

**Middle East - Suez story No  
1-6: Middle East - Suez story  
No 1-6 - 14**

*HS L 179:109*



Dag Hammarskjöld's samt.

Middle East/Suez story - 3

---

Feb. 56

Press clippings (collected by D.H.)

# WEST'S BIG 3 SETS MIDEAST ACTION

## Initial Move for U. N. Bid to Prevent Arab-Israeli War Is Expected Next Week

By **ELIE ABEL**

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, March 16—The Western Big Three are preparing to seek preventive action through the United Nations against a resort to war by Arabs or Israelis.

Diplomatic informants said that the initial step might be taken next week, probably after Secretary of State Dulles had returned from Asia Wednesday.

This would involve a Security Council appeal to both sides to refrain from warlike action and an inquiry into the most practical means of broadening the authority of the United Nations to work for peace in the Middle East.

Although Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations Secretary General, has shown a reluctance to risk the authority of the Security Council on a possibly futile gesture, the Western powers evidently feel that it would be even more dangerous to allow the present drift to continue.

High officials indicated that no specific Western proposals would be advanced, at least during the first stage, to establish a United Nations watchdog commission or to appoint a United Nations mediator with powers comparable to those of the late Count Folke Bernadotte.

The Western powers are concerned lest a Soviet veto would block any dramatic plan for intervention that bore the stamp of United States manufacture. They fear that a veto might embolden the Arabs and that it would be interpreted in Israel as final proof that the United Nations had failed them.

Only after the preliminary inquiry had been completed would the Security Council decide on specific measures for dealing with the threat to peace. Having studied the alternatives, the Western powers have yet to fasten on a single move. But they agree on the need for wider authority than is vested in Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns' Palestine truce supervision staff.

### Reports Are Discounted

The State Department, meanwhile, discounted reports from London that the Western powers had agreed on joint military action in the event of open hostilities between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

Lincoln White, State Department spokesman, said that "all aspects of the Middle East situation are under continuous discussion."

Other Western officials said that the Western Big Three had so far approved little more than a joint paper expressing their joint responsibility for the prevention of war in the Middle East.

The possibility of punitive joint action against a hypothetical aggressor has been explored in tripartite talks, the officials said, without a firm decision.

The main obstacle is said to be the extreme reluctance of the Eisenhower Administration to commit itself to possible military action without the blessing of the United Nations and Congress, particularly in an election year.

Herbert Hoover Jr., Acting Secretary of State, saw President Eisenhower this morning and reported on the critical Middle East situation. Mr. Hoover also talked for an hour with the Greek Ambassador, George V. Melas, on the Cyprus dispute.

Mr. Melas said he was hoping that "friendly action" by the United States might bring about a resumption of negotiations between Britain and the Greek Cypriotes.

The State Department also disclosed that Egypt had yet to accept formally British and United States offers of financial assistance for construction of the Aswan High Dam on the Nile River.

Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt announced last Feb. 9 that he and Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, had reached "substantial agreement" on financing the project.

Mr. White told reporters: "We have made an offer and the offer stands. We and the British and the Egyptians are talking about this in a normal manner."

Israeli circles, meanwhile, forecast a "supreme effort" by Ambassador Abba Eban to get a definite answer from Mr. Dulles next week on the \$63,000,000 arms request filed by his Government five months ago today.

### Canada Approves Israeli Order

Special to The New York Times.

OTTAWA, March 16—Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent told the House of Commons today that the Cabinet gave approval yesterday for the shipment of three categories of arms to Israel.

The permit covers 1,750 twenty-five-pounder artillery shells, \$1,200 worth of electronic radio equipment and spare parts for Sherman Tanks valued at \$136,000.

Shipments of all arms to the Middle East were temporarily halted Jan. 20 after a lively controversy in the House of Commons. The ban was lifted Feb. 6 and twelve Harvard training planes, ordered in July, were later permitted to leave for Egypt.

The Cabinet, however, deferred making a decision on the Israeli request for arms until yesterday.

### New Chinese and Arab Ties

CAIRO, March 16 (P)—Nationalist China and Communist China advanced on the Arab diplomatic front today. A Nationalist Chinese Embassy spokesman said King Saud of Saudi Arabia had agreed to establish diplomatic relations with Chiang Kaishek's Formosa regime on the embassy level.

The  
af  
RE  
S  
n  
to  
po  
tar  
num  
ficia  
some  
The  
curre  
moun  
northe  
Djerid  
area, t  
route p  
in the  
between  
geria.  
"Actir  
ceived."  
several  
a rebel b  
Zitouna  
French  
French  
were br  
next day  
drew lea  
them.  
prisoners  
Paris F  
Spec  
PARIS  
Guy Mol  
Christia  
break th  
Tunisian  
was ma  
between t  
meeting  
morrow  
Under  
cussion  
tocol se  
of Tun  
its inter  
The Tu  
tained,  
cently,  
the pr  
Treaty  
no long  
between  
French  
far as  
The  
cerned  
sponsib  
own de  
deman  
that "  
respon  
fense."  
The  
agree  
ing th  
to the  
ties"  
sian o  
stricti  
Bef  
with  
Ladgh  
moudi  
Affair  
the F  
Rogen  
from  
latest  
The  
that t  
tiation  
could  
sive a  
only if  
ably f  
conver  
autonc

# U. S. DRAFTS PLAN IN MIDEAST CRISIS

Continued From Page 1

ous news conference that he got his first hint of the new Soviet policy of "economic penetration of the mideast" at the Geneva conference last July of the heads of government of the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union. On checking his correspondence, he discovered it was in an exchange of letters with Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin of the Soviet Union before the Big Four Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva late in October.

The President wrote to Premier Bulganin only about three weeks after his Sept. 24 heart attack, it was learned. Briefly and in friendly terms, he expressed concern over the agreement between Communist Czechoslovakia and Egypt to exchange arms for cotton.

Secretary of State Dulles told Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov at meetings in New York on Sept. 20 and 27 that the shipment of Soviet bloc arms to the Middle East was not in the interests of the preservation of peace. He again raised the matter with the Soviet Foreign Minister during the Geneva conference.

Authoritative sources said that United States plans to ask the Security Council to form a new Middle Eastern commission were nearly complete, but that final decisions had not been taken. The sources expected the United States to make the proposal jointly with Britain and France soon, possibly as early as next week.

## Some Doubts About Move

An enthusiastic reception from Israel and the Arab states was not expected, since the functions of such a commission necessarily require the privilege of free movement for its members in the countries concerned. Israel in particular has shown herself sensitive on this question and has insisted that the members of United Nations observer teams be accompanied by Israeli officers.

It was presumed that the Soviet Union would want to take part in any new commission. This prospect raised hope of Soviet cooperation in the Security Council and also posed a problem for the Western powers, which would like to avoid bringing Soviet officials into the Middle East.

A problem was seen in the danger that a new commission would diminish the authority of Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns of Canada, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. He is generally judged to have been highly successful in maintaining the confidence of both Arabs and Israelis.

A possible way out would be to elevate General Burns' functions and make him part of the new body.

Some experts on the Middle East, including Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations Secretary General, do not believe that much can be gained by a Security Council initiative at this time. But the prevailing United States view is that the problem is so urgent that a new departure must be attempted.

Although Israeli circles commented tonight that they did not believe the United Nations could cope with the situation, some United States officials believe that the presence of the proposed commission on the spot could meet the Israeli objection that United Nations action would be too slow to save a victim of aggression.

## Moral Sanction of Majority

Upon observing a threat to the peace or overt aggression, the United Nations commission would make its recommendations directly to the Security Council, according to the United States plan. The Council could call for steps provided by the United Nations Charter, including a breach in diplomatic relations, economic sanctions or armed intervention. If the Soviet Union used its

Commission on Human Rights may be made by man.

veto to prevent action, the other members of the Council would have the moral sanction of a majority vote and might act on that basis to halt aggression.

At the same time, or as an alternative, the General Assembly could be called into emergency session within twenty-four hours. Under a resolution of Nov. 3, 1950, the Assembly can be called together by any seven members if they find that there is a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace or an act of aggression.

While the United States is not likely to go beyond Secretary of State Dulles' proposals, made in a speech Aug. 26, it is thought that the United States would favor recognition of the need for mutual border readjustments and an opportunity for some Arab refugees to return to Israel and for the rest to receive compensation and help in resettling.

The United States voted against territorial internationalization of Jerusalem in 1949, but

is thought to favor a system under which the holy places there would be placed under international jurisdiction.

In his Aug. 26 speech Mr. Dulles proposed an international guarantee of the borders between Israel and the Arab states once agreement had been reached on them. He offered United States help in this and other problems and said the United States would share in financial measures to compensate and resettle the refugees.

Cyprus Plan in NATO Gam  
NAPLES, Italy, Me

Registered in U. S. Patent Office

AN INTERNATIONAL DAILY NEWSPAPER

BOSTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1956

\*\*\* ATLANTIC EDITION

## Eisenhower On Troubles In Mideast

### Mideast Bid? Pauses

By Neal Stanford  
Staff Correspondent of  
The Christian Science Monitor  
Washington

The Mideast crisis (or better, crises) is getting the most serious attention in Washington.

President Eisenhower, by his own admission, is burning the midnight oil trying to devise ways of easing the tension on Cyprus and reversing the trend to war between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

War in that area, the President told his weekly news conference March 14, would "gravely jeopardize Allied interests"—which is diplomatic language for saying it would be disastrous.

While foreclosing nothing in a search for solutions, it is apparent the United States is using different approaches in these two critical areas. It is offering its good offices to both sides in the Cyprus affair to try and get its two friends—Britain and Greece—to resolve the crisis amicably. It is drafting ways of having the United Nations take responsibility for preserving peace in the Arab-Israeli crisis.

The Cyprus issue is the most immediately critical, for the British moves to repress terror and violence—particularly the banishment of Archbishop Makarios—have inflamed the Cypriotes and temporarily deepened the crisis. The British Government, harassed at home by opposition charges of bungling negotiations, was further exasperated by what it construed as too sympathetic American concern for Greek interests in Cyprus as expressed by the United States Ambassador in Athens, Cavendish Cannon.

#### U.S. Views Sought

Both the British Ambassador here, Sir Roger Makins, and the United States Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, Winthrop Aldrich, have been under urgent Whitehall pressure to explain American views.

Those views, as the President made clear at his press conference, are neither pro-Greek nor pro-British—but pro-peace and pro-West. He made it clear that the United States was ready to do anything honorable and useful, reasonable and practical, to get a solution to the Cyprus dispute. By pointing up that both Britain and Greece were members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Western Europe's prime security shield, he spotlighted free world interest in a London-Athens reconciliation over Cyprus.

Cyprus now is the West's principal military base in the explosive Near East area—so that Allied interests, to put it modestly, would be "gravely jeopardized" by any worsening in the Cyprus crisis. Under current conditions it is apparently absolutely vital in Western defense plans for the area.

As for the Arab-Israeli conflict which is threatening Mideast peace, the President intimated the United States was preparing a program of UN action there designed to stifle the danger of war in that area. What it is, of course, is not yet fully determined, but it does involve a variety of approaches to the dispute depending on the reactions or assistance of the parties involved.

#### UN Moves Weighed

One would be support of any new proposals the UN truce administrator on the spot, Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns, might want to make—request for larger patrols, better marked boundaries, a no man's land.

Another way to get UN to take responsibility for the mounting crisis would be to ask for General Assembly support of measures freezing arms contributions, restricting trade in strategic items.

A third approach would be to dump the issue into the lap of the Security Council and make the Soviet Union either co-operate or veto measures designed to settle the dispute peacefully.

Or a fourth way could be to call on the Secretary-General of the UN, who has just returned from the area, to make recommendations for easing the tensions in the area.

Under the Anglo-French-American declaration of 1950 the three powers agreed to take action either within or without the UN to keep or restore peace to the Mideast. That declaration was strengthened, following the Eden-Eisenhower talks here earlier this year, when the powers agreed to spell out the actions they were prepared to take. Since then efforts along this line have bogged down in the larger threat of explosions from Algeria to Cyprus to Jerusalem, which has caused the President to burn the midnight oil and study the mounting complications of British and French troubles in the Mediterranean.

It now appears that the President did not query the Soviets at the summit meeting at Geneva last July about their intentions in the Mideast but only became concerned later and in a private letter to Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin in October asked for an explanation.

President to the n

"intellige

The P

Presiden

There w

an all-ot

At his

on the e

The

against

use of

question

arise.

Some F

There

progress'

Supreme

1954 sch

000 publ

District

and sout

integrate

progress

some are

are great

The S

been "ac

complan

Court in

down by

but separ

Now the

old inter

take some

adjust its

Nixon D

The Pre

tiative for

to come fro

him (as un

venson), a

should act

quickly as

hower cau

by putting

"subpoena

commission

congression

while a pre

would not.

The imp

power, with

notations o

sion, has

much part

possible

whose pur

would be a

tion, cooper

discussion.

Mr. Eise

the subject

show of

Mr. Nixon

had failed

of his previ

felt it shou

preted, or

"drive a w

and his Vic

Mr. Eise

about Mr.

as final as

said on the

being. The

considered

he announc

"never ans

on this sul

gust." The

came afte

large writ

Nixon for

New Hamp

In brief

er's comm

Fraternal

His rega

such that

the relatio

brother an

he would

who tried

any kind

and me."

He said,

to be on a

which I v

him."

And fin

his statem

were giv

ence with

of the

whom he

ing March

"Now i

plain," ad

with a no

A Det

when he

an issue

A veil

Automob

of the i

The u

between

Hersch

vice-pre

meetings

Most l

plant he

policy.

Mr. D

your loc

Intern

"pulling

James

side" int

and app

"The

decide v

own un

"Whe

of the

Government

Detroit.

Mr. M

contribu

Colored

chief.

# U. S. PUSHES WORK ON MIDEAST PLAN

Final Form of Proposal for  
New U. N. Peace Bid Said  
to Await Dulles' Return

By DANA ADAMS SCHMIDT

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, March 15—

Work on a United States proposal for a new United Nations effort to bring peace to the Middle East continued in the State Department, the Defense Department and other agencies today.

Officials said the final form of the proposal would be made public soon after Secretary of State Dulles returned to Washington Wednesday.

They added that President Eisenhower, who said at his news conference yesterday that he was putting in "long hours" on the Middle East problem, again kept in touch with key officials preparing the proposals for the United Nations.

Lincoln White, the State Department's Press Officer, said he was unable to find anyone in the State Department who had "ever heard" of the plan, reported in The New York Times of today, for the creation of a Security Council commission to operate in Israel and the Arab States.

## Others Heard of Plan

Other officials of the State Department and of other agencies had, however, heard of this plan. They said an issue still to be resolved was whether the Security Council's new approach to the Middle East should be carried out by a new commission or through the machinery of one of the existing bodies created by the United Nations to deal with Israeli-Arab issues.

Mr. White said today that the United States policy was to give "utmost support" to Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns of Canada, who is Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization.

Other officials echoed this view, adding, however, that the difficulty with the truce supervision organization was that its functions were limited to implementing the armistice agreements. A broader approach with greater authority will be required, these officials held, if the present drift toward war is to be reversed.

Past attempts by the United Nations to deal with the Israeli-Arab problem have included the creation of a United Nations Palestine Commission to implement the partition resolution of 1947. This never got into operation because Britain refused to give it support.

## Mediator Role Lapsed

The office of mediator, held by the late Count Folke Bernadotte, to which the United Nations delegated special powers, lapsed when the armistice agreements were signed in 1949.

The Palestine Conciliation Commission of the United Nations is still in existence, but inactive.

In addition, committees have been set up by the United Nations from time to time to deal with various aspects of Israeli-Arab problems.

Whether a proposal is made for a new commission or for reactivation of old machinery with expanded functions, the officials said, the object will remain twofold:

First, to create machinery directly responsible to the Security Council that could alert it concerning a threat to the peace or open aggression.

Second, to offer assistance to Israel and the Arab states in settling the issues between them on the basis of existing or future United Nations resolutions.

Meanwhile Reuven Shiloah, Minister of the Israeli Embassy, renewed Israeli pressure for arms from the United States in a call on William Rowntree, acting chief of the Middle East Division of the State Department. Mr. Shiloah said he had discussed Israel's request for permission to buy arms and "minor questions" during his call.

# U.S. DRAFTS PLAN FOR NEW U.N. UNIT IN MIDEAST CRISIS

## Favors Peace Panel to Report to Council—President Says Fresh Approach Is Eyed

### WARNS OF PERIL IN AREA

## Denies There Is Ban on Arms for Israelis—Voices Hope for a 'Better Solution'

By **DANA ADAMS SCHMIDT**  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 14—

The United States is drawing up proposals for a new approach by the United Nations to the problems of preventing war in the Middle East and bringing about a lasting settlement there.

The proposals, as they stand, would provide for creation of a commission that would operate in Israel and the Arab states.

The commission would alert the United Nations Security Council to any threat of war or actual aggression and would recommend action to keep or restore the peace. It would also follow up any United Nations recommendations for solutions of the problems of borders, refugees and the status of Jerusalem.

At his news conference today, President Eisenhower, referring to the Middle East, said that the question as to "exactly what representation to make to the United Nations" was under intensive study. A new approach is "one of the elements" of the study, he added.

"I have been working long hours lately, going far into the evening," the President said, explaining that most of this work was on the Middle East.

#### President Talks With Aides

Sources close to the President disclosed that he was on the telephone up to 8:15 P. M. yesterday discussing the Middle Eastern situation with his advisers.

The President made these additional points about the Middle East:

¶United States interests in the Middle East are "gravely jeopardized." That is why the Government is exploring "every possible means" of keeping the peace.

¶In the Cyprus dispute, where "two of our very best friends are engaged in an argument," the United States is ready "to do anything that is reasonable and practicable" to help find a solution. Both Britain and Greece are "vitally necessary" to the successful operation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, General Eisenhower noted.

¶The United States has not "foreclosed" on Israel's request for permission to buy arms in the United States. "I never said, and I am sure that the Secretary of State has never said, that we would not furnish arms to Israel," the President asserted. "We were hoping for a better solution."

Specialists on the Middle East cautioned against concluding from the tense the President used that a decision to supply arms to Israel had been made. They maintained that the decision—unless it is in the President's mind—still was pending.

The President said he was mistaken in saying at his previ-

For SG

A22

ams budget night lead lloyd by arthur gavshon

London, Feb. 22 (AP)- Britain today disclosed plans for separating the quick-shooting armies of Israel and her Arab neighbors at the starting point of a possible Palestine peace.

Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd told parliament about the plan---a withdrawal of one kilometer by the rival Israel and Arab armies along the 1949 armistice lines with an international patrol moving into the no-man's land.

Lloyd said he made the proposals secretly a month ago to United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold.

The British statesman announced he will visit Israel in mid-march after a round of face-to-face meetings with leaders of middle eastern countries. His aim clearly is to urge upon the rival nations the need to begin negotiating a final peace settlement.

No British foreign secretary has visited Israel since the state was founded in 1948.

Lloyd's visit was announced as signs of fresh tension appeared. King Hussein of Jordan was quoted in a dispatch today as saying intelligence reports indicated Israel was preparing to attack Jordan in the near future. The king spoke at a camp of his crack army, the Arab legion. High ranking officers and officials were present.

In Cairo, the Egyptian interior minister announced a civil defense drill would be held next Wednesday. He said 15,000 civil defense volunteers have been enrolled in Cairo.

Israeli premier David Ben-Gurion yesterday issued a call for 160,000 volunteers to give six days work in building air raid shelters and fortifications.

Lloyd leaves London Feb. 29 primarily to attend the ministerial council meeting of the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) in Karachi, Pakistan, beginning March 6. He told Parliament:

"I hope to visit Cairo, Bahrein and New Delhi on my way to Karachi, and Baghdad, Ankara and Tel Aviv on my way back."

That schedule will enable him to canvass the ideas of the two leading Arab governments of the middle east--- Egypt and Iraq-- before meeting with Israeli Premier David Ben-Gurion. In Karachi, Lloyd will have the chance to consult with U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and French Foreign Minister Christian Pineau on the middle east situation.

Lloyd told questioners in the House of Commons that he still awaits Hammarskjold's "considered views" on the proposal for a one kilometer withdrawal and an international patrol along Israeli's frontiers.

The U.N. secretary general is consulting with Canadian Gen. Edson L.M. Burns whose job is to supervise the Palestine armistice.

The British proposal was submitted after Egyptian Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser had passed word to the west that he would be ready to pull back his forces one kilometer if Israel does the same.

British diplomats privately calculated that if an international patrol by neutral nationals could be set up in a no-man's land it would give the western powers more time and scope to promote peace talks between the Israelis and the Arabs. These might be conducted secretly through third and even fourth parties ---the way the Italian-Yugoslav settlement of the Trieste dispute was achieved-- rather than at a formal peace conference.

Transcript of the Record of News Conference Held by Dulles

Special to The New York Times. WASHINGTON, Feb. 7.—Following is a State Department transcript of the record of the news conference held today by Secretary of State Dulles:

Secretary Dulles—I will be glad to answer any questions. Q.—Mr. Secretary, there was a second letter received by the Government from Mr. (Nikolai A.) Bulganin (Soviet Premier) last week on the question of a friendship treaty. Are you working with the President now on a reply?

A.—Well, we haven't really gotten around to working on that. The urgency, I think, is not very great. The position of the United States was pretty fully set out in the letter which President Eisenhower wrote to Chairman Bulganin in answer to the first letter. I think if you recall the history of what happened it would be illuminating. You see, the Soviet Government did not, apparently, reply that they could let their people hear of President Eisenhower's letter until they had some further information to cover it up with. So they held their own people in ignorance.

—I think for six days, it may have been seven days—in complete ignorance of the fact that there had been any letter from President Eisenhower. All the rest of the world knew it; indeed, in the satellites they knew it. But in the Soviet Union nobody was allowed to know that there was such a reply, or that the reply had taken a negative view toward the Bulganin proposal. During that period they wrote another letter, which they published at the same time that they published the letter from President Eisenhower. So I think the second letter can be interpreted as being designed very largely for domestic consumption. The essence of it is already covered, I think, and dealt with by President Eisenhower's letter. Nevertheless, we are giving it careful study to see if we can find in it anything which might possibly be useful. But we haven't dealt with it on an urgent basis.

Reply by U. S. Planned Q.—Mr. Secretary, you do not preclude the possibility of an answer to this letter? A.—Oh, no. The will, undoubtedly, be an answer. Q.—Are you saying, sir, that you feel the point of diminishing returns has been reached in a public exchange of this kind; that there is no realistic possibility in their going forward with this kind of an exchange?

A.—Well, that isn't quite what I said. But I think it is a fact that there is no realistic possibility in their going forward with this kind of an exchange. Q.—Well, that isn't quite what I said. But I think it is a fact that there is no realistic possibility in their going forward with this kind of an exchange. Q.—Well, that isn't quite what I said. But I think it is a fact that there is no realistic possibility in their going forward with this kind of an exchange.

main it would seem that its points were covered already by the President's reply to the first letter. But I said we were examining it carefully to see whether there were any nuggets hidden there out of which something constructive could be built.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, it has been reported this morning that the note which was dispatched to the Hungarian Government, through its Minister in Washington, was not delivered but was returned to the department. Have you received the note? Was it returned to you, and if so, what would be the next step?

A.—Well, it hasn't been returned physically to me because I am a little removed from the spot. I believe that it was physically returned to our Minister there on the ground that they regard it as offensive. Q.—Was it returned to our Minister in Budapest? A.—Yes, that is my understanding.

Q.—The report was that it was not delivered by the Hungarian Minister here—he did not transmit it to his Government; they brought it back to the department. A.—Well, I have not been informed of that. Q.—Mr. Secretary, could you tell us what the position is under international law of balloons—meteorological balloons; and, also, other experiments, such as the circling satellites? A.—I wish I could tell you, but that whole subject, as I think somebody once said about Russia, "is a mystery wrapped in an enigma" or something to that effect. The question of the ownership of the upper air is a disputable question, and also of the other above the air. In the main, it is a recognized practice to avoid putting up into the air anything which could interfere with any normal use of the air by anybody else. I understand that these meteorological balloons that have been sent up all around the world, I believe several thousands of them, as a matter of fact, have been drifting over the United States, and they have been launched in California, Alaska, Hawaii, Okinawa and various places. As I understand it, they have a normal use of the air to a height in excess of 30,000 feet they are at once destroyed, and they are supposed to be up at a height of around 50,000 feet, which is way above any normal use of the air, far above any commercial flights. And, as I say, I think several thousands of these have been launched and have been carried by the winds to various places, and there is no known cause for their having caused any interference in any commercial flights, or any other flights for that matter.

The legal position is quite obscure. And, for one thing, it is not so easy, when you put up a balloon, to tell with any confidence where it is going to go. It is true that in the main the winds flow from the West to the East, but that's not uniformly true, and that's frequently they turn around and go in the other direction. There was one that was put up in California and which practically went all way round the world. It transited the United States, the Atlantic, Europe, somewhere through the Asian area, and was last heard of in the Western Pacific, and there they are gathering an extraordinary amount of useful and new information about these jet stream air currents, and, in doing so, at a height where they are not involved any risk to anyone. What the legal position is, I wouldn't feel in a position to answer, because I do not believe that the legal position has even been codified, you might say.

Launchings by Others Hinted Q.—Mr. Secretary, are any other countries similarly launching balloons of this kind; for instance, the Soviet Union, or England, or France? A.—No, they are not, as far as I know, although several of them are cooperating with us in this particular project. Q.—There is a balloon that was found two or three days ago in Japan which came from the Soviet Union. There were reports today from Tokyo. A.—Well, it is quite likely that they are doing that. I don't know anything about that.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, on the Middle East question, has there been any word from General Burns in response to the statement in the communiqué after the Eden visit last week? A.—Could I postpone that question a minute? I would just like to make clear, in connection with this talk about balloons, that the United States Government has not, directly, or indirectly, sent up any propaganda balloons whatever designed to transit into the Soviet Union. The note, received from the Soviet Union apparently, perhaps not, but to refuse these meteorological balloons with certain propaganda balloons which have been sent up by some organizations, I believe, primarily in relation to some of the satellite countries. But I want to repeat that the United States Government has not directly or indirectly attempted to send any propaganda material whatever by air into the Soviet Union.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, on that same question, would you care to clear up the other implication that these balloons carry photographic equipment which are photographing ground installations? A.—Well, I do believe that they do carry some photographic equipment as part of the devices which, on the one hand, keep track of the speed at which the balloons travel, and on the other hand, reproduce cloud formation which are usually under the balloons. When you fly at 50,000 feet or thereabouts you generally find cloud conditions underneath, and there is no reason, I believe, I believe, photographically of certain cloud conditions. It would be quite accidental, I believe, if the photograph happened to pick up anything significant on the ground. Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you saying that there is nothing new in this second Bulganin letter? A.—No, I said that in the



Associated Press Wirephoto. NO CEILING ON SOVEREIGNTY: Secretary of State John Foster Dulles at his news conference yesterday. Discussing Soviet complaint about United States balloons, he said any strong protest would be considered carefully, though law has not set height of a nation's sovereignty.

Soviet Weather Balloon Lands on Japanese Isle

Special to The New York Times.

TOKYO, Feb. 7.—The police in Hokkaido, Japan's northernmost island, revealed today that a balloon bearing Soviet markings landed in eastern Hokkaido last Saturday.

The balloon was about four feet long and three and a half feet wide and bore the inscription in Russian "For atmospheric observation." A small aluminum box was attached to its shrouds. The balloon was the second to have landed in Hokkaido within a year. One was found there last March. It also bore Soviet markings.

ter I think could only be quite accidental. Q.—On that same question, sir, you received the note from the Soviet Union covering this matter? Yes, we did. And I hope we will get a reply out today or tomorrow.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, is this material made available to scientific organizations of other countries? A.—Yes, after it is collated, it will, if it is of value—and, in fact, I think they already are satisfied that it will be of value. We hope to make it available, probably on a broad basis, in connection with this forthcoming geophysical year. Q.—Mr. Secretary, what are we doing, if anything, to codify the international law of the question of the balloons? A.—I don't know whether it is being considered by the international law group of the United Nations or not, I just don't know.

Q.—Would we favor such a consideration, sir? A.—I would think so, yes. Q.—Does the American Air Force, for instance, start these balloons from fields in Germany or other parts of the NATO countries? A.—I don't know. An announcement was made on this subject—I was looking at it yesterday. A full press release on this was given, I think, on the 8th of January, and it spoke about various places in Europe, as well as, I think, mentioned Okinawa, Alaska, Hawaii and the like. I don't know just where they are coming from in western Europe.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, on another subject, Russia seems to be making a certain— A.—If you are going on to another subject, I have got to give some first place. Was it you? Q.—To go back to the Middle East, Mr. Secretary— A.—Yes.

Middle East Question Posed Q.—Have you had any word from General Burns in response to the part of the Eden-Eden communiqué saying that you would look with favor on the request for additional observers? A.—No, we have not had a reply, but we would hardly expect one. We sent a copy of our communiqué in that respect to the Acting Secretary General of the United Nations, and he in turn, I understand, forwarded it to General Burns, who is now in the Near East. But we have had no reply yet.

Q.—A second point on the Middle East. Is it correct, as it has been widely reported, that the United States would favor a one kilometer withdrawal by the Arabs, Egyptians and Israeli forces, to make a two-kilometer wide zone along the border in which these unarmed United Nations observers could more carefully monitor the frontier? A.—That was not discussed at all during the Eden visit here, and I suppose it would be a suggestion which, if it had merit, would be made by General Burns. If he thought it had merit, we would certainly carefully consider it, but we have not, as far as I am aware, put it forward.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, to go back to the other subject, Russia seems to be making a sudden drive in the last week or two along with Red China to create a new feeling of friendship with Pakistan, as though to break down the Baghdad Pact and interfere with SEATO. (The Southeast Asian Defense Treaty). I wonder if you would give your evaluation of Pakistan as a member both of the Baghdad Pact and of the SEATO organization? A.—We believe that Pakistan is a member of SEATO and also a member of the Baghdad Pact because they are aware of

climatic changes which have occurred recently in various parts of the world are due to the shifting of these great jet streams of air at high altitudes. So, to locate those streams and measure their velocity and from time to time to measure their shifts, is a part of a project which has world-wide significance.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, in anticipating that these balloons would go over the territory of other countries, did the Government take any action or consider the question of notifying other countries that they might? A.—There was a public notice which was given to all the world at the time when this project was conceived and about to be launched. I am told that the gondolas that these balloons carry have in them requests in various languages, including the Russian language, that if a gondola is found that a reward will be paid for its return, so that the information that is available in the apparatus can be obtained and collated with that from other sources.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, does that mean that provided that there is no determination to the contrary, the United States feels that they have the right to send these balloons at a certain height anywhere around the globe? A.—Yes, I think that we feel that way, although, as I say, there is no clear international law on the subject. We would be disposed to be respectful of the strong views of any country which was opposed to it. While one can never be sure of where a balloon is going to go when you put it up 50,000 feet into the air, we would be disposed to try to avoid the territory of any country which felt violent objection to it. We would do this, not as a matter of their right, but as a matter of decent, friendly relations.

Israeli-Arab Issue Raised Q.—Mr. Secretary, in your letter to the forty Congressmen released yesterday, you spoke of the necessity of establishment of friendly relations between Israel and her neighbors and you said we are actively working toward the establishment of such relations. Would you in some way elaborate for us as to the nature of these efforts? A.—The efforts are those which were, I think, most officially expressed in my speech of Aug. 26, which I have often referred to. The principles of that seem to be sound. We constantly are keeping those proposals before the governments of the countries concerned, the Government of Israel and the governments of the Arab countries concerned, and emphasizing the great gains which would be achieved if the economic benefits that are portrayed in that program could be realized and the resources of the area devoted to the well-being of the people rather than to the barren effort to build up armament.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, as I understand it, this geophysical year is being taken part in by all countries, including Russia. Can you tell us whether the projects which each country is engaged in were divided up or whether each country decided on its own what projects it would undertake? A.—No, I don't know the answer to that question. But I do want to make clear I do not mean to suggest that this particular project is part of the geophysical year. I do suggest that it will probably garner information of a kind which would be interesting to those scientists who get together for the celebration of the geophysical year.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you said that the United States would be respectful of any strong opposition of any country which had strong opposition to having balloons over its territory. The Russians obviously feel strongly about having balloons over their territory. Will we do something to prevent their drifting over the U. S. S. R.? A.—Well, I would prefer not

to answer that question until the note which we are preparing on that subject is released, which I hope will be by tomorrow or the day after. Q.—Mr. Secretary, could I ask one more technical question on this? At what point does—at what height, I mean, approximate height does the balloon leave the area of sovereignty? A.—I just can't answer that question. I am very sorry. But it is the same problem that we get on a minor scale when you deal with a question as to whether a man who has a house near an airfield has a right to prevent planes flying over his piece of land and his home. There have been lawsuits, as you know, brought by the owners of homes near airfields, to try to prevent the airplanes from flying over, on the theory that if you own a piece of land you own the air up to a certain distance in the air. Well, in the main those lawsuits have been rejected, although certainly somebody admits that if you own a piece of land, you do control the air to a certain distance up. But precisely what the distance is has never been decided, even in domestic law. When you get into international law, the problem is also obscure. I don't know how high a balloon has to go before you get out of the bounds of sovereignty, so to speak.

Data to Be Made Available Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you prepared to make the information obtained by these balloons available to those countries who do not object to having them fly over their territory? A.—Yes, I expect we will make it available to all countries. Q.—Mr. Secretary, is it pretty well established that these balloons are what people used to see as flying saucers? A.—I wouldn't be surprised if some of the so-called flying saucers were these balloons. Q.—Do you know of anything that were flying saucers that weren't these things? A.—No, I don't. Q.—Mr. Secretary, what is the United States Government's attitude toward these privately launched propaganda balloons? A.—Well, these are efforts in the main by private citizens, some of them refugees of some of the satellite countries, to communicate with their fellow countrymen back home. They operate outside of the United States. Since these are private activities, it is not a situation which we feel disposed to try to control.

Q.—What is the position, sir, on radio broadcasts into the Soviet world? Is that similarly undefined as to airspace? That is done both by official United States Government and non-Government sources. Q.—I used to be an international lawyer, or thought I was. But I haven't practiced for so long that I am getting a bit rusty. I should have brought along, I think, Mr. Philger, who is my legal adviser, to this particular conference. That is another question, I think, where international law is quite obscure: whether you have a right to send other waves carrying messages into another country or whether you have the right to try to jam those waves. We have tried, as you know, at the last Geneva conference to get an agreement that what you might call straight news broadcasts would be recognized and not sought to be jammed, but we could not get very far with the Soviets on that score. What the law is, I don't know, but it is a case where I would suppose it would be extremely difficult to make any rule that you could not send radio messages into another country because they automatically go there. It is in ways sometimes like these balloons. You send them up and you can't tell where they are going to go. In the case of the radio, of course, some of it is directly openly beamed to another country for deliberate purposes. I don't think it has ever been suggested that that was illegal. Q.—Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Letter From Gronchi Cited Q.—Mr. Secretary, there has been published an interview with President (Giovanni) Gronchi of Italy which has circulated fairly widely. In it he made certain suggestions he said he would bring to your attention when he comes later this month. I wonder if you have seen this and if you have any comment about it? A.—Well, I observed that there seemed to be some difference of opinion between President Gronchi and the writer of the article, and I think I had better leave that dispute to be settled as between them.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you met Mr. (René) Mayer, chairman of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community yesterday. Could you tell us the general line of the talk and especially what are the views of his Government with respect to the well-being of the people rather than to the barren effort to build up armament. Q.—Mr. Secretary, as I understand it, this geophysical year is being taken part in by all countries, including Russia. Can you tell us whether the projects which each country is engaged in were divided up or whether each country decided on its own what projects it would undertake? A.—No, I don't know the answer to that question. But I do want to make clear I do not mean to suggest that this particular project is part of the geophysical year. I do suggest that it will probably garner information of a kind which would be interesting to those scientists who get together for the celebration of the geophysical year.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you said that the United States would be respectful of any strong opposition of any country which had strong opposition to having balloons over its territory. The Russians obviously feel strongly about having balloons over their territory. Will we do something to prevent their drifting over the U. S. S. R.? A.—Well, I would prefer not

to answer that question until the note which we are preparing on that subject is released, which I hope will be by tomorrow or the day after. Q.—Mr. Secretary, could I ask one more technical question on this? At what point does—at what height, I mean, approximate height does the balloon leave the area of sovereignty? A.—I just can't answer that question. I am very sorry. But it is the same problem that we get on a minor scale when you deal with a question as to whether a man who has a house near an airfield has a right to prevent planes flying over his piece of land and his home. There have been lawsuits, as you know, brought by the owners of homes near airfields, to try to prevent the airplanes from flying over, on the theory that if you own a piece of land you own the air up to a certain distance in the air. Well, in the main those lawsuits have been rejected, although certainly somebody admits that if you own a piece of land, you do control the air to a certain distance up. But precisely what the distance is has never been decided, even in domestic law. When you get into international law, the problem is also obscure. I don't know how high a balloon has to go before you get out of the bounds of sovereignty, so to speak.

Data to Be Made Available Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you prepared to make the information obtained by these balloons available to those countries who do not object to having them fly over their territory? A.—Yes, I expect we will make it available to all countries. Q.—Mr. Secretary, is it pretty well established that these balloons are what people used to see as flying saucers? A.—I wouldn't be surprised if some of the so-called flying saucers were these balloons. Q.—Do you know of anything that were flying saucers that weren't these things? A.—No, I don't. Q.—Mr. Secretary, what is the United States Government's attitude toward these privately launched propaganda balloons? A.—Well, these are efforts in the main by private citizens, some of them refugees of some of the satellite countries, to communicate with their fellow countrymen back home. They operate outside of the United States. Since these are private activities, it is not a situation which we feel disposed to try to control.

Q.—What is the position, sir, on radio broadcasts into the Soviet world? Is that similarly undefined as to airspace? That is done both by official United States Government and non-Government sources. Q.—I used to be an international lawyer, or thought I was. But I haven't practiced for so long that I am getting a bit rusty. I should have brought along, I think, Mr. Philger, who is my legal adviser, to this particular conference. That is another question, I think, where international law is quite obscure: whether you have a right to send other waves carrying messages into another country or whether you have the right to try to jam those waves. We have tried, as you know, at the last Geneva conference to get an agreement that what you might call straight news broadcasts would be recognized and not sought to be jammed, but we could not get very far with the Soviets on that score. What the law is, I don't know, but it is a case where I would suppose it would be extremely difficult to make any rule that you could not send radio messages into another country because they automatically go there. It is in ways sometimes like these balloons. You send them up and you can't tell where they are going to go. In the case of the radio, of course, some of it is directly openly beamed to another country for deliberate purposes. I don't think it has ever been suggested that that was illegal. Q.—Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Letter From Gronchi Cited Q.—Mr. Secretary, there has been published an interview with President (Giovanni) Gronchi of Italy which has circulated fairly widely. In it he made certain suggestions he said he would bring to your attention when he comes later this month. I wonder if you have seen this and if you have any comment about it? A.—Well, I observed that there seemed to be some difference of opinion between President Gronchi and the writer of the article, and I think I had better leave that dispute to be settled as between them.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you met Mr. (René) Mayer, chairman of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community yesterday. Could you tell us the general line of the talk and especially what are the views of his Government with respect to the well-being of the people rather than to the barren effort to build up armament. Q.—Mr. Secretary, as I understand it, this geophysical year is being taken part in by all countries, including Russia. Can you tell us whether the projects which each country is engaged in were divided up or whether each country decided on its own what projects it would undertake? A.—No, I don't know the answer to that question. But I do want to make clear I do not mean to suggest that this particular project is part of the geophysical year. I do suggest that it will probably garner information of a kind which would be interesting to those scientists who get together for the celebration of the geophysical year.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you said that the United States would be respectful of any strong opposition of any country which had strong opposition to having balloons over its territory. The Russians obviously feel strongly about having balloons over their territory. Will we do something to prevent their drifting over the U. S. S. R.? A.—Well, I would prefer not

to answer that question until the note which we are preparing on that subject is released, which I hope will be by tomorrow or the day after. Q.—Mr. Secretary, could I ask one more technical question on this? At what point does—at what height, I mean, approximate height does the balloon leave the area of sovereignty? A.—I just can't answer that question. I am very sorry. But it is the same problem that we get on a minor scale when you deal with a question as to whether a man who has a house near an airfield has a right to prevent planes flying over his piece of land and his home. There have been lawsuits, as you know, brought by the owners of homes near airfields, to try to prevent the airplanes from flying over, on the theory that if you own a piece of land you own the air up to a certain distance in the air. Well, in the main those lawsuits have been rejected, although certainly somebody admits that if you own a piece of land, you do control the air to a certain distance up. But precisely what the distance is has never been decided, even in domestic law. When you get into international law, the problem is also obscure. I don't know how high a balloon has to go before you get out of the bounds of sovereignty, so to speak.

Data to Be Made Available Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you prepared to make the information obtained by these balloons available to those countries who do not object to having them fly over their territory? A.—Yes, I expect we will make it available to all countries. Q.—Mr. Secretary, is it pretty well established that these balloons are what people used to see as flying saucers? A.—I wouldn't be surprised if some of the so-called flying saucers were these balloons. Q.—Do you know of anything that were flying saucers that weren't these things? A.—No, I don't. Q.—Mr. Secretary, what is the United States Government's attitude toward these privately launched propaganda balloons? A.—Well, these are efforts in the main by private citizens, some of them refugees of some of the satellite countries, to communicate with their fellow countrymen back home. They operate outside of the United States. Since these are private activities, it is not a situation which we feel disposed to try to control.

Q.—What is the position, sir, on radio broadcasts into the Soviet world? Is that similarly undefined as to airspace? That is done both by official United States Government and non-Government sources. Q.—I used to be an international lawyer, or thought I was. But I haven't practiced for so long that I am getting a bit rusty. I should have brought along, I think, Mr. Philger, who is my legal adviser, to this particular conference. That is another question, I think, where international law is quite obscure: whether you have a right to send other waves carrying messages into another country or whether you have the right to try to jam those waves. We have tried, as you know, at the last Geneva conference to get an agreement that what you might call straight news broadcasts would be recognized and not sought to be jammed, but we could not get very far with the Soviets on that score. What the law is, I don't know, but it is a case where I would suppose it would be extremely difficult to make any rule that you could not send radio messages into another country because they automatically go there. It is in ways sometimes like these balloons. You send them up and you can't tell where they are going to go. In the case of the radio, of course, some of it is directly openly beamed to another country for deliberate purposes. I don't think it has ever been suggested that that was illegal. Q.—Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Letter From Gronchi Cited Q.—Mr. Secretary, there has been published an interview with President (Giovanni) Gronchi of Italy which has circulated fairly widely. In it he made certain suggestions he said he would bring to your attention when he comes later this month. I wonder if you have seen this and if you have any comment about it? A.—Well, I observed that there seemed to be some difference of opinion between President Gronchi and the writer of the article, and I think I had better leave that dispute to be settled as between them.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you met Mr. (René) Mayer, chairman of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community yesterday. Could you tell us the general line of the talk and especially what are the views of his Government with respect to the well-being of the people rather than to the barren effort to build up armament. Q.—Mr. Secretary, as I understand it, this geophysical year is being taken part in by all countries, including Russia. Can you tell us whether the projects which each country is engaged in were divided up or whether each country decided on its own what projects it would undertake? A.—No, I don't know the answer to that question. But I do want to make clear I do not mean to suggest that this particular project is part of the geophysical year. I do suggest that it will probably garner information of a kind which would be interesting to those scientists who get together for the celebration of the geophysical year.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you said that the United States would be respectful of any strong opposition of any country which had strong opposition to having balloons over its territory. The Russians obviously feel strongly about having balloons over their territory. Will we do something to prevent their drifting over the U. S. S. R.? A.—Well, I would prefer not

to answer that question until the note which we are preparing on that subject is released, which I hope will be by tomorrow or the day after. Q.—Mr. Secretary, could I ask one more technical question on this? At what point does—at what height, I mean, approximate height does the balloon leave the area of sovereignty? A.—I just can't answer that question. I am very sorry. But it is the same problem that we get on a minor scale when you deal with a question as to whether a man who has a house near an airfield has a right to prevent planes flying over his piece of land and his home. There have been lawsuits, as you know, brought by the owners of homes near airfields, to try to prevent the airplanes from flying over, on the theory that if you own a piece of land you own the air up to a certain distance in the air. Well, in the main those lawsuits have been rejected, although certainly somebody admits that if you own a piece of land, you do control the air to a certain distance up. But precisely what the distance is has never been decided, even in domestic law. When you get into international law, the problem is also obscure. I don't know how high a balloon has to go before you get out of the bounds of sovereignty, so to speak.

Data to Be Made Available Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you prepared to make the information obtained by these balloons available to those countries who do not object to having them fly over their territory? A.—Yes, I expect we will make it available to all countries. Q.—Mr. Secretary, is it pretty well established that these balloons are what people used to see as flying saucers? A.—I wouldn't be surprised if some of the so-called flying saucers were these balloons. Q.—Do you know of anything that were flying saucers that weren't these things? A.—No, I don't. Q.—Mr. Secretary, what is the United States Government's attitude toward these privately launched propaganda balloons? A.—Well, these are efforts in the main by private citizens, some of them refugees of some of the satellite countries, to communicate with their fellow countrymen back home. They operate outside of the United States. Since these are private activities, it is not a situation which we feel disposed to try to control.

Q.—What is the position, sir, on radio broadcasts into the Soviet world? Is that similarly undefined as to airspace? That is done both by official United States Government and non-Government sources. Q.—I used to be an international lawyer, or thought I was. But I haven't practiced for so long that I am getting a bit rusty. I should have brought along, I think, Mr. Philger, who is my legal adviser, to this particular conference. That is another question, I think, where international law is quite obscure: whether you have a right to send other waves carrying messages into another country or whether you have the right to try to jam those waves. We have tried, as you know, at the last Geneva conference to get an agreement that what you might call straight news broadcasts would be recognized and not sought to be jammed, but we could not get very far with the Soviets on that score. What the law is, I don't know, but it is a case where I would suppose it would be extremely difficult to make any rule that you could not send radio messages into another country because they automatically go there. It is in ways sometimes like these balloons. You send them up and you can't tell where they are going to go. In the case of the radio, of course, some of it is directly openly beamed to another country for deliberate purposes. I don't think it has ever been suggested that that was illegal. Q.—Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Letter From Gronchi Cited Q.—Mr. Secretary, there has been published an interview with President (Giovanni) Gronchi of Italy which has circulated fairly widely. In it he made certain suggestions he said he would bring to your attention when he comes later this month. I wonder if you have seen this and if you have any comment about it? A.—Well, I observed that there seemed to be some difference of opinion between President Gronchi and the writer of the article, and I think I had better leave that dispute to be settled as between them.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you met Mr. (René) Mayer, chairman of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community yesterday. Could you tell us the general line of the talk and especially what are the views of his Government with respect to the well-being of the people rather than to the barren effort to build up armament. Q.—Mr. Secretary, as I understand it, this geophysical year is being taken part in by all countries, including Russia. Can you tell us whether the projects which each country is engaged in were divided up or whether each country decided on its own what projects it would undertake? A.—No, I don't know the answer to that question. But I do want to make clear I do not mean to suggest that this particular project is part of the geophysical year. I do suggest that it will probably garner information of a kind which would be interesting to those scientists who get together for the celebration of the geophysical year.

Q.—Mr. Secretary, you said that the United States would be respectful of any strong opposition of any country which had strong opposition to having balloons over its territory. The Russians obviously feel strongly about having balloons over their territory. Will we do something to prevent their drifting over the U. S. S. R.? A.—Well, I would prefer not

to answer that question until the note which we are preparing on that subject is released, which I hope will be by tomorrow or the day after. Q.—Mr. Secretary, could I ask one more technical question on this? At what point does—at what height, I mean, approximate height does the balloon leave the area of sovereignty? A.—I just can't answer that question. I am very sorry. But it is the same problem that we get on a minor scale when you deal with a question as to whether a man who has a house near an airfield has a right to prevent planes flying over his piece of land and his home. There have been lawsuits, as you know, brought by the owners of homes near airfields, to try to prevent the airplanes from flying over, on the theory that if you own a piece of land you own the air up to a certain distance in the air. Well, in the main those lawsuits have been rejected, although certainly somebody admits that if you own a piece of land, you do control the air to a certain distance up. But precisely what the distance is has never been decided, even in domestic law. When you get into international law, the problem is also obscure. I don't know how high a balloon has to go before you get out of the bounds of sovereignty, so to speak.

Data to Be Made Available Q.—Mr. Secretary, are you prepared to make the information obtained by these balloons available to those countries who do not object to having them fly over their territory? A.—Yes, I expect we will make it available to all countries. Q.—Mr. Secretary, is it pretty well established that these balloons are what people used to see as flying saucers? A.—I wouldn't be surprised if some of the so-called flying saucers were these balloons. Q.—Do you know of anything that were flying saucers that weren't these things? A.—No, I don't. Q.—Mr. Secretary, what is the United States Government's attitude toward these privately launched propaganda balloons? A.—Well, these are efforts in the main by private citizens, some of them refugees of some of the satellite countries, to communicate with their fellow countrymen back home. They operate outside of the United States. Since these are private activities, it is not a situation which we feel disposed to try to control.

Q.—What is the position, sir, on radio broadcasts into the Soviet world? Is that similarly undefined as to airspace? That is done both by official United States Government and non-Government sources. Q.—I used to be an international lawyer, or thought I was. But I haven't practiced for so long that I am getting a bit rusty. I should have brought along, I think, Mr. Philger, who is my legal adviser, to this particular conference. That is another question, I think, where international law is quite obscure: whether you have a right to send other waves carrying messages into another country or whether you have the right to try to jam those waves. We have tried, as you know, at the last Geneva conference to get an agreement that what you might call straight news broadcasts would be recognized and not sought to be jammed, but we could not get very far with the Soviets on that score. What the law is, I don't know, but it is a case where I would suppose it would be extremely difficult to make any rule that you could not send radio messages into another country because they automatically go there. It is in ways sometimes like these balloons. You send them up and you can't tell where they are going to go. In the case of the radio, of course, some of it is directly openly beamed to another country for deliberate purposes. I don't think it has ever been suggested that that was illegal. Q.—Thank you, Mr. Secretary.



IMPORTED SILK ORGANDY in Lovejoy's demure ballerina for the bridesmaid 29.98

Charming in attendance for spring and summer weddings, a bouffant skirted dress with slim long torso and gracefully draped fitted effect at shoulders and complete with matching gauntlets. Pale blue, pink, maize, Nile green, orchid and other springtime shades. Misses' sizes 8 to 20.

Whether you are planning a church or home wedding, Miss Ellen Williams, Saks' Bridal Consultant, will help you select your trousseau, your gown and those of your attendants.

SAKS-34th—Bridal Salon—Fifth Floor

SAKS-34TH



METICULOUSLY MANNERED Tailorbrooke's softened suit of imported Scottish wool tweed 59.95

Imported tweed, soft and zephyr light, impeccably detailed with the collar of single thickness. A sign of costly craftsmanship and triple stitched for smoothness. Jacket is gently molded, skirt is smoothly slim. Soft gray or brown in misses' sizes 10 to 20.

Come in... write, phone. Sorry no C.O.D.s. You can charge at Saks-34th.

SAKS-34th—Fourth Floor

SAKS-34TH THE SPECIALTY SHOP AT HERALD SQUARE 34TH AT BROADWAY LACKAWANNA 4-7000 Phone FREE—in N. J. (in 20c calling area) ask operator for WX 6767, and in Nassau, Westchester (in 25c calling area) ask operator for ENTERPRISE 6767



Arnold Constable

open thursday night 'til 9:00

suburbans 'til 9:30

pleats are newest!

29.95

TUCKED, THEN PLEATED, in finest pima cotton with the tucks and pleats all stitched to stay... an enchanting dress with notes of dyed-to-match lace and tiny jewels... blue, maize, pink or mint; with crinoline, misses' sizes 8 to 14. \$29.95

arnold constable fashion salon dresses, third floor 5th ave. • hempstead • new rochelle • hackensack • manhasset • trenton

Press (before S. C.)

# Excerpts From Dulles Testimony to Senators on Arms Shipments to Middle East

WASHINGTON, Feb. 25—Following are excerpts from the transcript of the hearing at which Secretary of State Dulles and Under-Secretary of State Herbert Hoover Jr. testified Friday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

[Mr. Dulles began his testimony by reading a prepared statement. This was published in Saturday's editions of The New York Times. The remarks that follow preceded questioning by the Senators.]

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Before questions are asked, I would like to add one or two words, words, indeed, that are suggested by your own opening statement, with regard to impartiality. [He referred to remarks by the committee chairman, Senator Walter F. George, Democrat of Georgia.]

We are dealing here in this area with problems of tremendous delicacy and complexity. So long as there is not a real peace between Israel and the Arab States, there are dangers which may be very far-flung, burning throughout the Moslem world and throughout all of Africa.

Our difficulty in dealing with this problem, dealing successfully with this problem, derives very largely from the fact that the Arabs believe that the United States, which confronts a problem which relates to Israel, is in the last analysis dominated by domestic considerations—domestic political considerations.

### Notes Political Campaign

I can see that it is the determination of this Administration to deal with the problem purely from the standpoint of the best interests of the United States, and to deal on a basis which you described, Mr. Chairman, a basis of friendly impartiality toward both the Israelis and the Arabs, and I feel confident that that is a point of view which will also be shared by the Congress, and I hope very much that in the pending political campaign the discussion will be on such a level as to dissipate the idea that United States policy in relation to the Near East is dominated by local domestic considerations.

If that is not the case, we would greatly endanger the major interests of the United States and its Allies and, indeed, in my opinion, equally endanger the State of Israel itself.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[At this point Senator Theodore Francis Green, Democrat of Rhode Island, and Senator Alexander Wiley, Republican of Wisconsin raised some questions that had previously been pursued, and Under Secretary Hoover read a summary of a State Department release explaining the Saudi Arabian shipment. The release was published in The New York Times last Sunday.]

**THE CHAIRMAN**—Senator [J. W.] Fulbright [Democrat of Arkansas].

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I wonder, Mr. Hoover, just who did make the decision to cancel or to suspend the export licenses.

**MR. HOOVER**—I am sorry, sir, I did not hear it.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Who made the decision to suspend the export licenses?

**MR. HOOVER**—I made the decision, sir.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Did you do it after consultation with the President or with Mr. Hagerty?

**MR. HOOVER**—The decision was fully concurred in by the President, and I do not believe that I should discuss my relations with the Executive, sir.

### Responsibility Cited

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Mr. Hoover, who is responsible to see that shipments of such materials conform to the interests of the Government at the moment of shipment? Is that your responsibility?

**MR. HOOVER**—That would be a responsibility, in so far as the compliance with the licenses, terms of licenses, and enforcement of provisions of shipment, would be under the jurisdiction, as I understand it, of the United States Customs Service.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—As to the policy aspects, that would be under the Department of State.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I wonder if we could review for you the date on the license, yes, sir?

**MR. HOOVER**—I believe that is the date on the license, yes, sir.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Why did you appear to be surprised, then when they were being put on the boat? Was it—

if it is your responsibility to follow through on that—did this take you by surprise when you read in the press they were being put on the boat?

**MR. HOOVER**—No, it did not.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I do not understand why a suspension order at that late date was necessary.

**MR. HOOVER**—The suspension was made primarily because of charges, as I understand it, that this was not in compliance with the laws and export regulations of the United States. Under those circumstances—

### Charge Made in Press

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Who made the charge?

**MR. HOOVER**—The charges were in the press at that time, and on the radio.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—But you knew about this export license, did you not?

**MR. HOOVER**—Yes, sir.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—You knew it was in conformity with the license, did you not?

**MR. HOOVER**—We did not know—we thought that it was highly desirable, under those circumstances, as an assurance to the public, that we would make a complete investigation as to the proper enforcement of the laws and the carrying out of these orders.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Do you not think it is evident that instead of reassuring the public, it has disturbed everybody that

something is very loosely administered in the Government, that someone did not know what was going on, and the real impression is left, is it not?

**MR. HOOVER**—I am of the personal opinion now, sir, as I was then, it was a reassurance that all of these matters would be thoroughly investigated, and we would continue as we did, in a deliberate manner.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—You made reference to the press. Are you familiar with an article by Mr. Chalmers Roberts [of The Washington Post and Times Herald] in the paper a few days ago which is entitled, "Brief Ban on Tank Shipments Is Laid to Hagerty and Hoover"? Did you read that article?

**MR. HOOVER**—I think I saw it briefly, sir.

### Article Is Mentioned

**SECRETARY DULLES**—You know Mr. Chalmers Roberts is a very reputable reporter, and his accounts of what went on with regard to our decisions in Indochina and in Korea were later proved to be quite accurate.

He says in this article, in effect, that this decision came from Mr. Hagerty [James C. Hagerty, White House Press Secretary]. He attributes it largely to you and Mr. Hagerty. And that, coupled with statements of other responsible newspaper men, such as the following, and I quote from an article by Mr. Walter Lippman [a newspaper columnist, whom we all know and who I think generally is considered an extremely able man. He says in one of his recent articles: "With nobody at the top in Washington who can or will take new decisions, our diplomacy is almost everywhere fighting unattractive rear-guard action."

That is what really disturbs me, I think, the public as well as members of this committee.

I think it would be very enlightening if you would tell us precisely exactly how this particular affair developed, and why a suspension order was called for.

**MR. HOOVER**—After an assessment of the entire press at that time, the immediate press and other statements, some of which I believe had occurred in the Congress, and after consultation with my associates, I made the decision to suspend the shipment, and it was fully concurred in by the President.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—By the press or President? I could not hear you.

**MR. HOOVER**—Fully concurred in by the President.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—By the President, Mr. Roberts says: "State officials say Hagerty played an influential part in the decision to slap an embargo and that Hoover gave it. As one of them put it, the Administration panicked because of domestic political problems involved in the Israeli request for arms."

That is an accurate description of how this decision developed?

**MR. HOOVER**—No, sir, it is not.

### Takes Full Responsibility

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Then you took the initial responsibility and suggested the suspension order?

**MR. HOOVER**—The suspension was entirely my decision.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Why did you not have to be done, rather than suspending the order?

**MR. HOOVER**—I am sorry, I do not quite understand the question.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—You knew there was a license which was fully in order and you knew the shipment had to go on. Why did you suspend it?

Why did you not make an announcement that your policy had been in existence as long ago as September?

**MR. HOOVER**—We considered that, among others, and we thought the best thing to do was to suspend all the licenses for the moment.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—What purpose did that serve?

**MR. HOOVER**—I think it had the effect of allowing us to be certain, beyond any measure of doubt, that all laws and regulations were being complied with.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Did you have any doubt about it when you ordered the suspension?

**MR. HOOVER**—There had been serious charges that appeared in the press, and elsewhere, that such was not the case, and we felt under those circumstances that we were justified in making certain and reassuring ourselves of that fact.

### Imminent Sailing Cited

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Did you have any doubt in your own mind that there was? Did you have any doubt about that being in order?

**MR. HOOVER**—We had no opportunity, at the late hour, prior to the shipment, which was late in the evening of Sept. 16, before the boat was scheduled to sail early the next morning, as to what these procedures were.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—The what?

**MR. HOOVER**—We had no way of being able to find out, late on the night of Feb. 16, and the shipment was to take place early the next morning—I think it was scheduled for 6 or 7 o'clock—that all of the laws and regulations had been complied with in regard to that shipment.

For that reason, we suspended all permits temporarily.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—How long did the suspension order last?

**MR. HOOVER**—I believe the suspension order was removed at about 7 o'clock on the evening of Feb. 18, after a full investigation had been made.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Who investigated it?

**MR. HOOVER**—The Department of State, and the United States Customs, and the United States Customs.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Did you have any part in the investigation?



FOREIGN AFFAIRS SESSION: Scene of hearing on Friday, as Secretary Dulles spoke

**MR. HOOVER**—I ordered the investigation to be made. The facts were brought to me, and I made the decision to reinstate all shipments.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Was the fact that there was a license in being well known in the department?

**MR. HOOVER**—What, sir?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I think it has developed into a dangerous move, yet.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Do you not consider this as a very dangerous move on the part of the Russians to supply arms to Egypt?

**MR. HOOVER**—I think it is a good move, yet.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Do you not think it would have been wise to raise the point, perhaps, to try to dissuade the Russians from doing this while they were in a good humor at Geneva? [Laughter.]

**SECRETARY DULLES**—There was no information at all at that time to indicate that the movement of arms was in prospect.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—You knew they had started the negotiations, you said, in the preceding month, in June.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—No, I don't think I said that. If I said that, I did not mean to say it. What I said was that we were informed that the Government of Egypt might try to get arms from the Soviet bloc.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Well, I meant it was a dangerous signal. Had the Egyptians ever asked to get arms from us prior to that?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Not in any substantial quantities.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Well, in any quantity?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I think there were some very small shipments, whether civilian aircraft, or something of that sort. It was very insignificant. Arms were gotten on a much cheaper basis in various parts of Europe.

Our prices were too high. We were priced out of the market. So that, except for certain shipments to Saudi Arabia, which took place perhaps for special reasons, the United States, broadly speaking, has not been in the business of selling arms to the area.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—You do not think sales of arms like this, the decision to do it or not to do it, is purely on a commercial basis, do you?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—No, but the buyers put it on a commercial basis. They buy where they can get it the cheapest.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Do we have a policy which is not to sell arms to the Middle East, regardless of the price; or do we have a policy that we will sell it if we can make a profit on it?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—We are not in the business of selling it for profit, but we do have prices which the Defense Department puts on these items; and, broadly speaking, those prices are higher than the prices which are put on comparable items by various countries of Europe which are also selling arms.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I would like to ask the Secretary some questions, Mr. Chairman.

**THE CHAIRMAN**—The Secretary will return to the stand.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Mr. Secretary, I wondered if you could tell us when you and the President first heard of the negotiations between Mr. Nasser and the Czechs, involving and concerning the acquisition of planes and other armaments from Czechoslovakia.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—We first heard, or I first heard it during the month of June, that Colonel Nasser might be thinking of trying to get some arms from Czechoslovakia or from the Soviet Union.

Then in the early part of July, I was advised that that effort was being discontinued, and that the decision had been to at least suspend at that time any efforts to get arms from the Soviet bloc, and to try to get arms from the United States.

Then in about the middle of August, I was informed that the Czech arms deal was probably on, or being negotiated, about the middle of August. Our information at that point was not firm. It was not until September that we had what we regarded as really firm information about it.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Did you or did President Eisenhower raise this matter with the Russians at Geneva?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I did not, and to the best of my

knowledge, the President did not. As I pointed out, at that time our information was that the Egyptians had dropped the thought of getting arms from the Soviet bloc.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Do you not consider this as a very dangerous move on the part of the Russians to supply arms to Egypt?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Well, I think it has developed into a dangerous move, yet.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Do you not think it would have been wise to raise the point, perhaps, to try to dissuade the Russians from doing this while they were in a good humor at Geneva? [Laughter.]

**SECRETARY DULLES**—There was no information at all at that time to indicate that the movement of arms was in prospect.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—You knew they had started the negotiations, you said, in the preceding month, in June.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—No, I don't think I said that. If I said that, I did not mean to say it. What I said was that we were informed that the Government of Egypt might try to get arms from the Soviet bloc.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Well, I meant it was a dangerous signal. Had the Egyptians ever asked to get arms from us prior to that?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Not in any substantial quantities.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Well, in any quantity?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I think there were some very small shipments, whether civilian aircraft, or something of that sort. It was very insignificant. Arms were gotten on a much cheaper basis in various parts of Europe.

Our prices were too high. We were priced out of the market. So that, except for certain shipments to Saudi Arabia, which took place perhaps for special reasons, the United States, broadly speaking, has not been in the business of selling arms to the area.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—You do not think sales of arms like this, the decision to do it or not to do it, is purely on a commercial basis, do you?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—No, but the buyers put it on a commercial basis. They buy where they can get it the cheapest.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Do we have a policy which is not to sell arms to the Middle East, regardless of the price; or do we have a policy that we will sell it if we can make a profit on it?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—We are not in the business of selling it for profit, but we do have prices which the Defense Department puts on these items; and, broadly speaking, those prices are higher than the prices which are put on comparable items by various countries of Europe which are also selling arms.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I would like to ask the Secretary some questions, Mr. Chairman.

**THE CHAIRMAN**—The Secretary will return to the stand.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Mr. Secretary, I wondered if you could tell us when you and the President first heard of the negotiations between Mr. Nasser and the Czechs, involving and concerning the acquisition of planes and other armaments from Czechoslovakia.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—We first heard, or I first heard it during the month of June, that Colonel Nasser might be thinking of trying to get some arms from Czechoslovakia or from the Soviet Union.

Then in the early part of July, I was advised that that effort was being discontinued, and that the decision had been to at least suspend at that time any efforts to get arms from the Soviet bloc, and to try to get arms from the United States.

Then in about the middle of August, I was informed that the Czech arms deal was probably on, or being negotiated, about the middle of August. Our information at that point was not firm. It was not until September that we had what we regarded as really firm information about it.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Did you or did President Eisenhower raise this matter with the Russians at Geneva?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I did not, and to the best of my

take cotton? Do you think that was the principal reason?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—They did not ask us to take cotton, because we did not offer to take cotton. We quoted them a cash price.

**Views on Security Asked**—In leading us to turn down their request that they asked us to take cotton? We quoted them a cash price.

**MR. SECRETARY**, in your statement, particularly on Page 3, at the bottom of the page, I have the feeling that you do not feel we have a primary interest in this area; that we just share an interest along with a lot of other people.

I would like to know your views as to whether or not you think the Middle East is of primary interest to the security of this country.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I think it is. I thought I made that clear in the first paragraph of my statement.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I mention the words that we would contribute in one sentence, and in another it is willingness to assist, which leads me to feel that perhaps you feel we do not have a primary interest, in other words, that this is a very, very important interest to us what happened. And if it is, we must assume the leadership in trying to develop the countries these various countries, economically and to assist in their stability.

I wonder if you would clarify your views about how important and why you think this area is important.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—The area is important for the reasons, which I thought I suggested, from the standpoint of communications, at that crossroads between Europe, Asia and Africa.

It contains natural resources which are of tremendous importance. It is a seat of culture and religion, which attracts the devotion and interests of religious peoples throughout all the world.

**Area Held Important**—So that from every standpoint, religion, culture, geography, and economics, it is an area of tremendous importance.

You asked why I said here that we would contribute. Well, the reason is that the area is important to other countries, too, and I do not see any reason why the United States should pay the entire bill in these matters when you can get other people to contribute and go along with us.

The British are willing to join in this contribution. I do not think we should reject that.

Therefore, I think if we can get others to contribute financially, and with guarantees, that we ought to do it and not try to bear all the burdens ourselves.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—The Russians are quite willing to contribute, are they not?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I beg your pardon?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—The Russians are quite willing to contribute, are they not?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—That depends upon the political factors, also. But broadly speaking, I imagine that if we had had a request for arms and the parties had been willing to pay the price, we would probably have done it, subject, of course, to the conditions that were specified in the 1950 Declaration, namely, they wanted to maintain a certain balance there, and we also did not want to start an arms race. But subject to those qualifications, we were willing to sell surplus arms.

**Pressed on Egyptians**—I do not believe I quite got it clear. Have they, the Egyptians, ever requested us to sell them arms? First, have they requested it?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—They requested in July of 1955, yes.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—But we would not give them good prices; is that the reason they turned to the Russians or the Czechs?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I believe so, yes. We gave them good prices, and they found that they could get arms from the Soviet bloc more cheaply, and on the basis of a barter of cotton, which is their principal export commodity, and where they feel that because of our big cotton exports and the likelihood of our selling competitively, they prefer to use their cotton, if they can, on a barter arrangement such as this.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—That is a very interesting demonstration. [Laughter.]

You consider that an ap-

proval, of course, of the accuracy of your statements.

Do you think this last meeting which just ended, I believe, would indicate, or that the speeches of Khrushchev [Nikita S. Khrushchev, Soviet Communist party leader] and the other leaders in the Russian Government would indicate, a failure in their foreign policy?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Absolutely, sir.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—I would be most interested to hear why you think they indicate that.

**Shift in Tactics Listed**—I would be most interested to hear why you think they indicate that.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—All right, I will be glad to tell you. For thirty years, Soviet foreign policy and Soviet policy generally has been based upon two principles; namely, intolerance—or no use, non-Communist system; any system which did not conform to Soviet communism, because there are other brands—and also upon the policy of using violence as a means of getting their results.

There has been talk, time after time, that by violence can Soviet communism succeed. Stalin said that if anybody did not believe in the policy of violence, he either did not understand Soviet communism or else had gone out of his mind.

They also taught that if anybody did not conform to their particular standard, that he must be fought; he was an enemy.

Those two policies, of intolerance—and the use of violence, had been basic in Soviet policy for the last thirty years.

Those policies have gradually ceased to produce any results from them. The free nations have banded together, shown their strength, shown their unity to an increasing degree, so that that policy was not producing any positive results.

The result is, they have got to revamp their whole creed, from A to Z. It is a tremendous process for them, because they have got to undo the teaching of many years and get onto a new basis.

What that new basis is going to be, I do not know, because their Congress is still sitting. But one thing that is absolutely certain is, the unity and firmness and resolution of the free nations during the past few years have caused the Soviet policy to fail, and today they are trying to figure out how they are going to get a better one. [Applause.]

**THE CHAIRMAN**—Let us have order in the room, please.

**Visit to Tito Mentioned**—I recall that we were told the Russians went to Tito because of a great crisis in their agricultural policy and internal weakness.

Do you think the facts have borne that out? Is that why they went to court Tito?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—No, they went to court Tito as part of a program which they started to adopt last May, to indicate a shift away from the doctrine of intolerance to a doctrine of tolerance, and they felt that that was a good exhibit of it. That was the beginning of their search for a new program.

Their visit to Tito had nothing to do, whatever, with their agricultural crisis.

**SECRETARY DULLES**—Was the news or the statements that they were weak internally—has it been borne out by the facts, do you think?

**SECRETARY DULLES**—They are weak internally in certain respects, Senator. They have put all their emphasis upon heavy industry, and they have pushed their heavy industry quite effectively, I would say.

# Secretary Describes the Tensions in U. S. Struggle to Maintain Peace in Region

Continued From Preceding Page

I do not think we have to assume that no nation can exist except as it has within its own boundaries the weapons needed for its own defense. If that were the case, the world would be in a quite impossible situation, because outside of the Soviet Union and the United States, there are no countries which can have enough military power to make themselves safe against an attack by one or the other.

We are not going to attack the Soviet Union might. Where do you find security today? Primarily in mutual security arrangements and, above all, we hope, in the United Nations Charter. The United Nations Charter was created for that very purpose, and we are working very closely with the United Nations on this matter.

They have their General Burns [sic] Gen. F. L. M. Burns of Canada) out of the picture today. Primarily in mutual security arrangements and, above all, we hope, in the United Nations Charter. The United Nations Charter was created for that very purpose, and we are working very closely with the United Nations on this matter.

There is no country in the world which has as strong a call upon the United Nations as the State of Israel has, and we believe that if the members of the United Nations will put their strength behind the United Nations' action to save Israel, that is a far better assurance for Israel than if we get into an arms race, because any amount of arms which we could furnish from the United States cannot be topped, like that, by more arms which the Soviet Union will pour into the situation, and you get into an arms race which Israel cannot possibly win, because Israel, with a population of about 1,700,000 and a very small area, cannot absorb arms comparable to what can be absorbed by the surrounding Arabs, with their capacity to absorb arms, now that they have access to the arsenals of the Soviet Union.

Therefore, I believe, Senator, the situation is one which calls for our concentrating upon other means than the question of giving Israel the arms which will alone enable it to save itself. I think that the more serious danger to Israel than a help.

Senator Smith—I assume we would give some aid, possibly to Iraq in the event that Iraq is tied up with this mutual security treaty.

Secretary Dulles—Iraq is not a country which has common borders with Israel. I do not mean to imply by that that Iraq is in any sense friendly to Israel, but I imagine that the people of Iraq feel as strongly against Israel as any other Arab peoples do. But the facts of geography are that Iraq does not have common boundaries with Israel, and is the triangular wedge which fits in between Turkey and Iran; that it has a great concern, which the more southern Arab countries do not have, with the possibility of an attack from the Soviet Union.

For those reasons, we have given a small amount of military aid to Iraq, although Iraq gets most of its military supplies from the United Kingdom.

Senator John J. Sparkman (Democrat of Alabama)—Mr. Secretary, I should be very brief in my questions.

A couple of days ago, there appeared an article in The New York Times under the heading "Fact, for Red Arms to Syria Reported," under a Tyrol dateline. Did you by any chance see that?

Secretary Dulles—Fact for what? What was the headline?

Senator Sparkman—Fact for Red Arms to Syria. In other words, the story was that Red arms were likewise to be furnished to Syria. Are you familiar with that report?

Secretary Dulles—Yes, I am not familiar with The Times article, but I am familiar with the fact.

Secretary Sparkman—Well, it is my understanding that the getting of arms from the Soviet bloc is not entirely a new development. Israel itself has in the past gotten substantial amounts of arms from the Soviet bloc.

I might say, Senator, that the getting of arms from the Soviet bloc is not entirely a new development. Israel itself has in the past gotten substantial amounts of arms from the Soviet bloc.

Secretary Dulles—Well, certainly they may be unfounded, yes, and I believe—

the interest of the United States in seeing that Israel—and of the United Nations—in seeing that Israel continues a free and independent country.

Secretary Dulles—We do have that interest; and, as I said, that is a basic part of our foreign policy.

You see, Senator, a nation, naturally, likes to feel that it has within its own borders, under its own command, all the means necessary to assure its preservation against any contingency. That is a very natural desire. But it is not a desire which today many nations can satisfy, because of the disparity in arms which exists between big countries and little countries, between industrialized countries and non-industrialized countries, and the like. They feel, and I believe that, in fact, their danger would not be diminished if they were to put primary reliance upon their own arms.

Secretary Sparkman—You bring out the point that perhaps peace could be brought to that area through other methods, much more surely than it can through any arms race; that is, through negotiations.

Are we doing anything in that regard?

Secretary Dulles—As I pointed out, we are, through diplomatic channels, constantly probing the situation, in touch with it. I have met, myself, a good many times with Foreign Minister [Moshe] Sharett, of Israel. I have met frequently with the Israeli Ambassador here in Washington to discuss these matters. Our Ambassadors in Cairo and in Tel Aviv are in constant touch with the situation, and we are trying to move it forward along the lines of my Aug. 26 address.

One of the troubles we have encountered in this project of ours is that several times, as the situation looked brighter, it has been clouded again by instances such as the Gaza raid, and the Tiberias raid.

I do not want to suggest that those raids are entirely unprovoked, but I do feel that they were quite out of relation to the mutual assistance agreements we have had, certainly in fact, to a considerable deterioration of the situation.

So, just as we get up to where it looks like we are going to get somewhere, we have been put down, several times. But I am by no means hopeless as to the possibility of working out a permanent solution there.

Senator William F. Knowland of California, Senate Republican leader, asked Secretary Dulles a number of general questions about the objectives of American foreign policy, to all of which Secretary Dulles replied. Senator Knowland then completed his questioning with the following observation.

Senator Knowland—I might just make this comment—and then I will conclude, to give the other members of the committee ample opportunity and I will have other questions in executive session—I would express the hope that at an early date there might be a full discussion with the Foreign Relations Committee, and the comparable committee in the House of Representatives, relative to discouraging the sale of arms in this area of tension, by not only ourselves, but by our associates in the Western world, and by the Soviet world.

Banon Shipments Suggested

I assume that the Department has explored and will continue to explore those possibilities, realizing the difficulties we have in dealing with the Soviet world. But it seems to me that here is a case where the moral conscience of the world, at least, might be directed to a banning of all shipments from both the Soviet world and the free world, in the hope that then, by peaceful means, we could work out some of these economic and political problems and bring about an area of agreement between Asia and Israel.

And I would like to have the assurance of the Department that will be fully explored.

Secretary Dulles—We are senator, exploring that very fully. We are doing everything we can to try to limit this particular Egypt-Czech deal to a one-shot operation.

Whether we will succeed or not, I don't know. When I say "succeed," I mean succeed by our own efforts and those of friendly countries.

If it looks as though that would not succeed, perhaps in any event consideration might be given to United Nations action of the kind to which you refer.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, after some preliminary discussion questioned Mr. Dulles as follows.

Senator Humphrey—Am I to understand there is a mutual defense agreement with Egypt?

Secretary Dulles—Yes, Senator Humphrey—Well, then, why have I been informed within the last half hour that the very existence of this agreement is secret, and that is why the Treaty Division of the Department of State has no record?

Humphrey Is Disturbed

Senator Humphrey—I had that information, Mr. Secretary; it has kind of disturbed me.

Secretary Dulles—I think there must be some misunderstanding, perhaps, to what you were referring to. I do not think there is any secret to the fact that we have made these over-all agreements, under which arms can be bought, and I leave them to you, with Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and other countries.

Secretary Dulles—Well, I am very pleased to hear this, Mr. Hoover testified a moment ago to the effect that there were charges made in the press that export licenses might

not be in conformity with, I imagine, these agreements.

I would like to ask Mr. Hoover, who made those charges.

MR. HOOVER—They appeared over the radio programs late in the evening of Feb. 16, that this was a shipments that was not in conformance with the law.

Senator Humphrey—Who made them, Mr. Secretary?

MR. HOOVER—Offhand I do not know, but I think those kind of charges were flying around very widely at that time, the late afternoon and early evening of Feb. 16.

Senator Humphrey—Who was selling these tanks, Mr. Hoover?

MR. HOOVER—These tanks were being sold by the United States Government to Saudi Arabia.

Broker Sold Tanks

Senator Humphrey—By the United States Government, not by an independent merchant or broker?

MR. HOOVER—No, not by a broker.

Senator Humphrey—Then it is fair to assume that the United States Government knew what was in the export license?

MR. HOOVER—Certainly. It is fair to assume a responsible government would know exactly the terms for which these tanks—under which these tanks would be used; is that correct?

Secretary Dulles—It may be, I think that for many years, not just in recent years, but that running over a long period of years, there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia.

Status of Americans Asked

Senator Humphrey—I mean Americans; I am talking about citizens of the United States of America.

Secretary Dulles—I am talking about persons of Jewish faith.

Senator Humphrey—Yes, but Americans.

Secretary Dulles—Yes, of any nationality.

Senator Humphrey—Is it true that American businessmen, when they go to Saudi Arabia, are not permitted to engage in commercial enterprise in Saudi Arabia with our agreement and our recognition of that discrimination?

Secretary Dulles—No, not with our agreement or recognition of it. The King of Saudi Arabia himself, as the primary custodian of the sacred places of the Moslem faith, and they have a long time been extremely rigorous in the practice of the Moslem law.

I was there when I was visiting King Ibn Saud, it was during the period of the Ramadan, when there had been the very time the sun rises in the morning, and at that time of the year it rises very early—until it sets at night, no one can take a drop of liquid or a bite of food, and the former King Ibn Saud was an aging feeble man, but he nevertheless stuck rigorously to that, and there is another prohibition that applies there also. There is not a drop of liquor that is allowed to be sold or used in the whole area.

Now, they have got some practices which we may think curious.

Secretary Dulles—The Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States apparently spent a great deal of time in the discussion of this critical area. Is it not true that Saudi Arabia is an ally to Egypt?

MR. HOOVER—I believe they have some form of agreement. What it is I do not know, Senator.

Secretary Dulles—Is Saudi Arabia still in a state of—technically in a state of war with Israel?

MR. HOOVER—I believe that it technically is.

Secretary Dulles—Is Egypt technically in a state of war with Israel?

MR. HOOVER—I believe so.

Secretary Dulles—I understood the Secretary to say a few moments ago that these tanks were so far removed that they could not—in Saudi Arabia from Israel, that they could not be used for aggressive purposes; am I correct in that, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Dulles—Yes, I have been advised by the military people, who know about these things, that they could not be gotten across the deserts from Dhahran to Israel.

Secretary Dulles—Am I correctly informed . . . that there is a road which connects the Port of Dhahran up to the very frontier of Israel through the neighboring state of Jordan which likewise is a technical state of war with Israel; is that correct?

Secretary Dulles—Well, is your question does the map show it or is there such a road?

Secretary Dulles—Is there such a road?

Secretary Dulles—I understand there is no road which is passable for this type of tank. I get my authority on that from the military people who make and operate these tanks. These tanks are designed in any event, if I understand, they are the kind of tanks which are usable practically only for training purposes. They are designed only for training purposes.

Secretary Dulles—Now, the only possible enemy that Saudi Arabia could have in that area would be the area known as the Gulf of Aden, or the Gulf of Oman, they have had some hostilities in that area; isn't that correct?

Secretary Dulles—It is correct there have been some minor hostilities in that area, yes.

Secretary Dulles—We are not providing tanks for Saudi Arabia to engage our ally Great Britain are we?

Secretary Dulles—I understand the tanks are equally unavailable to move down to the Buraimi area.

Purpose of Tanks Asked

Secretary Dulles—Then, what purpose are the tanks for, Mr. Secretary? Do they just need tanks to feel good? I mean, if there is no possible enemy and you cannot move the tanks against any particular foreign enemy, what purpose are the tanks?

Secretary Dulles—The purpose, Senator, of the tanks is to maintain internal security. There has been a very substan-

tial danger from that source. There have been large-scale riots and disturbances at various points in that area, and there are also some 6,000 Americans living in that area, and we want to see protection given to our own citizens.

Secretary Dulles—Some of them are Jews, yes.

Secretary Dulles—Speaking of Americans who are in Saudi Arabia, is it true what I read in the paper here, and which I spoke about in the Senate, and which today the Pentagon apparently seems to feel departments in on is, to the effect that arrangements have been arrived at between our Government and Saudi Arabia under the terms of the Mutual Security Agreement and our air base at Dhahran, that certain American personnel are not permitted to be stationed in Saudi Arabia, and that certain personnel of the Jewish faith?

Secretary Dulles—It may be, I think that for many years, not just in recent years, but that running over a long period of years, there has been a prohibition on Jews in Saudi Arabia.

Secretary Dulles—Well, Senator, I would not get much of a rest. I do not get much away, but I do not get much all if every time I went off for a week's vacation the people in the State Department kept calling me up about matters.

Secretary Dulles—If the flow of arms from the Soviet world continues into the Middle East, what will be our intentions with respect to arms shipments to the State of Israel or other friendly powers?

Secretary Dulles—I would not care to answer that question here, Senator.

Secretary Dulles—Are you very optimistic that there will be political settlement between Israel and the Arab states?

Secretary Dulles—Well, I am not optimistic as to a political settlement of this particular Johnston plan within the next few days.

We had hoped that progress could be made so it could be settled before the first of March. However, those hopes were set back primarily by the Tiberias affair, and I would now have to put my sights a bit further forward, but I do believe that that plan will be accepted in the immeasurably near future, assuming, of course, the whole area does not blow up, which I do not think will happen, but it might.

Secretary Dulles—In case there should be a blow-up, Mr. Secretary, has this country, in concert with other countries, made any preparations for immediate action, action that would be corrective, or at least would hold the situation from getting out of hand?

Secretary Dulles—I would not want to answer that in detail, but, in general, the answer is, yes.

Secretary Dulles—Sufficiently, with sufficient speed and time not to permit the destruction of the states?

Secretary Dulles—I would not be prepared to over-write it to that extent, because that probably primarily is a military question. But, as I pointed out, that is the type of question which is being studied. It is a question which has been observed in the press recently, that some United States destroyers are that vicinity.

Secretary Dulles—Adhered to, did you say? (Laughter.)

Secretary Dulles—Go ahead, Mr. Secretary.

Calls Saudi Arabia Ally

Secretary Dulles—Now, we do not like or approve of or acquiesce, except in passing, in any such practices, such as that, but we do have to recognize the fact that Saudi Arabia is an ally, became an ally in the first instance, through the conversations and subsequent communications with President Roosevelt, and then it was confirmed by President Truman, and we have a very special relationship there with that Government.

Secretary Dulles—That is my next point, however. As you ship these arms into Saudi Arabia, and in view of at least what the press reported, the King of Saudi Arabia said not too long ago, along the lines of what the Senator from Minnesota pointed out, that he was not talking about sacrificing ten million Arabs in Saudi Arabia, but as I recall the account, he was talking about his feeling that the Arabian states ought to be willing if necessary to sacrifice ten million Arabs to put down Israel; when you have such indications of an unfriendly attitude, why should we assume that this agreement is going to mean very much, particularly if some tinderbox ignites over there, and these Arab states start on the move? What are we going to do then?

Secretary Dulles—On the basis of our experience, which goes back quite a little time, I think we have every reason to believe that the Saudi Government will live up to its obligations to us.

Secretary Dulles—Do you think that there is a danger of our approaching a potential danger in this area of the country, with all the threats and counter-threats that are being uttered?

Secretary Dulles—Well, we have been brought close to the edge of war before and we may again. That depends upon other people.

Secretary Dulles—Would it be fair to say that American foreign policy in the Middle East today is another example of our art of coming close to the brink of war but still avoiding it?

Secretary Dulles—If we are brought close to war, I hope we will have the art to avoid it.

Peril of War Asked

Secretary Dulles—Do you think that there is a danger, that there is a potential danger, of war in the Middle East now?

Secretary Dulles—I would think that there was some danger of war in the Middle East now, yes, and if so, I hope we will avoid going into it, but we have duties and obligations.

Secretary Dulles—Certainly hope there is a chance of avoiding a war, but looking at Israel for the moment, if we take the position that we are not going to ship her any arms, and she seeks eighteen tanks going to Saudi Arabia which have maneuvered, that they take advantage of the denial of human rights in a totalitarian government, and the people that rise up against that totalitarianism frequently will find themselves in the control of Communist subversive groups.

Secretary Dulles—That's correct.

Secretary Dulles—I recognize that, but when we ship arms under the Saudi Arabia agreement of 1951 to this totalitarian government, to keep down, in part, internal uprisings, do we not play into the hands of Russian propaganda in the free nations of the world, still free nations of the world, in Southeast Asia and elsewhere, where they are trying to win this fight for freedom? That what we are doing is using the military support of the United States to keep down human rights and freedom?

France and Italy Cited

Secretary Dulles—I do not think that that is the case, Senator, certainly in the case of Saudi Arabia. And as far as the Soviet Communists are concerned themselves with democratic rights.

Secretary Dulles—They are trying to break down democratic processes in countries like France and Italy, and to substitute totalitarianism in its place. So I do not think that in any way the hand of the Soviets is possibly strengthened by what we are doing in Saudi Arabia.

Secretary Dulles—Of course, I like to think that there are groups in totalitarian countries who are not controlled by Communists, but who are seeking to better the lot and dignity of the individual person. I just have a sneaking suspicion that if I was a resident of such a country and if I were a member of such a dissident group, I would look with disfavor upon anybody sending in arms to a country to prevent my securing liberty. I think notice is taken of that in parts of the world where we are trying to win fights for freedom.

Use in Aggression Denied

Now, in regard to this sale of tanks, do you think these eighteen tanks have increased the war-making potential of Saudi Arabia?

Secretary Dulles—That could be done. As I pointed out, the agreement of '51 provides that they shall not be transferred to any other country.

I realize agreements have been violated, but you cannot do business with countries that have demonstrated their friendliness and loyalty to the United States on the assumption that they are going to violate their agreements.

Arab Statements Cited

Secretary Dulles—That is my next point, however. As you ship these arms into Saudi Arabia, and in view of at least what the press reported, the King of Saudi Arabia said not too long ago, along the lines of what the Senator from Minnesota pointed out, that he was not talking about sacrificing ten million Arabs in Saudi Arabia, but as I recall the account, he was talking about his feeling that the Arabian states ought to be willing if necessary to sacrifice ten million Arabs to put down Israel; when you have such indications of an unfriendly attitude, why should we assume that this agreement is going to mean very much, particularly if some tinderbox ignites over there, and these Arab states start on the move? What are we going to do then?

Secretary Dulles—On the basis of our experience, which goes back quite a little time, I think we have every reason to believe that the Saudi Government will live up to its obligations to us.

Secretary Dulles—Do you think that there is a danger of our approaching a potential danger in this area of the country, with all the threats and counter-threats that are being uttered?

Secretary Dulles—Well, we have been brought close to the edge of war before and we may again. That depends upon other people.

Secretary Dulles—Would it be fair to say that American foreign policy in the Middle East today is another example of our art of coming close to the brink of war but still avoiding it?

Secretary Dulles—If we are brought close to war, I hope we will have the art to avoid it.

Peril of War Asked

Secretary Dulles—Do you think that there is a danger, that there is a potential danger, of war in the Middle East now?

Secretary Dulles—I would think that there was some danger of war in the Middle East now, yes, and if so, I hope we will avoid going into it, but we have duties and obligations.

Secretary Dulles—Certainly hope there is a chance of avoiding a war, but looking at Israel for the moment, if we take the position that we are not going to ship her any arms, and she seeks eighteen tanks going to Saudi Arabia which have maneuvered, that they take advantage of the denial of human rights in a totalitarian government, and the people that rise up against that totalitarianism frequently will find themselves in the control of Communist subversive groups.

Secretary Dulles—That's correct.

Secretary Dulles—I recognize that, but when we ship arms under the Saudi Arabia agreement of 1951 to this totalitarian government, to keep down, in part, internal uprisings, do we not play into the hands of Russian propaganda in the free nations of the world, still free nations of the world, in Southeast Asia and elsewhere, where they are trying to win this fight for freedom? That what we are doing is using the military support of the United States to keep down human rights and freedom?

France and Italy Cited

Secretary Dulles—I do not think that that is the case, Senator, certainly in the case of Saudi Arabia. And as far as the Soviet Communists are concerned themselves with democratic rights.

Secretary Dulles—They are trying to break down democratic processes in countries like France and Italy, and to substitute totalitarianism in its place. So I do not think that in any way the hand of the Soviets is possibly strengthened by what we are doing in Saudi Arabia.