain and the United States, ..France and the United States open up more and more and then you will witness the Soviet trying to play upon those differences. Now that's what Stalin laid down in his last testament so to speak. He said two things: Divide the United States from her allies, number one, and where is the best place to do it? In the Far East --- they can't divide us in Western Europe. And the second objective was to wage a relentless political propaganda and economic sturggle against the United States and they are preparing just to do that.

FOLLIARD: Well, now Senator, these talks at Geneva are supposed to be preliminary. Presumably preliminary to maybe an Asian conference you might call it the sub-summit level, perhaps with us the Red Chinese and possibly other nations. Do you think that any such conference --- subsequent to the Geneva talks now --- should include both Nationalist China and Red China.

HUMPHREY: Yes, I do. I think the representatives of Nationalist China must be included in the discussions and conferences in the Far East. This is a most difficult problem in that whole area and it is a difficult one for us. May I say that once the United States of America adopts a treaty with Nationalist China we have some international obligations. If we didn't want that treaty we should not have ratified it. And I am of the opinion that we would be looked upon as a sort of an unreliable people if we were to toss aside what are really fundamental documents and instruments of accord and unity by ignoring the Nationalist Chinese in any of these conferences.

(more)

DUFFEE: Well, what about the other Asian nations? Now, we all recognize the importance of Japan -

HUMPHREY: Yes, indeed.

DUFFEE: We have alliances with other nations in the South-East Asia Treaty Organization -

HUMPHREY: That's correct.

DUFFEE: Should they be included?

HUMPHREY: Yes, they should. My opinion is, Mr. Duffee, that before we go into any major conference at the Foreign Minister level with the Red Chinese, that we should have some very extensive preliminary discussions and talks with our allies in SEATO, that^{is} the South-East Asiatic Treaty Organization - we surely ought to be keeping constantly in mind that the ultimate objective of the Soviet Union in the Far East is to neutralize Japan from the orbit of Western power, just as she tries to neutralize Germany. I think there are two basic - there are two great countries that are still in doubt in this whole power struggle in the world. One is Germany and the other one is Japan, and we've had some unfortunate developments of late with Japan. So, I suggest that we pay a good deal of attention to the advice and the counsel of the representatives of Japan, of India, of Indonesia, of other friends that we have in that area, Ceylon, and Thailand and South Vietnam, in Burma, in Pakistan. Now, there are going to be many of these countries that differ with us, but at least we ought to talk with them and get the advantage of their thinking.

FOLLIARD: Senator Humphrey, you mentioned the differences between the U.S. and Britain and some of our other allies with respect to Asia. I do think that in Britain and France perhaps there is a certain amount of sympathy for the concept of two Chinas -

HUMPHREY: That's correct.

FOLLIARD: That is to say of our recognizing Chiang Kai Shek's China based on Formosa and also Red China. Do you think that that concept, the two-China concept - is feasible?

HUMPHREY: I do, I - may I say that I think it's about the only principled position we can take at this time. I do not believe that in the light of our commitments to the Nationalist Government on Formosa and in light of our long history with that Government that we could, well, frankly put the word "sell-out". You just can't do that without being an unprincipled people, and I don't believe the American people would countenance it. So, I think we ought to make it quite clear that number one, that we don't intend to engage on any offensive or aggressive action upon the mainland of China. But with equal candor and firmness we don't

intend to renig upon our committments to the Nationalist Government on the island of Formosa and, of course, we can - I think we'll find considerable amount of support in it if we stand firm. But, if we start to waver, and start to permit public thought to grow that maybe this can be reconciled with some sort of an autonomous government on Formosa as Chou En-Lai and the Red Chinese and others have in their private conversation suggested, we are apt to lose what support we have.

FOLLIARD: Well, certainly Senator, don't you think we must take Red China at her word that she is determined to take over Formosa?

HUMPHREY: Well, I think that may be very true that she's determined to, but if she wants settlement in the Far East there will have to be concessions. Now, there are concessions that can be made. There are concessions that are being talked about - some trade concessions. Which, by the way, I think they are more interested in at the present time than they are in more land. The problems in China are essentially economic at the moment, and with the exception, of course, with their everlasting political problems. The Japanese are anxious to re-establish their trade with China on the mainland. Now, in so far as the non-strategic items of commerce - in the areas of food and soft goods, a good deal could be done in that area as a concession on our part, but for us to concede to the Red Chinese just because they say "This is what we want" isn't, - really there is no reason for negotiations if that's all - if that's the case.

DUFFEE: Senator, what would you require of Red China before we recognize her and recommend her admission to the United Nations?

HUMPHREY: Well, I would surely first require that the committments under international law which a sovereign state is supposed to fulfill be fulfilled. I would surely require that the truce in Korea be abided by and it is not being abided by - there is flagrant evidense, evidence of flagrant abuse. I would certainly require that such things as holding American citizens illegally be done away with at once, and I would certainly require that respect for international, respect for properties and individuals be fully maintained and fully guaranteed. Now, those are some of the minimum credentials. Furthermore, I think the Red Chinese have a problem at the UN, they're branded as an aggressor. And until they can remove that brand, they're not entitled to admission in the the UN. I think that our policy should be directed along the lines of getting the Red Chinese to face up to the problems of mature statehood, rather than acting as if they were a bully that could run pell-mell over nations and peoples at will.

DUFFEE: Senator, back to this Red China and Formosa problem -- Chou En lai said in his speech early Saturday morning, I think it was, that Red China wants the -- what he calls the "peaceful liberation of Formosa" and if they don't get it that they will try to get Formosa in their words "liberated" by force. How can we with the mutual defense pact which we have with Formosa ever negotiate any peaceful liberation of Formosa?

HUMPHREY: I don't know. Frankly, Mr. Duffee, I don't think that that's possible. And therefore, I think that our attitude in these negotiations should be one -- let us have the smile, let us be friendly, let us be, however, steadfast. I think furthermore, if we can hold on the idea and the concept of the two Chinas, the French and the British and the rest of our Western European allies that we will have a bulwark of strength which the Red Chinese may threaten, may bluster about, but which they will not do very much about. Because I am further convinced that if we can hold the British with us that it will have a great deal of influence upon the so-called Colombo powers, that is the Commonwealth powers that are associated with Great Britain.

DUFFEE: Senator, you mentioned West Germany, and of course, Formosa, Japan as serious and possible tension spots -- I'd like to get over to South Vietnam right now. Now we face the prospect of an election there next year.

HUMPHREY: Yes, indeed.

DUFFEE: Is it your feeling that perhaps we should take steps now to possibly postpone that election?

HUMPHREY: It is indeed. I do not believe that South Vietnam is prepared for this election. I think it would be wrong on the part of our Government to encourage the election, or to even, may I say, to agree with the French that the election ought to be held. South Vietnam is ^{of} the utmost importance for the entire security of the Far Eastern area, particularly South East Asia and the Government of Premier Diem is not as yet prepared to meet the problem of this election. They've been harrassed from within and have had little or no cooperation with the French.

DUFFEE: Well, do you feel we should continue to give more aid and support to Diem -- his government?

HUMPHREY: Yes, I do.

DUFFEE: Senator, did you approve the army's decision to move its Far East Headquarters from Tokyo to Korea -- Seoul?

HUMPHREY: I really didn't give it very much thought, to be very candid with you. I know that the Japanese are ever more concerned about the presence of American forces in Japan. I do not however, approve of the removal of many American forces from the Far East as we've been doing. I think that the time to remove the forces is at a time that you have something that you want to concede. This always bothers me. We start taking our trump cards out of the deck before the game starts. This is most unfortunate. If the Red Chinese want some concessions the time to give them some concessions is maybe the removal of some of the troops after they have agreed to something. We have already removed large elements of American man power from the Far East and then have told them in the whole Far East that we are going to have a mobile striking force of airpower with atomic warheads. Now I am of the opinion that this talk about atomic warheads on bombs and strategic missiles is about the worst propaganda that you can have in the Far East. I think the less we talk about that the better off we are going to be. And I further believe that if you are going to be face only with periferile or the fringe kind of beligerancy or violence that we ought to be prepared to meet that. And what we are really doing in this instance is relying on our long-range bombers, our heavy striking force of air power against the kind of rebellion and the kind of war and violence that takes place where airpower is not really very important. Well, I won't say important, I mean very effective -- we found that out in Korea.

FOLLIARD: Senator, I'd like to switch from foreign affairs, to domestic affairs -- In a word to domestic politics, and ask two questions. First, who in your opinion, is most likely to be the Democratic Nominee for President in 1956? And two, what will be his prospects of victory?

HUMPHREY: Well, I think the most likely candidate at this time, and by the way, may I say that my profession is not that of a prophet and I have never been very good in that particular area, but since you ask the question I'll just give you an off-the-cuff answer. I think the most likely prospect is Adlai Stevenson, if he wants it. I think he'll get it. His prospects for victory are dependent upon what the developments are between now and the election and his zeal in waging the campaign and the dedication of his cohorts. I happen to be much more optimistic may I say than some people are in this area.

(more)

I do not believe that unless there is a great change in the international situation that international matters will be of great political concern. They could be if the administration softens up too much in the Far East. And, there is a danger of this. I want to say right now there is a real danger that we may listen to the soothing words and the honeyed words and actually get ourselves into a position that isn't any too healthy - but, I believe that the major issues will be domestic. And, I could pinpoint those major issues if we have a few more Dixon-Yates's, if we have a few more Talbot's, if we have a further drop in agricultural prices, and there will be - if we have spotty unemployment continuing as it is in some of the areas such as West Virginia and Kentucky; along with the public power issues, the reclamation issues - we Democrats will have something to talk about and we'll have the chance to talk constructively.

HURLEIGH: I am 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 evening's broadcast. In a moment Senator Humphrey is going to answer these questions. Stand by for the names of the winners.

FISKE: A large portion of the responsibility for keeping the American people the best informed people in the world belongs to radio newscasters, commentators and analysts. On Mutual you'll find veteran newsmen in every category who are experts in their fields and who take their responsibility to you, the listeners, with utmost seriousness. Whether you prefer a fast five-minute digest of the big headlines of the moment or thoughtful, penetrating and informed commentary, Mutual is your network for news, as you like it, and when you like it. Weekday evenings there are Fulton Lewis, Jr. and Gabriel Heatter, with full quarter hours of news, as well as Lyle Van and his five minute news capsule. The daytime favorites, Robert F. Hurleigh, heard every morning with news and commentary, and Cedric Foster, whose constant search for background takes him to many corners of the world. In addition, Cecil Brown, Bill Cunningham, Holland Engle, and Sam Hayes. These are but a few of the Mutual names for news. Hear them all regularly over most of these stations. Mutual is your network for news.

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

FISKE: From Mrs. A. O. Wendleburg of Miles City, Montana.

HURLEIGH: Is it true that President Eisenhower has emulated the foreign policy of the Democratic party?

HUMPHREY: Well, I will say that President Eisenhower has continued the basic tenets of the Democratic party in foreign policy, and I attribute much of the improvement in the international situation at least on the surface to the fact that we

built strength through the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, military assistance and our foreign aid program. And, these were programs that were instituted under Democratic administrations. In the main, the policy continues, but there are some deviations, may I say some, - I think there has been a little too much loose talk and there is a tendency sometimes to be just a little bit too gullible as to what others may want us to think.

FISKE: From Miss Hazel Brown of Washington, D. C.

HURLEIGH: Do you think, Senator, that aerial photography and the exchange of blueprints between the Soviets and ourselves would initiate global disarmament?

HUMPHREY: It is one of the steps that could be helpful, however may I say that it surely is not the only step and it is at best just an approach.

FISKE: From Miss Molly C. Reed, of San Francisco, California

HURLEIGH: What would prevent the USSR from keeping Red China informed about us and even having their own war machinery in Red China while they roam at will over our country?

HUMPHREY: There, that surely is a possibility and may I say it's a very penetrating question. As a matter of fact, I think we ought to recognize that the Soviet system is not a system of independent nation states. That it is a system based upon a central power with satellite states. There is also this possibility, may I say, to your questioner - that great nations or powerful nations sometimes become envious of each other, so what appears to be at the moment a closest allegiance and alliance between Red China and the Soviet could possibly work out into mutual distrust and tension. I have the feeling that the Soviet is somewhat concerned about that. And, maybe that's one of the reasons that Mr. Nehru was invited to Moscow - Mr. Nehru of India - possibly the Soviet would like to have a little counter-force friendship in the Asian area.

FISKE: Handsome Gyms Dual purpose clocks are being sent to the persons named for submitting the three prize-winning questions on this evening's broadcast. Mutual and Facts Forum have brought you this program with the hope of stimulating your interest in the matters you have heard discussed and in all other issues. Facts Forum does not offer a final word on either side of controversial issues, but asks further study--so that you, the American public--may hear, read, consider and arrive at your own decisions. Transcripts of Facts Forum programs are published in the Facts Forum News, Dallas, Texas. Next week our news-making guest will be questioned on whether the Communist "new look" is sincere or artificial. The writers of the three most interesting and timely questions for our guest will each receive this handsome prize -- a Gyms Dual Purpose Clock, made by the world-famous Gyms Watchmakers.

This Gyms Clock will be your companion at home or wherever you go. 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 United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, and member of the Senate's powerful Foreign Relations Committee, for being our guest on tonight's REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, which came to you transcribed from the Senate Radio Gallery in your nation's capital. My thanks, too, to the reporters on our panel: Mr. Warren Duffee, United Press Senate Correspondent in Washington, and Mr. Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post and Times Herald White House Correspondent. Be sure to send in your questions for our news-making guest, who will be questioned on whether the Communist "new look" is sincere or artificial. Until then, this is your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh.

Until then, this is your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh.

FISKE: This broadcast of REPORTERS' ROUNDUP will make news because its guest, United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, faced questions which are asked by most Americans. 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 reporters. Fred Fiske speaking.



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