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The Editor of the Bulletin wishes to call attention to the following errors in Volume XXXV:

October 29, page 664, "President's Determination Concerning Aid to Yugoslavia": The date in the press release line and in the first line should be October 15 rather than October 16.

November 19, page 798, right-hand column, fourth line from the top: "noble" should read "humble."

December 3, page 871, "Proposal of Ceylon, India, and Indonesia": The document number should be A/Res/408.
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SECRETARY DULLES' STATEMENT AT WHITE HOUSE, SEPTEMBER 17

White House press release dated September 17

President Eisenhower and I have been talking over the Suez question in advance of my departure today for London. The United Kingdom has called together another meeting of the representatives of the 18 governments which supported the views put to the Government of Egypt by the five-nation mission headed by Prime Minister Menzies of Australia.¹

Let me make certain things quite clear:

1. The United States is dedicated to seeking by peaceful means assurance that the Suez Canal will carry out the international purpose to which it is dedicated by the convention of 1888.

2. We are not, however, willing to accept for ourselves, nor do we seek from other nations acceptance of, an operating regime for the canal which falls short of recognizing the rights granted to canal users by the 1888 convention.

3. We are not trying to organize any boycott of the canal, but we cannot be blind to the fact that conditions might become such that transit through the canal is impractical or greatly diminished. There must always be ways to assure the movement of vital supplies, particularly oil, to Western Europe. Accordingly, we are carrying out planning as a prudent precaution. But our hope remains that satisfactory operating arrangements can be worked out with Egypt.

At London we will consider developments since the previous conference on the Suez adjourned August 23 and, I hope, find a common approach to the future.

¹ For background, see Bulletin of Aug. 27, 1956, p. 335; Sept. 3, 1956, p. 371; and Sept. 24, 1956, p. 467.

SECRETARY DULLES' STATEMENT AT FIRST PLENARY SESSION, SEPTEMBER 19

Press release 497 dated September 20

Our meeting here last month gave rise to solid hope that the Suez Canal problem could be settled. Eighteen of us had come to an agreement. We represented nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and America. Our shipping constituted over 90 percent of all the Suez Canal shipping. Among us were those whose patterns of trade showed differing, yet important, dependence upon the canal. It was no small achievement that out of that diversity agreement was reached. That was possible only because there prevailed among us a spirit of conciliation, and of urgency, born out of the gravity of the situation with which the Government of Egypt has confronted us.

What we agreed upon was a program to assure permanently an efficient and dependable operation, maintenance, and development of the Suez Canal in accordance with the treaty of 1888.² That program was scrupulously respectful of the sovereignty of Egypt.

However, as our Committee of Five has just reported to us, the Government of Egypt unquali-

About the Bulletin's new cover...

For 7 years following its inception in July 1939, the Bulletin appeared in a plain black-and-white cover. With the issue of October 6, 1946, the publication adopted a more distinctive cover design using color.

Now the Bulletin has undergone another transformation. The new cover, designed by the Division of Visual Services of the Department of State, gives greater prominence and readability to the table of contents and permits a wider range of color tones. As has been the practice during the last 10 years, the color will be changed every 6 months to indicate the beginning of a new volume.
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fiedly refused to consider our proposal as a basis of negotiation. It made no counterproposal.

This attitude of Egypt has created a new and difficult situation.

Exercising the restraint enjoined by the charter of the United Nations, we continue to seek, by peaceful means, a solution of this difficult problem.

Certain things are, I think, clear.

1. The convention of 1888 gives our vessels the right at all times to pass through the Suez Maritime Canal as a free and open waterway.

2. Those rights are jeopardized by the action of the Egyptian Government in preventing the Universal Suez Canal Company from exercising its agreed functions and in Egypt itself usurping all of those functions.

It is true that, although the Egyptian Government has unilaterally terminated the concession to the Universal Suez Canal Company, which was part of the system referred to and established by the convention of 1888, that Government says that it will nevertheless live up to the convention itself and assure a fair and equal operation of the canal.

But the testing issue is whether the Government of Egypt accepts that the parties to, and beneficiaries of, the convention of 1888 may in fact have the facilities needed to assure them in the exercise of their rights. If the Government of Egypt insists that ships' masters be in the position of suppliants, who can never pass through the canal except under such conditions as the Government of Egypt may from time to time impose, then there is no guaranty of free and secure passage such as the convention of 1888 prescribes.

I know that the Government of Egypt has argued that it can always, by the use of force, interrupt traffic through the Suez Canal and that therefore transit must depend on Egypt's good faith and good will. But there are many sanctions against open and forcible interruption of free passage. The same is not true if any one government dominates and controls all phases of operation. The operation of the Suez Canal is a highly complicated, intricate affair. It offers infinite possibilities of covert violation and the practice, in obscurity, of preferences and discriminations. Lack of efficiency can be a grave hazard. It is against risks of this kind that the users can, and I believe should, protect themselves in the exercise of their rights under the 1888 treaty. The economic well-being of many nations and peoples is at stake, and there are no adequate sanctions against the dangers I describe.

3. The third point I would like to make is this: When vital rights are threatened, it is natural and elemental to join to meet the common danger.

The Government of Egypt has warned us not to join together in association. It is natural that it should prefer the canal users to be unorganized and divided. I recall that in its memorandum of September 10, 1956, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to many governments, the Egyptian Government seeks the creation of a negotiating body that will reflect what it calls "different views." But for those endangered to come together and to harmonize their views is an elemental right, not to be forgone.

Outline of Proposal for Association

What is it that we seek? It is nothing hostile to, or prejudicial to, Egypt.

Let me outline briefly the proposal for association as it is understood by the Government of the United States.

1. It means first of all that we should continue our present association. This not for the purpose of enabling any one or more of us to impose our views upon any of our associates. The only basis for association is such a common will as we may freely achieve. Nor is it our purpose to coerce Egypt. It is merely that the necessities of the situation make continuing association useful for ourselves and for all who depend upon the canal. Also, such association will be in the interest of Egypt whenever she is willing constructively to seek a solution with those who are chiefly concerned. Also, it is in the interest of world peace that we stand together.

2. We would, I suppose, in association, continue to accept, as a basis for the negotiation of a permanent solution, our joint statement of August 23, 1956.

3. We would, I suggest, find it useful to have a small operating staff which would be ready to assist our ships, and the ships that serve our countries, in operating through the canal. We need not, I think, exclude the possibility of finding, on a provisional, de facto, practical operating basis, a measure of cooperation with the Egyptian canal authorities, even though the Government of Egypt

---

1 Not printed.
I would like to indicate a little bit the broad perspective in which the United States, at least, sees this meeting. This meeting is far more important than just the question of whether a boat or two gets through the canal or does not get through, or even whether the canal breaks down. We are dealing with one of the most significant aspects of postwar life. Upon what we do, in my opinion, will very largely depend the question of whether or not, in fact, we are going to build a peaceful world.

Our problem is no less than that in its importance. Now, why do I say that? I say that because we all want a world in which force is not used. True, but that is only one side of the coin. If you have a world in which force is not used, you must also have a world in which a just solution of problems of this sort can be achieved. I don't care how many words are written into the charter of the United Nations about not using force. If, in fact, there is not, as a substitute for force, some way to get just resolutions of some of these problems, inevitably the world will fall back again into anarchy and into chaos.

And I would like to point out, fellow delegates, that the United Nations Charter itself does not just say, "There must be peace." What does it say? The very first article of the United Nations Charter says that the purpose of the United Nations is to bring about settlements "by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law." And if that latter part is forgotten, the first part of it will inevitably come to be ignored.

We have to realize, when we have to deal with problems of this character, that we are not really in the long run furthering the cause of peace, even peace for those of us who seem remote from the particular problem, if we don't feel that we have just as much a responsibility to try to seek a solution "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law" as we have a responsibility to try to prevent the use of force. If we only put our emphasis upon one side of that problem and forget the other, then our efforts are going to be doomed. And the hopes represented by this charter of the United Nations are equally going to be doomed.

Now we are faced here with a problem whereby great nations are faced with a great peril. Nobody, I think, can fairly dispute that fact. It is a peril that they could readily remedy if they resorted to the methods which were lawful before this charter was adopted. Then, we wouldn't be sitting around here—perhaps somebody else wouldn't be sitting where he is, either. But those days, we hope, are past. There has been exercised, and is being exercised, a great restraint in the face of a great peril. But you cannot expect that to go on indefinitely unless those of us who appreciate the problem, who are sympathetic with it, rally our forces to try to bring about a settlement which is not only a peaceful settlement but a settlement "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law."

Some may feel, although I do not think anyone here feels—it could be felt by some nations that are not immediately involved in this problem—that the only aspect of it that concerns them is the problem of peace and that, if you can just be sure that there won't be force used, you can just forget about the rest of it. That is only half of the problem, and you cannot solve the problem just by halfway measures which relate only to peace and which do not also put the full weight of our strength behind what we believe to be a solution "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law."

Now, we agreed on what we thought were principles of justice and international law in relation to this matter. Our conclusions are reflected in the statement that we agreed upon in the month of August. We are here primarily because we are the 18 who not only have this great interest of our own in the situation but because we agree on the principles of international law and of justice as applicable to this situation. I believe that we owe it to ourselves, to every one of the nations here involved, to stand together to try to work this thing out, not just in terms of peace but to work it out in terms of bringing about a just solution in accordance with the principles of international law and in accordance with the provisions of the charter. I believe if we don't do that, if we scatter, thinking that the problem is solved because perhaps the danger of war seems a little less than it did, then I believe we will have done a great disservice to ourselves.

What we do in that respect—if that should be what we would do—would come back to plague us and haunt us in the days to come. So I say, let's stick together in this proposition and continue to work not only for "peace" but also for peace "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law."
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canal; he could help coordinate routes through or around the canal, if the latter proved necessary; he could be authorized to act as the agent of the shipowners and collect and pay out such sums of money as are appropriate in connection with the maintenance of and transit through the canal, and the performance of his other duties.

4. It would, I think, be useful if our association had a small governing board chosen from among our number who would be able to keep us informed with respect to developments, call us together whenever there was occasion, and appoint the administrative agent and fix his authority and the principles which would govern and control his action on behalf of the association.

It is, I suppose, inevitable that those interested in the movement of passengers and freight between the East and the West and in the production of oil and other goods for such transit should now be thinking in terms of long-range alternatives to the Suez Canal. For example, there is much talk at the present time about larger tankers which could go around the Cape of Good Hope with greater economy than smaller tankers passing through the canal. There is talk of new pipelines. I would hope that the governing board of our users' association would keep in touch with all of these projects and keep all of the members informed of any serious developments which would materially affect our economic lives.

5. It would, I think, be useful if the association had a modest working fund to be advanced initially by the members and reimbursed out of sums hereafter collected from member ships for services rendered.

6. Membership in the association would not, as we see it, involve the assumption by any member of any obligation. It would, however, be hoped that members of the association would voluntarily take such action with respect to their ships and the payment of canal dues as would facilitate the work of the association and build up its prestige and authority, and consequently its ability to serve. This action, I emphasize, would be entirely a voluntary action by each of the member governments if it saw fit to take it.

Cooperation on Practical Basis

Such, in broad outline, could be the association that we organize. The extent of its practical utility will, of course, depend much, though not wholly, upon Egypt's attitude. But our readiness to cooperate with Egypt on a practical basis serves again to demonstrate our desire to leave no reasonable step untried in the search for a solution of the grave problem that confronts us and, indeed, the world.

This readiness of ours to cooperate with Egypt on a de facto provisional basis may also suggest a provisional solution which the United Nations might find it useful to invoke while the search for a permanent solution goes on. It has, I know, been the thinking of many of us that, if the principal parties to the Suez dispute are unable to find a solution by means of their own choosing, the offices of the United Nations should be availed of.

The United States believes that action along the lines here suggested will helpfully increase the possibilities of a peaceful and constructive solution.

SECRETARY DULLES' FINAL REMARKS AT CONCLUDING SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21

Press release 501 dated September 22

Mr. Chairman [British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd], as the proposal for the users' association has been evolved here, it does not, as we see it, impose any such legal obligations upon the members as would require my Government to submit it to the Senate or the Congress for its action. It is an organization designed to promote the exercise by our citizens of rights which we believe that they have, and to settle existing difficulties, and to be, in general, an instrumentality for peace and order in this matter.

Under these circumstances, my Government feels in a position to act at once on the matter. And I expect before leaving London this night to leave with you, Mr. Chairman, a statement on behalf of my Government informing you that we subscribe to the declaration, that it will be our intention to comply loyally with its letter and spirit and to seek to promote the purposes which are set out in the document.

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I want to join with others who have expressed their appreciation to you of the way in which you have conducted this conference, and to your Government for the courtesies and facilities that it has extended to us.

I believe that this conference has been of very great importance to finding peace in the way in
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which I suggested earlier, at least for now, that is, by working for a solution of these problems in accordance with the principles of justice and international law. I hope that we can stay together for the future, because I believe that the risk of war increases as our disunity increases, and the chance of peace increases as our unity is preserved.

I realize that we all face differing problems and that the circumstances for some are difficult. But I think that all can feel that, as we maintain our unity, we are making an indispensable contribution today to the kind of international effort which any one of us may be calling for in the future to help us out of predicaments in which we may be.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have served a very important purpose and it is my Government's intention to continue along this way.

**MR. DULLES TO MR. LLOYD, SEPTEMBER 21**

I am glad to inform you that the Government of the United States subscribes to the Declaration providing for a Cooperative Association of Suez Canal Users.

The United States as a member of this Association will seek in cooperation with the other Members to assist the Association to achieve its intended purposes.

Immediately upon my return steps will be taken with our Treasury officials and with the representatives of owners of American flag vessels which largely transit the Suez Canal with a view to perfecting this cooperation in terms of actual operating practices.

**STATEMENT AND DECLARATION ISSUED AT FINAL SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21**

Press release 502 dated September 22

**Statement Issued by the Second London Conference on the Suez Canal**

Representatives of the 18 Governments who joined in the proposals which were subsequently submitted to the Egyptian Government by the Five Nation Committee presided over by the Prime Minister of Australia, the Right Honorable Robert Menzies, as a basis for negotiating a settlement of the Suez Canal question, met in London from September 19 to 21, 1956. Their purpose was to consider the situation in the light of the report of that Committee and other developments since the first London Conference.

They noted with regret that the Egyptian Government did not accept these proposals and did not make any counterproposals to the Five Nation Committee.

It is the view of the Conference that these proposals still offer a fair basis for a peaceful solution of the Suez Canal problem, taking into account the interests of the user nations as well as those of Egypt. The 18 Governments will continue their efforts to obtain such a settlement. The proposal made by the Egyptian Government on September 10 was placed before the Conference but it was considered too imprecise to afford a useful basis for discussion.

A Declaration was drawn up providing for the establishment of a Suez Canal Users Association. The text of this Declaration is annexed hereto. This Association is designed to facilitate any steps which may lead to a final or provisional solution of the Suez Canal problem. It will further cooperation between the Governments adhering to it, concerning the use of the Canal. For this purpose it will seek the cooperation of the competent Egyptian authorities pending a solution of the larger issues. It will also deal with such problems as would arise if the traffic through the Canal were to diminish or cease. The Association will be established as a functioning entity at an early date after the delegates to this Conference have had an opportunity to consult in relation thereto with their respective Governments.

The Conference noted that on September 12, 1956, the Governments of the U.K. and France informed the Security Council of the United Nations of the situation, and that subsequently, on September 17, the Government of Egypt also made a communication to the Security Council. The Conference considers that recourse should be had to the United Nations whenever it seems that this would facilitate a settlement.

The representatives of the 18 Governments have found their cooperation at the Conference valuable and constructive. The 18 Governments will continue to consult together in order to maintain

---

*The name of the association was subsequently changed to the Suez Canal Users Association.


a common approach to the problems which may arise out of the Suez question in the future.

It is the conviction of the Conference that the course outlined in this statement is capable of producing by peaceful means a solution which is in conformity with the principles of justice and international law as declared in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Declaration Providing for the Establishment of a Suez Canal Users Association

I. The members of the Suez Canal Users Association (SCUA) shall be those nations which have participated in the second London Suez Conference and which subscribe to the present Declaration, and any other adhering nations which conform to criteria to be laid down hereafter by the Association.

II. SCUA shall have the following purposes:

(1) To facilitate any steps which may lead to a final or provisional solution of the Suez Canal problem and to assist the members in the exercise of their rights as users of the Suez Canal in consonance with the 1888 Convention, with due regard for the rights of Egypt;

(2) To promote safe, orderly, efficient and economical transit of the Canal by vessels of any member nation desiring to avail themselves of the facilities of SCUA and to seek the cooperation of the competent Egyptian authorities for this purpose;

(3) To extend its facilities to vessels of non-member nations which desire to use them;

(4) To receive, hold and disburse the revenues accruing from dues and other sums which any user of the Canal may pay to SCUA, without prejudice to existing rights, pending a final settlement;

(5) To consider and report to members regarding any significant developments affecting the use or non-use of the Canal;

(6) To assist in dealing with any practical problems arising from the failure of the Suez Canal adequately to serve its customary and intended purpose and to study forthwith means that may render it feasible to reduce dependence on the Canal;

(7) To facilitate the execution of any provisional solution of the Suez problem that may be adopted by the United Nations.

III. To carry out the above mentioned purposes:

(1) The members shall consult together in a Council on which each member will be represented;

(2) The Council shall establish an executive group to which it may delegate such powers as it deems appropriate;

(3) An Administrator, who shall, inter alia, make the necessary arrangements with shipping interests, will be appointed to serve under the direction of the Council through the executive group.

IV. Membership may at any time be terminated by giving 60 days' notice.

Proposal To Exchange Flights Over Arctic With U.S.S.R.

Press release 496 dated September 29

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

The United States Government on September 19 informed the Government of the U.S.S.R. that it is prepared to enter into an agreement with the Soviet Government for reciprocal aerial observation of Arctic ice in connection with the International Geophysical Year, 1957-58, including exchange of landing rights and the use of equipment, facilities, and personnel related to the flights.1 A note outlining the proposal by the U.S. Government was delivered to the Soviet Embassy by the Department of State in Washington.

Agreement is being sought through diplomatic channels on specific operating details such as a schedule of flights, designation of landing sites, and other factors. It is anticipated that the flights will begin in the spring of 1957 and coincide with the period of maximum daylight, approximately March through September. The suggested American terminal is Nome, Alaska, while the suggested Soviet terminal is Murmansk.

The U.S. proposal is designed to increase the potentials for geophysical research into the dynamics of the flow of ice in the Arctic Basin, thus providing vital scientific knowledge of value to all nations. From the data collected it should be possible to determine the laws of motion of the movement of portions of the icepack and the ice-

1 For background on the International Geophysical Year, see Bulletin of Dec. 12, 1955, p. 989. For information on the IGY satellite program, see ibid., Aug. 13, 1956, p. 280.
pack as a whole. The extent of melting can only be ascertained after the motions are better understood.

TEXT OF U.S. NOTE

The United States Government has undertaken to provide logistical support to the United States National Committee for the International Geophysical Year in carrying out ice observation flights to survey dynamics characteristics and limits of the polar ice pack as part of the Committee’s participation in the activities of the International Geophysical Year beginning next year.

The Committee has informed the United States Government that the Soviet National Committee of the International Geophysical Year also was interested in making ice observation flights over the polar ice pack from Soviet territory.

The United States Committee informed this Government that, at the Arctic Conference of the Ice in Stockholm in May 1956, it proposed that the flights mentioned above be coordinated by the two Committees in order to improve the resulting scientific data. The United States Committee also informed this Government that during the discussion on this point, Soviet representatives at the Conference in turn proposed that alternate flights by Soviet and American planes between the Murmansk and Nome bases be exchanged in order to obtain a more comprehensive photographic record of the polar ice pack and its changes and indicated that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be willing to participate in such an exchange of flights.

In the light of the above, the United States Government proposes that the Soviet Government agree to an arrangement whereby Soviet and American planes would make alternate flights between Murmansk and Nome during the period of maximum daylight—approximately March to September—along routes and under such operating conditions as agreed upon by our two Governments.

If the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics accepts this proposal in principle, the Government of the United States will make specific suggestions as to the manner, place and time for carrying out the necessary negotiations concerning the operational aspects of the project.

Anniversary of Death of Nikola Petkov

Press release 500 dated September 22

The execution of the Bulgarian patriot Nikola Petkov on September 23, 1947, by Bulgarian Communist authorities violated all principles of justice and humanity. He was falsely charged and condemned, and the democratic Agrarian Party, which he led, was arbitrarily suppressed. On this 9th anniversary of Petkov’s tragic death the Communist regime of Bulgaria remains stigmatized by these acts which it has as yet made no effort to rectify.

Nikola Petkov was one of four Bulgarian leaders who signed the armistice in 1944 which took his country out of the war as an ally of Nazi Germany. He played an active role in establishing a democratic coalition government. However, when it became evident in July 1945 that the Communist minority had usurped the powers of government, Petkov and the majority of his Agrarian followers withdrew in protest. From then until his arrest in 1947, Petkov, as the acknowledged leader of the democratic forces in Bulgaria, opposed communism in his country with unyielding courage.

By his devotion to the cause of freedom and his valiant efforts in defense of democratic principles, Nikola Petkov earned the lasting admiration and respect of the free world. The memory of his name is no less enduring than the ideals for which he struggled.

Mr. Aigner Appointed to Tribunals on German External Debts

The Department of State announced on September 17 (press release 489) the appointment of Martin Aigner of New York City as the United States member of the Arbitral Tribunal and the Mixed Commission established pursuant to the Agreement on German External Debts of February 27, 1953.1 The Arbitral Tribunal, which is composed of members appointed by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, has exclusive jurisdiction as provided in article 28 of the agreement in disputes between the

---

1 Treaties and Other International Acts Series 2792.
parties to the agreement. The Mixed Commission, composed of members similarly appointed, has jurisdiction as provided in article 31 of the agreement in the interpretation of annex IV to the agreement. These tribunals have their seat at Coblenz, Germany.

**Surplus U.S. Foods To Feed Italian Children**

The International Cooperation Administration announced on September 4 that it had authorized the use of some 26,700 tons of surplus American food to help supplement the diet of 1,700,000 needy Italian children for a second year.

The U.S. agricultural products are supplied to the Italian Government to improve and expand its school-lunch and other child-feeding programs. The foodstuffs provided by the United States—dry milk, butter, dried beans, flour, and cheese—supplementing food supplied by the Italian Government, are improving the nutritional value of the children's diet as well as making possible the feeding of a greater number of children.

Under the first year's program, the United States has provided nearly 40,000 tons of American farm products for the 12 months of the Italian feeding program ending September 30. In addition, the Italian Government has provided similar commodities as well as other foods such as fruits, vegetables, and sweets.

As agreed by the two Governments, the joint child nutrition program covers a 3-year period, with the United States contributing less food each year and the Italian Government increasing its contribution each year, to keep the total of the major food staples at a level of more than 50,000 tons distributed annually. Besides its increasing contribution of food, the Italian Government pays the ocean freight charges on the American food as well as all costs of the program in Italy.

The new supplies are for the year beginning October 1. Valued at $13.5 million (Commodity Credit Corporation cost), they include about 3,900 metric tons of dry milk, 1,400 tons of butter, 5,800 tons of cheese, 2,400 tons of dried beans, and 12,900 tons of flour or wheat equivalent.

The U.S. commodities provided for the first year's program, valued at some $18 million (Commodity Credit Corporation cost), have included some 5,000 metric tons of dry milk, 1,500 tons of butter, 7,600 tons of cheese, 3,600 tons of dried beans, 19,000 tons of flour or wheat equivalent, and 1,500 tons of vegetable oil.

Italy's child-feeding program, which began in 1945, now provides meals for 1,300,000 needy children in schools and kindergartens and 400,000 in orphanages and summer camps. Under the agreement between the United States and Italy, the Italian people are kept informed that the food sent from here is a gift of the people of the United States. The donated foods do not displace normal sales of these commodities.

The U.S. foodstuffs are provided under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480). Title II, which is administered by ICA, authorizes grants to friendly nations of agricultural products held as surplus by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

**Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy**

**84th Congress, 2d Session**

The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. H. Doc. 443, June 14, 1956. 145 pp.


Control and Reduction of Armaments. Hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to S. Res. 93 and 185, 84th Congress. Part 9, June 16, 1956. 174 pp.


Foreign Trade in Cotton Textiles. Hearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on S. 4156, a bill to assist the United States cotton textile industry in regaining its equitable share of the world market, July 16, 1956. 33 pp.

Assistant Secretaries for Research and Development; Loan of Naval Vessels. Hearing before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on H.R. 11575, providing for an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development for each of the three military departments; H.R. 11613, authorizing the loan of naval vessels to foreign governments. July 19, 1956. 29 pp.


Laws Controlling Illicit Narcotics Traffic. Addendum to S. Doc. 120, 84th Congress: Summary of Federal legislation enacted during the 2d session, 84th Congress, for the control of the illicit narcotics traffic, presented by Mr. Clements. S. Doc. 145, July 31, 1956. 11 pp.
Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives
Holds First Meeting

Following is the text of a statement made by Milton S. Eisenhower on September 17 before the Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives, which met at Washington September 17-19, together with the communiqué which the Committee issued at the close of the meeting. Dr. Eisenhower serves as President Eisenhower’s representative on the Committee.

STATEMENT BY DR. EISENHOWER

White House press release dated September 17

The President of the United States in his address at the signing of the Declaration of Principles at the Meeting of Panama last July laid stress upon the work that might be initiated to “. . . hasten the beneficial use of nuclear forces throughout the hemisphere, both in industry and in combating disease.”¹

Much thought has been given by the United States Government to ways and means by which all of the American Republics jointly might accelerate the use of this new force to bring greater health and happiness and abundance into the lives of all our peoples.

There are numerous ways in which nuclear energy may be put to the service of human welfare. Our Governments were represented at the U.N. Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva last year, and there a vision was caught of the boons which might be gained by mankind through utilization of this new force. The United States is interested in the attainment of these benign results as soon as feasible.

Many of the Governments of the other American Republics have negotiated agreements for cooperation with the United States which will bring aid to their programs of nuclear research and new knowledge from this research to benefit their citizens. Such agreements have been negotiated with 11 of the American Republics; three more are under discussion. Under one agreement already completed, the President’s offer of aid in financing the construction of a research reactor has been accepted and the United States commitment to pay a $350,000 contribution has been given.

President Eisenhower announced in February of this year that the United States initially will make available for distribution abroad 20,000 kilograms of uranium 235, the refined fissionable material that serves as the fuel for nuclear-power reactors.² Under United States laws, our Government can provide nuclear fuels for research and power reactors only to those friendly nations with which we have concluded agreements for cooperation.

Such agreements for cooperation in the field of nuclear power are under discussion with three of the other American Republics—Argentina, Brazil, and Cuba. Discussions have not yet been undertaken by other member nations of the Organization of American States. The United States hopes they soon will be, for it is the desire of this Government that the American Republics make use of their full share of the stocks of nuclear fuel which have been already allocated, and the additional supplies that shall hereafter be set aside, to aid in the development of atomic power in friendly nations.

However, there are some helpful things that can be done while waiting for research and power-reactor agreements of cooperation to be concluded, and the United States is ready, willing, and able to accelerate the application of nuclear energy to human welfare in the American Republics. In this spirit, the United States Atomic Energy Commission has recently taken two steps and soon will take a third.

²Ibid., Mar. 19, 1956, p. 469.
The first of these steps was the inauguration last month of a special program of assistance to the University of Puerto Rico to enable it to establish programs of training and instruction in the Spanish language in the field of atomic energy. A second step was the formulation earlier this month of a program to cooperate with the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences at Turrialba, Costa Rica. A third project is the convening early next year of a symposium in which scientists and atomic energy officials of the 21 American Republics would exchange information and ideas on the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

The increasing use of radioisotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry, the development of nuclear propulsion for ships, and the inevitable large growth in electric power plants using nuclear energy instead of conventional sources of power are expected soon to put heavy demands on manpower resources for atomic-energy research and development.

The United States attaches great importance to the solution of the problem of how best to develop enough competent atomic scientists, engineers, and technicians in the immediate future. The world has not yet reached high noon in the atomic age but is only at the beginning of the dawn of a marvelous new era, the opportunities and responsibilities of which can hardly be imagined by any people now living.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission has progressively expanded its training programs and undertaken new ones to augment the supply of scientists and engineers in this country. It is also providing training assistance to friendly nations. There are now two schools supported by the Commission in which foreign students are trained—the International School of Nuclear Science and Engineering at Argonne, near Chicago, and the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies in Tennessee. Only 16 students from the other American Republics of this hemisphere are now enrolled in these schools.

New Program in Puerto Rico

One of the most recent actions taken by the United States Atomic Energy Commission to alleviate the impending shortage of nuclear scientists and technicians was the inauguration of a special program of assistance to and collaboration with the University of Puerto Rico. The Commission is providing a training research reactor and laboratory equipment and other forms of aid to the university to enable it to begin practical training, education, and research in the field of atomic energy not later than the beginning of the next college year. This program of assistance to the university will include aid to its School of Medicine, School of Science, College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, and Agricultural Experiment Station.

The Commission and Puerto Rican officials are now planning the installation of a 20,000-kilowatt nuclear-power plant to supply more electric power for commercial purposes and to serve as an auxiliary training facility for students attending the university. The implementation of this plan is, of course, subject to congressional approval.

This program will provide the University of Puerto Rico with unique nuclear training and research facilities within 3 or 4 years. Because these planned facilities would be truly outstanding and because instructions would be in Spanish, the University of Puerto Rico might well become a nuclear research and training center of interest to many of the countries of the hemisphere. In this connection, it is of interest to note that about 300 students from Central and South America are now attending the university, some of them under the technical assistance program of the United States International Cooperation Administration. If there should be evidence of a desire on the part of other students in the American Republics to enter the nuclear training and research courses at the University of Puerto Rico, the United States Government would, of course, cooperate in a program to include such students.

Earlier this month, the United States Government sent a team of three experts in the agricultural applications of atomic energy to Turrialba, Costa Rica, to discuss how atomic energy might be put to work in the program of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences. They found that the Institute is peculiarly adaptable to utilizing radioisotopes and radiation in tropical agricultural research. They reported that implementation of a program in the Institute utilizing atomic energy for training and research in agriculture could be expected to make substantial contributions in plant nutrition and breeding, preservation of foodstuffs, and protection against disease and pests.
Aid to Institute at Turrialba

Four programs to assist the Institute are now being organized by the Atomic Energy Commission.

First, the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies in Tennessee, an organization of colleges and universities maintained by the Commission, will accept applications for the course starting in early 1957 for those staff members for whom the Director of the Institute at Turrialba considers additional training desirable.

Second, the United States is prepared to make available to the Institute equipment for a radioisotope laboratory.

Third, if the Institute desires to set up a so-called “cobalt field” to study the effects of external radiation on a variety of plants, the United States would be willing to supply the radiation source and to give help in the technique of its use. Also the United States could provide radioisotopes for other research purposes.

Fourth, irradiation of plants and seed to obtain beneficial effects in new varieties and to acquire new knowledge of plant growth and development will be carried on for the Institute at the Brookhaven National Laboratory if the Institute so desires.

Inter-American Symposium

The United States Atomic Energy Commission is engaged in planning for an Inter-American Symposium on Nuclear Energy proposed to be held early next year at the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island, N. Y. These plans anticipate that both the scientific and economic aspects of nuclear energy would be discussed at first hand by appropriate representatives of the 21 American Republics. Among the topics proposed to be considered are:

1) the uses of radioisotopes in industry, agriculture, and medicine,
2) nuclear-reactor types and uses, with collateral discussion on the prospects of economic nuclear energy as a source of commercial power, and
3) factors to be considered in the organization and development of an effective nuclear energy program.

Following this 4- or 5-day symposium, several days of tours would be arranged to permit practical, close-at-hand inspections of our Atomic Energy Commission facilities and of hospitals, universities, and industrial establishments where the peaceful atom can be observed at work.

Believing this symposium to be a desirable forum to stimulate the use of nuclear energy throughout the American Republics, the United States Government, through its embassies, will shortly extend personal invitations to individuals who are prominently identified with the nuclear energy programs in the Latin American countries. It is hoped that there will be derived from this symposium an increased realization that this new servant of man—the atom—can improve the health and well-being of all the American peoples.

TEXT OF FINAL COMMUNIQUE

The first session of the Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives adjourned on the afternoon of September 19 after three days of intensive work. Representatives of 21 countries met five times in closed session characterized by informal and frank discussions.

The Committee was created pursuant to a suggestion made by President Dwight D. Eisenhower of the United States, at the Meeting of Presidents at Panama, July 21-22, 1956, and accepted by the Presidents of the other American Republics. This proposal was that each President appoint a representative to consider together ways of making the Organization of American States a more effective instrument of inter-American cooperation in economic, social, financial and technical fields, including attention to the problem of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The objective of this first meeting was to identify the problems for the solutions of which recommendations will subsequently be drafted and submitted to the Presidents of the American States in fulfillment of the foregoing mission. As a first step in the Committee’s deliberations, a general discussion was held concerning the approach to the Committee’s task which the various Representatives considered appropriate.

The general discussion yielded a widespread recognition of the importance of the task assigned to the Committee and a universal desire to proceed with the effective strengthening of the Organization of American States. It was felt that
ultimate recommendations should emphasize practical steps which the Organization of American States might take to promote the economic and social welfare of the peoples of the American continents. It was generally believed that the effective raising of the living standards of the American countries constitutes a long-range problem, to the solution of which the Oas could at this time make effective contributions.

The Committee then focused its attention upon the specific problems which in the opinion of the respective Representatives merited further study. The specific problems suggested for study fell under the main headings of economic, social, financial, technical, administrative and organizational, and nuclear energy. In all these fields emphasis was placed upon activities which might be considered under the general heading of technical-assistance activities and training and educational work. Great interest was also displayed in the possibility of developing through the Oas more effective and useful attention to specific economic and financial problems facing the various governments.

While Representatives at this stage did not feel in a position to express themselves definitively on any of the proposals which were advanced, the Committee can state that as a result of its three-day discussion, it has decided to proceed with study of the problems arising under the subjects summarized below:

A. Economic

1. Agriculture: Enlargement and wider dissemination of technical information; technical advice for governments; problems of development and trade in connection with agricultural products.
2. Industry: Industrial development and increase in industrial productivity.
4. Transportation: Expansion of, and greater facilities for, land and water transport.

B. Social

1. Public Health: Elimination of major diseases.
2. Education: Expansion and improvement in educational facilities; wider public participation in activities of the Oas.
3. Housing: Methods of solving social problems of housing; development of low-cost housing.
4. Social Security and Welfare: Advice to governments on establishment and improvement of social security and welfare programs and other activities of special concern to workers.

C. Financial

Obtaining capital from public and private sources.

D. Technical

Improvement and coordination of present technical assistance programs.

E. Organization and Administrative

Adequate administrative organization of the Oas and strengthening of Ia-Ecosoc [Inter-American Economic and Social Council], in the light of new recommendations for substantive work.

F. Atomic Energy

Possibility of using nuclear materials in scientific research, and coordinating national training activities.

The Committee has decided to meet again early in January, after the governments have had an opportunity to give further consideration to the problems mentioned above. The purpose of the second meeting will be to prepare a list of topics, drawn from the various suggestions discussed at the present meeting, which will constitute the agenda for a third and final meeting later in 1957.

The Secretary General of the Oas is being requested to prepare factual reports on a number of subjects discussed during the present meeting and to present such additional observations on various topics as he may consider desirable. A secretariat for the Committee is being established by the Chairman of the Committee to provide a central point of coordination and information for all committee activities.

At the final meeting, probably in March or April 1957, definitive recommendations regarding certain topics will be drafted for submission to the twenty-one American Presidents.

---

3 Dr. Eisenhower.
$100 Million Credit Established for Argentine Recovery

The following joint announcement was made on September 17 by Samuel C. Waugh, President and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank, and Ambassador Carlos A. Coll Benegas, head of the Argentine Financial Mission now visiting the United States. As head of the mission, Ambassador Coll Benegas represents the Minister of Treasury of Argentina, Eugenio Blanco.

The President and Directors of the Export-Import Bank and the Argentine Financial Mission have reviewed the economic and financial aspects of the economic recovery program of Argentina. The Argentine delegation outlined the extent to which the attainment of the objectives of the program is dependent upon the acquisition of capital equipment from abroad, which Argentina requires to regain and improve its former levels of productivity and exports. Primary emphasis was given to the rehabilitation of the transportation system, increasing the production of electric power, and the need for machinery to increase the output of Argentine industry and agriculture.

During its negotiations with the bank, the Argentine Financial Mission stressed the need for improving transportation facilities to reduce losses to the economy of Argentina resulting from the lack of sufficient capacity to move crops to market. The mission indicated that the transportation needs of Argentina fall into two categories: first, the emergency requirements, and, secondly, the overall rehabilitation of the transportation network, which over a period of years will require a substantial investment program to cover local costs and the capital equipment to be acquired abroad.

Mr. Waugh stated that the bank was impressed by the progress Argentina is making in attaining monetary and financial stability and by the efforts of the Argentine Government on behalf of free enterprise in the Argentine. The bank will continue to give due consideration to the progress Argentina continues to make in these respects.

The Export-Import Bank agreed to establish credits up to $100 million for Argentina to assist in financing the purchase of United States equipment and services required for projects of an urgent nature in the private and public sectors, including transportation, industry, and agriculture. The field of transportation embraces railroads, merchant marine, ports, highways, and commercial aviation. Credits in the public sector will be repaid over a period of 18 years, with interest at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Any credits that may be considered for requirements of privately owned enterprises will be utilized for the most urgent capital-equipment needs for purposes which will benefit the dollar exchange position of Argentina, under terms and conditions appropriate to the individual case.

It was agreed that a bank mission would visit Argentina at an early date to participate in a joint study of emergency requirements and related matters in order to facilitate the allocation of the credits.

EXIMBANK and the Government of Argentina will continue their joint discussions in connection with the economic recovery program of the Argentine.

U.S. Experts To Select Korean Art for Loan Exhibition

The Department of State announced on September 17 (press release 492) that Alan Priest, curator of Far Eastern art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, and Robert Treat Paine, Jr., one of the curators of the department of Asiatic art at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, have left for Korea under the international educational exchange program. They were invited by the Government of Korea to assist in selecting objects from that country's national art collection for a loan exhibition to be held in the United States during 1958. They will also give lectures during their 6-week stay in Korea.

Tentative plans are being made for the exhibition to open at the National Gallery of Art at Washington, D. C., with other exhibitions scheduled to be held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the Institute of Arts at Minneapolis, the California Palace of the Legion of Honor at San Francisco, and the Honolulu Academy of Arts. It will be the first time that a loan exhibition of Korea's national art treasures has ever been held outside of Korea.
UNESCO and American Foreign Policy

by Francis O. Wilcox
Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs

This is the first time I have had the opportunity formally to address the National Commission for UNESCO. I welcome this opportunity, for I am keenly aware of the importance of your Commission. As a matter of fact, as chief of staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee back in 1946, I had the privilege of assisting in its creation when the Congress of the United States considered American participation in UNESCO.

The Commission is a unique institution within the framework of our Government. It is created by an act of Congress, its membership is in part selected by the Government, and it is financed from public funds. At the same time, in its work and activities it is free from governmental interference and control. The Government, I am sure you will agree, has scrupulously refrained from any attempt to exercise control over your work program, and we welcome the fact that the Commission itself has jealously guarded its independence.

Its members are representative of what is best in the educational, scientific, and cultural life of our Nation. Through you scholars, scientists, educators, and artists, organizers of libraries and museums, and representatives of cultural organizations, the American people themselves are speaking to our Government and are advising us on the policies we as a government should pursue in UNESCO, which is one of the most important of the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

Beyond being a bridge between the people of the United States and their Government, the National Commission has become a bridge also to the cultural life and aspirations of other countries that are members of UNESCO. As a result of the contacts which have been established between the United States Commission and national commissions in other countries, you have opened up new ways of communications between the peoples of various lands. Working in close cooperation with each other, the different national commissions have done much to make UNESCO more than just an organization of sovereign governments.

Over the years the work of your Commission has grown in stature. I know of the great contributions which only recently you have made in advising our Government in its preparations for the important conference which UNESCO will hold in New Delhi.

For all this, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you very sincerely. You have demonstrated that the Government and the people of the United States are at one in promoting a peaceful world, a world richer in social and cultural achievement, a world in which individuals everywhere will have a chance to develop their gifts and abilities to the full.

Importance of the Specialized Agencies

I suppose it is true that any person, when he becomes involved in a job or a program, has a tendency to take broad, major principles for granted and to concentrate largely on the day-to-day pressures and emergencies that confront him. This can be true particularly of those of us who are associated with international organizations and their affairs.

We may believe so much in what we are doing that we are inclined to forget that other people

---

1 Address made before the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at New York, N.Y., on Sept. 18.
may not believe as we do or perhaps do not understand at all. Perhaps the fact that we do at times neglect the general for the specific explains some of the difficulties in dealing with the public that organizations like these can occasionally have.

Today, therefore, let us spend a few minutes considering in general terms the part that organizations such as Unesco play in our world today. These are things we do know, to be sure; but they are things of which we must over and over again remind ourselves and our neighbors if our work is to be fully successful.

The specialized agencies, of which Unesco is one, represent what is perhaps the least glamorous aspect of United Nations activities. While the heated political debates in the General Assembly catch the headlines, the specialized agencies are carrying out their relatively humdrum tasks at the grassroots in many lands. They may not be working in full view of the television cameras, but in their quiet and unobtrusive way they are successfully grappling with problems that are very real to millions of people and are building solid support for the United Nations all over the world.

There are a few chronic critics—but not many—who are inclined to belittle the work of the specialized agencies. What good is it, they ask, if the United Nations can guarantee the delivery of our letters in Afghanistan or spare a few thousand people in Central America from the ravages of malaria, if it cannot prevent the outbreak of a thermonuclear war?

There is, of course, something to be said for this argument. After all, the prime responsibility of the United Nations remains the maintenance of international peace and security, and we should never lose sight of that important objective. But it can be argued that the specialized agencies, in slowly eroding the curtains of suspicion and distrust that hang between the nations, may be doing much more than we realize in creating the kind of climate in the world in which a lasting peace may eventually be built.

To the United States, the specialized agencies provide an opportunity to exercise its leadership, to help develop a sense of unity among the nations of the free world, and to gain good will and prestige. To the extent that these agencies contribute to relieve tensions, to reduce poverty, disease, and illiteracy, and to raise standards of living, their work contributes measurably to the efforts of our Government to combat the threat of communism throughout the world. Likewise, to the extent that they help governments develop the habit of cooperation and the routine of working together toward common goals, they are helping to lay stable foundations for a peaceful world.

Perhaps equally important, in a world where the underdeveloped countries are striving for psychological and political prestige and for freedom from any sort of domination on the part of other countries, our vigorous participation in the United Nations is extremely helpful. It is evidence to these countries that we are ready to take our part in working out mutual problems, ready to engage without fear or reservation in the free exchange of ideas, ready to lay a share of our great resources on the table for the common good.

We also seek to win the respect and friendship of our neighbors. In this objective we are like most other countries. We believe that this constant aim of our diplomacy can be profitably furthered through active participation in the agencies of the United Nations. As we meet with others to discuss common tasks, to compare solutions, and to work out agreements, we are helping to establish the habit of cooperation among sovereign equals. In this way we are lessening the possibility of being misunderstood which might arise from the undertaking of policies which we ourselves solely determine. Through responsible action within the international system we lay a foundation for the respect and friendship of other countries. A wise man once said: "To have a friend you must be a friend." In the United Nations there is daily evidence that this precept is sound.

Proper Role of the Specialized Agencies

In the performance of its functions in economic, social, and humanitarian affairs the United Nations has been censured for undertaking programs beyond the proper scope of an international organization. It has been criticized for timidity in the conception and slowness in the execution of these programs. It has been reproached for overstepping the bounds of the charter and condemned for not meeting its responsibilities under the charter. On many occasions it has even been praised for a particular job well done.

The diverse criticisms directed at the United Nations in connection with some of these activities are a reflection of the diverse points of view that are held regarding its proper role in this field.
The United Nations has therefore had to grapple with the vast difficulties inherent in international economic, social, and humanitarian problems as well as with the difficulties resulting from the fact that some of its most prominent members—including the United States—had difficulty in deciding how these problems should be approached.

There are, for instance, suggestions from a few critics to the effect that the United States should limit its participation in, or even withdraw from, certain of the specialized agencies. One argument is that increasing Soviet and Communist-satellite activity in these agencies is a threat to free-world interests. My own view is that this is an additional reason, if any were needed, why the U.S. should continue in, and even increase its support for, the specialized agencies.

Actually the Soviet decision to take a fuller part in this work, after giving little or no support in earlier years, is evidence of the growing effectiveness and influence of the specialized agencies. Everyone likes to be associated with success. The United States has been deeply involved with the development and success of the agencies since the beginning. I believe it would be sheer folly for us to lessen our interest, much less withdraw, at this time.

In carrying on its work in the social and economic field the U.N. and its specialized agencies must be guided by two cardinal principles. In the first place, in their natural enthusiasm to get results they should not take action that will result in antagonizing the sovereign sensitivities of their member states. The possible advantages to be derived from even occasional invasions of the domestic jurisdiction of the sovereign states are far outweighed by the risks involved and the harm that can come to the organization from adverse criticism and the loss of valuable support. The United Nations is an organization of sovereign states, and we would be naive indeed if we did not learn to operate within our proper metes and bounds.

In the second place, the United Nations should not attempt to do more than it can reasonably do. Progress in the social and economic fields is painfully slow, and there is much to be done. Yet it is clear to me that modest programs, well conceived and effectively administered, will take the United Nations further toward its goal than bigger and perhaps ill-conceived programs that are poorly handled. Once again we must recognize that the United Nations will lose ground and may suffer incalculable damage if it tries to move too far and too fast.

**Publication on UNESCO**

The Department of State last month released a pamphlet prepared by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO entitled *UNESCO: Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization . . . An American View* (publication 6332, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.—price 35 cents). More than half of the pamphlet is devoted to an account of UNESCO's work in the field of economic and social development, with emphasis on its program of fundamental education. The remaining chapters deal with "UNESCO and International Understanding" and "UNESCO and the American People"; the latter chapter includes a section describing the functions of the National Commission.

**U.S. Support for UNESCO**

This, then, is the broad picture as I see it. Now to turn to UNESCO itself. As all of you are well aware, UNESCO has not altogether escaped the criticisms which have been directed at the specialized agencies. As far as I know, no one has differed with the aims and purposes set forth in UNESCO's constitution, but there has been a difference of view as to how UNESCO has carried out these responsibilities.

We in the Department of State have followed the work of this organization very closely since the beginning. We study its publications, we participate in the General Conferences and in the planning of its program, and we follow as closely as possible the work the international secretariat does to carry out the resolutions of the General Conference.

Based on this study and observation, our view in the Department of State is that this organization is properly carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to it by its 76 member states. We find that it has abided by the provision of its constitution that forbids it to intervene in matters that are within the jurisdiction of its member states. We do not find that it has attempted, either in this country or in other countries, to infiltrate the schools or try to dictate what should be taught or how it should be taught in the schools.
Nor do we find that Unesco in any way constitutes a threat to our freedoms and our way of life, as is sometimes charged.

On the contrary, we believe Unesco is performing many useful and valuable services for its members and is carrying on numerous programs of lasting merit. Indeed, I believe Unesco's work in fundamental education alone—helping underdeveloped countries devise methods of teaching adults to read and write—would more than justify its existence.

It is my conviction that a full examination of the record will support our views. As a matter of fact, each time an organization has undertaken a systematic and comprehensive review of Unesco's work, it has supported the view I have stated. There have been a number of impartial studies of this kind.

At the same time, in honesty, it must be said that this Government, the Department of State, and our delegations to Unesco conferences do find points to criticize. We find that its program is in some respects too diffuse, that it tends to undertake too many projects with too little resources, and that it does not perform uniformly well in each undertaking. Further, it has all of the failings that any organization has that is dependent on human effort. It makes mistakes.

But over the past 10 years we have witnessed very substantial progress in the definition of aims and goals, in the building of constructive programs of work, and in the development of the experience and the skills needed to carry out the difficult tasks Unesco undertakes.

We believe, further, that participation in Unesco is in the national interest of the United States and that the organization should have the close study of a larger number of our people. We believe such study will result in broader support for the organization and its work.

**Significance of New Delhi Conference**

A Commission meeting that immediately precedes a Unesco General Conference is always important. Because the 9th General Conference opening in New Delhi on November 5 is unusually important, however, this Commission meeting takes on an added significance.

The conference is significant for several reasons. In the first place, it completes the first decade of the Unesco program. While the organization may not yet be fully mature, we can safely state that it has now reached a stage in its development when it can move with more sureness than ever before.

In the beginning, Unesco was little more than an idea, and a group of people who were determined to make that idea work. Today it has benefited from a varied experience. There now is a record of solid accomplishment. Real progress has been made in fundamental education. The Universal Copyright Convention has been ratified. There are free public libraries in areas today where 10 years ago they were unknown. The organization has learned much about bringing its resources to bear effectively on the needs of its member states.

I think it would be fair to say that the 9th General Conference finds Unesco in the position of a young man newly graduated from college. He has acquired certain basic knowledge and skills. He is ready to begin the serious work of life, to make his studies bear fruit. But, like the college graduate of today, Unesco is faced with so many opportunities that it scarcely knows which career to choose.

Another reason why this General Conference is unusually important is that Unesco now has 76 member states, whereas at the beginning it had only 30. Compared with the first General Conference, the New Delhi conference poses a huge problem in international negotiation. It might seem that a choir of 76 voices is not much more difficult to manage than one of 30. But we are talking of 76 singers who have no real training in harmony. Many of these 76 voices will be singing solos, trying to direct the rest of the choir, and rewriting the score—all at the same time. A bit of confusion may result until the choir gets properly organized.

I have mentioned the presence of the Communist bloc in international organizations. This is perhaps the single greatest problem, or, rather, single source of problems, which our delegation—and the organization—will face in trying to plan soundly for Unesco's future. It is true that the Soviet Union participated in the 1954 conference. But then it was new to the organization. It was feeling its way. It has learned fast. It is moving with far more assurance. If past performances are any indication, we can be fairly certain that it will be working hard and skillfully to use Unesco for its own ends.
Unesco occupies today a position of increasing significance for both the Soviet Union and the free nations. With the recognition that out-and-out armed aggression might well result not only in total war but in total destruction, Communist tactics have been increasingly directed into economic and cultural channels. And it is precisely in the fields of education, science, and culture that the Soviets have now mounted an increasing offensive against the free world.

It is curious to note what an abrupt change the Soviet Union has made in connection with the work of the specialized agencies. In the past they either ignored them completely or else sought to frustrate their work. They roundly denounced Unesco as "an instrument of American cultural imperialism."

Only recently have they changed their tune. Since Stalin's death they have joined Unesco and rejoined the ILO. They are negotiating to rejoin the Wro, and they are contributing to the U.N. Technical Assistance Program. We shall soon see what this new-found interest in the specialized agencies means for Unesco.

**Importance of the Conference to India**

I hardly need underline the political significance of the fact that the 9th General Conference will be held in India. India has a rich cultural heritage coupled with a great need for the benefits of modern education and science. It is natural for Indians to regard Unesco as an immensely important element in international relations.

This will be the first international conference of this size to be held in India and is a fitting recognition of the significant role that country plays in the United Nations system. An excellent opportunity will be afforded for the representatives of other countries to observe and appreciate the many fine qualities of the people of India. There has been considerable discussion in Unesco bodies of the need to further an appreciation by other countries of the cultural values of Asian countries. This conference will be a useful step in this direction.

I will not be giving away any secrets if I say that the United States delegation will be instructed to seek at the conference, in consultation with other members, particularly the great nations of Asia, to work toward a program designed to bring about closer contacts, cooperation, and mutual appreciation between Asia and the West.

On the physical side, the Government of India is going to great lengths to provide an appropriate setting for the conference. Three large buildings—a hotel, an office building, and a conference hall—are being completed. This also may be considered a yardstick of the importance which India, and indeed all Asia, attaches to Unesco and the conference.

**U.S. Objectives at the New Delhi Conference**

We have three main objectives at the 9th General Conference. The first I have already touched on. We seek to reaffirm the basic purpose of the organization as embodied in its constitution. Unesco was created "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture..." We think the constitution means what it says. We believe in what it says. Therefore, we wish to develop the widest possible community of interest among the nations represented at the conference.

Unhappily there is a sharp cleavage between our interests and those of the Soviet bloc in Unesco. Certainly men who are dedicated to world domination must have interests that directly conflict with a "universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world without distinction of race, sex, language or religion by the Charter of the United Nations."

Nevertheless, it is our conviction that our first aim in this conference, as in all our relations with the organization, must be to make Unesco serve the cause of harmony among nations. We shall, no doubt, be able to develop a measure of harmony among like-minded free nations.

The second objective of the United States at this conference will be to strengthen Unesco by strengthening its program. Put another way, we will attempt to assure that Unesco will work effectively through the adoption of sound work plans.

Sound plans involve an increasing concentration of the program. As I suggested earlier, this point applies to many of the specialized agencies. Unesco has limited resources. They must be brought to bear on projects limited in number and
sufficiently well defined to give every reasonable insurance of success. This means that Unesco, in our view, should stick to the sort of project that experience has shown it can do best. In general, we think we should capitalize on the work of the past 10 years rather than branch out into new and untested fields.

In line with the effort to concentrate the Unesco program, the United States supported the development of the “major project” approach at the 1954 Montevideo conference. The concept was adopted at that meeting, and the organization has since developed three major projects for the consideration of the 9th General Conference—the development of arid-lands research, the extension of primary education in Latin America, and a program for mutual appreciation of Asian and Western cultural values. All these projects will be vigorously backed by the United States. Although the projects are new as integrated major efforts, each builds on a solid foundation of previous work by Unesco. It is for this sort of planning that the United States will press.

A third objective of the U.S. delegation will be to assure the continued integrity of the organization and its program. We must allow for the possibility that there may be attempts to distort and twist the Unesco program. We will attempt to thwart any efforts that might be launched to use the organization as a channel for propaganda. We accept the fact that there will be politics at this conference. That is inevitable. But we want to insure that the politics serve the same purpose that they serve in the United States: that is, to produce results that reflect the will and the needs of the majority.

I have tried today to review with you the broad basis upon which our support for Unesco rests; to assure you again of the faith this Government has, and the strong support it is determined to give, to the purposes and the program in whose behalf you are here; to stress the importance of the coming General Conference; and to indicate United States objectives at the conference.

Again this world is passing through anxious times, as it has more than once since Unesco was founded. When there is great tension and an air of crisis, it is not always easy for the American people, or our public officials, to shift their attention to the quieter, less spectacular activities like those of Unesco and the other specialized agencies.

Yet it is our job to take the long-range view and to influence those around us, to the extent that we are able, to take it also. Institutions such as Unesco are playing, and increasingly will play, an important role in preserving and strengthening the hope for peace and for a better tomorrow.

We can take pride in this fact and from it draw strength as we carry forward this vital work.

U.S. Committee for Prevention of Pollution of Seas by Oil
Press release 495 dated September 19

Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, on September 19 opened the first meeting of the United States National Committee for Prevention of Pollution of the Seas by Oil. This committee was convened by the Department of State in cooperation with the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Interior, and Treasury to study and to keep under review the problem of oil pollution and to recommend practical measures, including those of research and education, for oil pollution prevention.

This meeting is another step taken by the United States to comply with the recommendation of resolution 7 of the London Conference of 1954 on Pollution of the Seas and Coasts by Oil. This conference recommended international cooperative measures to seek a solution to the problem of oil pollution, and the establishment in each country of a national committee to coordinate the efforts of governmental agencies and other interested persons. The conference also recommended that the United Nations serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of technical and other information on oil pollution.

The U.S. National Committee consists of representatives of governmental agencies. The various departments, however, may be represented in more than one capacity and also may reflect the views of other nongovernmental organizations. The Department of Commerce, which as well as representing its own interest will serve as the point of contact in connection with this problem with United States shipbuilders, port and harbor authorities, and hotel and beach resort associations, will be represented in the committee by William G. Allen of the Maritime Administration, Herbert

1 For an article on the London conference by Rear Adm. H. C. Shepheard and John W. Mann, see Bulletin of Aug. 30, 1954, p. 311.
Ashton of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, and Edward Wichers of the Bureau of Standards. The Department of Defense has designated Capt. A. G. Schnable of the Navy and Col. George H. Walker of the Army Engineers as its representatives in the U.S. National Committee. The Department of the Interior, which will serve as point of contact with wildlife and fisheries associations, has appointed O. Lloyd Meehan of the Fish and Wildlife Service and R. M. Gooding of the Bureau of Mines as its delegates. Vice Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, has been selected as the representative of the Treasury Department, with Rear Adm. Henry T. Jewell as his alternate. Arrangements for contact with the shipping industry and with maritime labor on oil pollution prevention already are provided by the Oil Pollution Panel of the Merchant Marine Council, which reports to the Commandant of the Coast Guard. The Department of State will be represented in the committee by Henry L. Deimel and John W. Mann.

No chairman for the U.S. National Committee for Prevention of Pollution of the Seas by Oil has yet been selected. It is expected that the Department of State, after consultation with the other governmental agencies, will invite an individual prominent in the field of oil pollution and familiar with governmental procedure to serve as chairman of the new group. Until the permanent chairman is selected, the Treasury Department will designate the chairman pro temp; Admiral Jewell served in that capacity at the first meeting.

Mr. Kalijarvi, in welcoming the delegates to the U.S. National Committee on behalf of the Department of State, reviewed the events which had led to the committee's formation. He stressed the importance of the work in which the committee was to engage and wished the committee every success.

Eximbank Loans to Overseas Buyers of Surplus Agricultural Commodities

A plan for stepped-up assistance in financing exports of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities on a short-term basis was announced on September 10 by Samuel C. Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The bank is prepared to receive applications from overseas buyers who desire credits to aid in obtaining U.S. agricultural surpluses in situations in which adequate credit is not available from the usual commercial sources. Loans for this purpose would be extended for periods of from 6 months to 1 year; longer terms may be authorized when warranted by special circumstances.

The financing is available for exports of 15 commodities: barley, cheese, corn, cotton, dry edible beans, grain sorghums, nonfat dry milk solids, oats, rice, rosin, rye, tobacco, turpentine, vegetable oils, and wheat. This list may be modified from time to time after consultation with the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture.

Credits under the plan generally would be extended to commercial banks abroad to finance purchases by foreign importers, or to the importers themselves where the guaranty of their own banks is offered. These short-term credits, like all Export-Import Bank loans, would not be authorized in cases where financing was available from private sources.
Calendar of Meetings¹

Adjourned During September 1956

1st Suez Canal Conference .................................................... London Aug. 16–23
Suez Committee ................................................................. London and Cairo Aug. 24–Sept. 9
2d Suez Canal Conference ....................................................... London Sept. 19–21
17th International Exhibition of Cinematographic Art ......................... Venice Aug. 16–Sept. 8
10th International Edinburgh Film Festival ................................ Edinburgh Aug. 19–Sept. 9
6th International Congress of Soil Science .................................. Paris Aug. 29–Sept. 8
SEATO Committee of Economic Experts .................................... Bangkok Sept. 3–8
6th ILO Regional Conference of American States Members .................. Habana Sept. 3–14
FAO Council: 25th Session ....................................................... Rome Sept. 3–15
International Geological Congress; 20th Session. México, D.F. Sept. 4–11
9th International Congress of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics .......... Brussels Sept. 5–13
ICAO Joint Financing Conference To Revise the Danish and Icelandic Agreements. Geneva Sept. 6–25
WHO Regional Committee for Western Pacific: 7th Session .................... Manila Sept. 7–13
FAO Conference: Special Session ................................................. Rome Sept. 10–22
PASO Executive Committee: 29th Meeting ..................................... Antigua (Guatemala) Sept. 11–13
9th Meeting of PASO Directing Council and 8th Meeting of Regional Committee of WHO for the Americas. Antigua (Guatemala) Sept. 16–29
Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives: 1st Meeting. Washington Sept. 17–19
U.N. ECE Coal Committee ......................................................... Geneva Sept. 18–20
ICEM Executive Committee: 5th Session ...................................... Geneva Sept. 20–27
14th International Dairy Congress .............................................. Rome Sept. 24–28
PASO Executive Committee: 30th Meeting .................................... Antigua (Guatemala) Sept. 29 (1 day)

In Session as of September 30, 1956

North Pacific Fur Seal Conference ......................................... Washington Nov. 28, 1955–29
U.N. Committee To Review the Salary, Allowances and Benefits System: 2d Session. New York Sept. 15–
3d ICAO Air Navigation Conference ........................................ Montreal Sept. 18–
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#### In Session as of September 30, 1956—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Sept. 20-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO/WHO Regional Nutrition Committee for South and East</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Sept. 25-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia: 4th Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scheduled October 1–December 31, 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3d Suez Canal Conference</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Oct. 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: Dairy Products Working Party</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Oct. 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan American Highway Congresses: 2d Meeting of Permanent Executive Committee</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Oct. 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEM Council: 5th Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Council for the Exploration of the Sea: 44th Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>Oct. 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pacific Commission: Technical Meeting on Pastures and Livestock</td>
<td>Melbourne (Australia)</td>
<td>Oct. 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Committee on Weights and Measures</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Oct. 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Regional Conference on Exchange of Publications in Latin America</td>
<td>Habana</td>
<td>Oct. 1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sugar Council: Statistical and Executive Committees</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hague Conference on International Private Law: 8th Session</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>Oct. 3-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sugar Council: 9th Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 3-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Sugar Conference: 2d Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Tin Study Group and Management Committee: 8th Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Oct. 8-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Special Committee on Question of Defining Aggression</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Oct. 8-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Regional Conference for Asia and the Far East: 3d Session</td>
<td>Bandung (Indonesia)</td>
<td>Oct. 8-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Ad Hoc Meeting on Arbitration</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 8-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Committee on the Administrative Budget</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Oct. 10-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Congresses of Tropical Medicine and Malaria: International Interim Committee</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>Oct. 11-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATT Contracting Parties: 11th Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 11-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Committee on Development of Trade: 5th Session and East-West Trade Consultations</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 15-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMO Commission for Maritime Meteorology: 2d Session</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>Oct. 16-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO World Eucalyptus Conference</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Oct. 17-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pacific Commission: 16th Session</td>
<td>Nouméa (New Caledonia)</td>
<td>Oct. 18-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Improvement of National Statistics: 4th Session</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Oct. 22-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation: 2d Meeting</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Oct. 22-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Executive Board and Program Committee</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Oct. 22-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Timber Committee</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 22-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECAFE Committee on Industry and Trade: 2d Session of Trade Subcommittee</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Oct. 29-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 1st Meeting of Consultative Subcommission on the Economic Aspects of Rice</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Oct. 29-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Executive Board: 45th Session</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>Oct. 31-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO General Conference: 9th Session</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>Nov. 5-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Rice Commission: Ad Hoc Working Group on Storage and Processing of Rice</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Nov. 5-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Electric Power Committee: Working Party on Rural Electrification</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 5-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO Special Meeting on Charges for Airports and Air Navigation Facilities</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Nov. 6-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th International Grassland Congress</td>
<td>Palmerston (New Zealand)</td>
<td>Nov. 6-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Electric Power Committee</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 8-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO International Rice Commission: 5th Session</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Nov. 12-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO Governing Body: 133d Session (and Committees)</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 12-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Meeting of International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: Standing Committee on Biology and Research</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Nov. 12-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. General Assembly: 11th Session</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Nov. 12-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Timber Committee: Joint FAO/ECE Working Party on Forest and Forest Products Statistics</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 12-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Commission: Conference on Town and Country Development Planning</td>
<td>Trinidad, B. W. I.</td>
<td>Nov. 14-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interparliamentary Union: 45th Conference</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>Nov. 15-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Regional Conference for Latin America: 4th Session</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Nov. 19-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scheduled October 1—December 31, 1956—Continued

Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia ("Colombo Plan"); Officials Meeting.
ITU International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIT); Preliminary Study Group.
Inter-American Economic and Social Council; 1st Inter-American Technical Meeting on Housing and Planning.
U.N. ECE Housing Committee; 13th Session and Working Parties.
Customs Cooperation Council; 9th Session.
Inter-American Travel Congresses; Permanent Executive Committee.
NATO Council; Ministerial Session.
ITU International Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIF): 18th Plenary Assembly (and Final Meeting).
U.N. ECE Committee on Agricultural Problems; 8th Meeting.
U.N. ECE Steel Committee and Working Parties.
Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia ("Colombo Plan"); Ministerial Meeting.
International Wheat Council; 21st Session.
UNESCO Middle East Conference on Vocational and Technical Education (with FAO and ILO).
UNESCO Executive Board; 46th Session.
ITU International Telegraph Consultative Committee (CCIT): 8th Plenary Assembly (and Final Meeting).
ILO Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers; 4th Session.
Caribbean Commission; 23rd Meeting.
U.N. ECE Coal Committee.
U.N. ECE Inland Transport Committee.
Symposium on Tropical Cyclones.
U.N. ECAFE Railway Subcommittee; 5th Session of Working Party on Railway Track Sleepers.
ITU International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIT); 1st Plenary Assembly of New CCIT (former CCIT and CCIF combined).

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

International Dairy Congress

The Department of State announced on September 11 (press release 477) that the U.S. Government will be represented at the 14th International Dairy Congress at Rome, Italy, September 24–28 by the following delegation:

Chairman
Ralph E. Hodgson, Chief, Dairy Husbandry Research Branch, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture; member, Board of Directors, American Dairy Science Association

Members of Delegation
Clarence J. Babcock, Director, Dairy and Poultry Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture
A. Morelle Cheney, Secretary, Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Bernt I. Christensen, Meridale Dairies, New York, N.Y.

Chester K. Enstrom, President, Jones-Enstrom Ice Cream Company, Grand Junction, Colo.; Director, American Dairy Association; Director, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers
Herbert L. Forest, Director, Dairy Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture
Kenneth E. Geyer, Manager, Connecticut Milk Producers Association, Hartford, Conn.
Ira A. Gould, Jr., Chairman, Department of Dairy Technology, College of Agriculture, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
T. Kline Hamilton, Diamond Milk Products, Inc., Columbus, Ohio
Patrick B. Healy, Assistant Secretary, National Milk Producers Federation, Washington, D.C.
Herbert B. Henderson, Chairman, Dairy Division, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Milton Carl Hult, President, National Dairy Council, Chicago, Ill.
Eugene L. Jack, Professor and Head of the Department of Dairy Industry, University of California, Davis, Calif.
William H. E. Reid, Professor of Dairying, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Reinhold, Pennington, Section (press Shaw, Goldberg, London, the Brussels, Dairy the Department member of science, whole. associations under many international Belgium. first Federation, Dairy States, cal the products of the United States, in 1903 by the first International Dairy Congress at Brussels, Belgium. The Federation, composed of national associations in 20 countries, is administered by an international permanent bureau at Brussels. The aim of the Federation is to promote the solution of international scientific, technical, and economic dairy problems in the interests of humanity as a whole. The Federation studies economic questions solely from the point of view of applied science, and its work is influenced by neither commercial nor political considerations. Congresses are held about every 3 years, usually in the capital of one of the member countries. The United States, while not a member of the International Dairy Federation, has participated officially in many of its Congresses.

The program for the presentation and discussion of the scientific papers will be carried out under three sections, as follows: Section I: Milk for Liquid Consumption; Section II: Dairy Products—Technical and Economic Problems; Section III: Legislation, Control, Methods of Analysis. In addition, the program includes three general lectures to be delivered during the Congress: (1) the position of the milk industry in the national economy; (2) an adequate supply of milk in tropical countries, particularly in relation to milk-producing animals; and (3) effective and controlled use of surplus dairy products.

ILO Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference

The Department of State announced on September 19 (press release 494) that the United States would be represented by the following tripartite delegation at the Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference of the International Labor Organization beginning that day at London, England:

Representing the Government of the United States Delegate
Rocco C. Siciliano, Assistant Secretary of Labor Advisors
L. James Falck, American Embassy, Bonn, Germany Joseph P. Goldberg, Special Assistant to the Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor Dr. G. Halsey Hunt, Assistant Surgeon General, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
James L. Piiper, Assistant General Counsel, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce Comdr. Paul E. Savonis, Coast Guard, Department of the Treasury

Representing the Shipowners of the United States Delegate
Mainland S. Pennington, Vice President, Seas Shipping Company, Inc.
Adviser
Rear Adm. Halbert C. Shepheard, Safety Counselor, American Pilots Association

Representing the Seafarers of the United States Delegate
John Hawk, Secretary-Treasurer, Seafarers International of North America
Advisors
Joseph Lane Kirkland, Department of Social Insurance, AFL-CIO
John McDonagall, Secretary-Treasurer, National Maritime Union of America

Secretary of Delegation
Maurice J. Scanlon, Office of International Conferences, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State

The conference will bring together employer, worker, and government delegates from 21 countries to discuss the following six-item agenda, as recommended by the Joint Maritime Commission and determined by the Governing Body of the ILO at its 131st session in March 1956: general revision of the ILO convention on wages, hours of work, and manning at sea; engagement of seafarers through regularly established employment offices; flag transfer in relation to social conditions and safety; contents of medicine chests on board ship and medical advice by radio to ships at sea; jurisdiction over the suspension of officers' certificates of competency; and reciprocal or international recognition of seafarers' national identity cards. The conference is considered preparatory and technical because its task is to prepare the texts and documents on these subjects for a mari-
time session of the Ilo General Conference to be held early in 1958.

The countries invited to participate in the Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference are: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, and United States.

**ICAO Air Navigation Conference**

The Department of State announced on September 17 (press release 490) that the U.S. Government will be represented by the following delegation at the 3d Air Navigation Conference of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), to be convened at Montreal, September 18, 1956:

**Delegate**

Oscar Bakke, Chairman, Deputy Director, Bureau of Safety Regulations, Civil Aeronautics Board

**Alternate Delegates**

Robert W. Craig, ICAO Officer, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce

W. Edmund Koneczny, Chief of Airworthiness Division, Civil Aeronautics Board

**Advisers**

Jack Bowman, Chief, Regulations Section, Operations Division, Air Transport Association of America, Inc.

Philip Donely, Assistant Chief, Dynamics Loads Division, Langley Aeronautics Laboratory, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

Bernard C. Doyle, Aeronautical Research, Development and Design Engineer, Airworthiness Division, Civil Aeronautics Board

William L. Halnon, Meteorologist, International Section, Synoptic Reports and Forecasts Division, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce

Max Karant, Vice President, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association

John D. Kay, Civil Aeronautics Administration-Coast and Geodetic Survey Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce

James L. Kinney, ICAO Representative, Flight Operations, Office of Aviation Safety, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce

J. Matulaitis, Chief, Development Section, Engineering and Development Branch, Transportation Corps, Department of the Army

John J. Quinn, Chief, Air Carrier Division, Civil Aeronautics Board

Burdeii Springer, Supervisory Aeronautical Engineer, Airframe and Equipment Branch, Office of Aviation Safety, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce

Don Talmage, Engineering Department, Air Transport Association of America, Inc.

The purpose of the conference is to discuss subjects principally in the fields of airworthiness and operations. Agenda items include (1) revision of international standards and recommended practices for the airworthiness of aircraft and the complementary specifications for operating limitations; (2) consideration of a program of future work of the International Civil Aviation Organization in the field of airworthiness; (3) consideration of the need for rearward-facing seats in public transport aircraft; (4) marking of break-in points to be used by rescue crews to remove occupants of an aircraft in case of crash; (5) exchange of views on operational requirements for the forecasting and reporting of gusts; (6) aircraft requirements for navigation lights; and (7) operational control.

The conference is expected to last approximately 5 weeks.

**Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography**

**Security Council**
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Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Austria

Finance
Signatures and acceptances: Argentina, September 20, 1956; Viet-Nam, September 21, 1956.
Signatures and acceptances: Argentina, September 20, 1956; Viet-Nam, September 21, 1956.

Genocide
Ratification deposited: Iran, August 14, 1956.

Safety at Sea
Acceptance deposited: Bulgaria, August 17, 1956.

Slave Trade
Accession deposited: Viet-Nam, August 14, 1956.

Trade and Commerce
Schedules of concessions entered into force: Haiti, August 1, 1956; Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, September 1, 1956.

United Nations

Women-Political Rights
Ratifications deposited: Peru, June 11, 1956; Nicaragua, August 22, 1956.

1 Not in force for the United States.

BILATERAL

Pakistan

Peru

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Foreign Service Examination
Press release 491 dated September 17.

The Department of State announced on September 17 that the semianual Foreign Service officer examination will be given on December 8 at more than 65 centers throughout the United States. This examination is open to anyone who meets the age and citizenship requirements outlined below.

Officials of the Department of State estimate that several hundred new Foreign Service officers will be required during the next year to fill positions overseas and the many Washington positions now required to be filled by Foreign Service officers.

After completing several weeks of training at the Foreign Service Institute in Washington, about half of the new officers will take up duties at one of the 265 American embassies, legations, and consulates around the world. At these posts, which range in size from the large missions such as Paris and London to the one-man posts such as Perth, Australia, the new officer may expect to do a variety of tasks, including administrative work, political, economic, commercial and labor report-
ing, consular duties, and assisting and protecting Americans and their property abroad. Other new officers will be assigned to the Department's headquarters in Washington, where they will engage in research or other substantive work, or in the many administrative tasks which are essential to the day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs.

To explain fully these opportunities in the Foreign Service which await qualified young men and women of America, a number of Foreign Service officers will visit more than 230 colleges and universities in all 48 States this fall. In order to make known the diversified needs of the Department of State and Foreign Service, these officers will talk not only with promising students of history, political science, and international relations but also with those who are specializing in economics, foreign languages, and business and public administration.

Those successful in the one-day written examination, which tests the candidate's facility in English expression, general ability, and background as well as his proficiency in a modern foreign language, will subsequently be given an oral examination by panels which will meet in regional centers throughout the United States. Those candidates who successfully pass the orals will then be given a physical examination and a security investigation. Upon completion of these phases, the candidate will be nominated by the President as a Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service.

To be eligible to take the examination, candidates must be at least 20 years of age and under 31, as of October 26, 1956, and must be American citizens of at least 9 years' standing. While a candidate's spouse need not be a citizen on the date of the examination, citizenship must have been obtained prior to the date of the officer's appointment.

Starting salaries for successful candidates range from $4,750 to $5,350 per year depending upon the age, experience, and family status of the individual. In addition, insurance, medical, educational, and retirement benefits are granted, as well as annual and sick leave.

Application forms may be obtained by writing to the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C. The closing date for filing the application is October 26, 1956.

Foreign Service Selection Boards Meet

Press release 482 dated September 12

The Department of State announced on September 12 the convening of the Tenth Selection Boards which will review the records of all career Foreign Service officers for purposes of promotion. The Selection Boards are established by the Secretary of State under the terms of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. Consisting of senior officers drawn from the top ranks of the career Foreign Service and of distinguished private citizens, the boards normally meet once each year to evaluate the performance of Foreign Service officers and to determine the rank order listings, which are the basis for the President's promotion of the top officers in each class.

This year the Selection Boards will be faced with the largest task which has ever confronted a similar body, since the size of the career Foreign Service group has been substantially expanded during the past year. Largely as the result of the integration of a number of civil service and Foreign Service Staff officers, the career Foreign Service officer corps has increased from 1,900 in 1955 to 2,800 this year.

The Selection Boards will meet for 4 months. The boards will include 23 Foreign Service officers, 7 "public members" drawn from private life, and 7 observers designated by the Departments of Commerce and Labor to sit on the boards in view of the direct interest of those Departments in the work of the unified Foreign Service of the United States.

The Foreign Service officer members include four career ministers who have been called back to the United States for this purpose:

John M. Cabot, Ambassador to Sweden, former Assistant Secretary of State and former Ambassador to Finland and to Pakistan
Edward T. Wailes, Minister to Hungary, former Assistant Secretary of State and former Ambassador to the Union of South Africa
Theodore Achilles, Ambassador to Peru
Cecil B. Lyon, Ambassador to Chile

The public members will be:

Wendell W. Moore, Assistant Vice President, A. S. Aloe Co., St. Louis
Graham H. Stuart, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Stanford University
Marvin L. Frederick, Personnel Consultant, Peat, War-wick, Mitchell and Co., New York
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Lloyd C. Hatverson, Chief Economist, National Grange
Richard C. Thompson, former Export Manager, Electric Auto-Lite Co.
E. Wallace Chadwick, former Member of Congress
Edward D. Gray, former secretary, New York Petroleum Industries

Consular Offices

The Department announced on September 5 that, effective October 1, 1956, the American Consulate at Rotterdam, the Netherlands, will be elevated to the rank of Consulate General.

Designations

Robert E. Stufflebeam as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, with responsibility for working on problems related to employment of U.S. citizens in international organizations and agencies, effective August 12.

Raymond E. Lisle as Deputy Director, Office of German Affairs, effective September 12.
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Press releases issued prior to September 17 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 477
of September 11 and 482 of September 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>Aigner appointed to German tribunals (rewrite).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>Delegation to ICAO conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>Foreign Service officer examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>Loan exhibition of Korean art (rewrite).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>Educational exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>9/19</td>
<td>Delegation to ILO maritime conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>9/19</td>
<td>Committee for prevention of oil pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>9/20</td>
<td>Note on U.S.-Soviet exchange of flights over the Arctic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>9/20</td>
<td>Dulles: Suez conference statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>9/21</td>
<td>Dulles: Suez conference exasperating remarks (excerpt).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>9/21</td>
<td>Hemmendinger resignation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>9/22</td>
<td>9th anniversary of death of Nikola Petkov.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Publication 6322 15 cents
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Opening of Discussions on Statute of International Atomic Energy Agency

WELCOMING ADDRESS BY LEWIS L. STRAUSS CHAIRMAN, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

It is my privilege and great honor, on behalf of my fellow countrymen, to welcome you to the United States for the historic deliberations which you are about to undertake. I bring you warmest greetings from President Eisenhower and his sincere good wishes for the success of this conference.

The fervent prayers of all mankind attend your labors here. Peoples of many lands look hopefully to you, not alone to spread the bounties of the beneficent atom that their lives may become healthier and more abundant but that in so doing you will also provide the foundations upon which a durable structure of peaceful understanding will eventually be erected.

This is the largest conference of nations to be held since the end of the Great War, indeed perhaps the largest in the entire history of international collaboration. Thus, your voice can be the voice of humanity itself, the conscience of the world of men.

Since the end of the last war, the nations of the earth have been caught in the endless spiral of an atomic arms race. As recently as 3 years ago, there appeared to be no formula, and no hope, for averting mutual disaster. Indeed, 3 years ago a convocation for a purpose such as that which has brought you together today would have been unthinkable.

In the midst of the thick darkness of those days a lamp was kindled. Its light first shone forth in this very hall. Some of you perhaps were so fortunate as to be here on that late December afternoon in 1953. Standing at this very lectern before the representatives of your governments, standing in effect in the presence of all humanity, President Eisenhower pronounced the words which broke the evil spell that war had cast upon the world.

They will be long remembered, and it is fitting to recall those sentences today.

He said:

It is not enough to take this weapon out of the hands of the soldiers. It must be put into the hands of those who will know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace.

The United States knows that if the fearful trend of atomic military buildup can be reversed, this greatest of destructive forces can be developed into a great boon, for the benefit of all mankind.

And he went on to say this:

The United States knows that peaceful power from atomic energy is no dream of the future. That capability, already proved, is here—now—today. Who can doubt, if the entire body of the world’s scientists and engineers had adequate amounts of fissionable material with which to test and develop their ideas, that this capability would rapidly be transformed into universal, efficient, and economic usage.

He then outlined his plan for the international agency, including the pooling of fissionable materials for peaceful uses and the establishment of safeguards against any use of those materials for other than peaceful purposes. He said:

... the United States pledges before you—and therefore before the world—its determination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma—to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

When he reached the conclusion of his message, an ovation swept through the great assemblage.
It evidenced the profound effect which his pronouncement had made upon his listeners. I shared with many of you the drama of that moment and sensed, in what will always remain as one of the most moving experiences of my life, the electric response which began in this room and echoed around the world, lifting the hopes and stirring the imaginations of men everywhere.

No longer could it be said that man’s genius in pushing back the frontiers of the physical universe had outstripped his moral inspiration to control his discoveries.

What the President proposed was motivated solely by desire to find a way out of the atomic dilemma which had fastened itself upon the world and thereby to lift the darkest cloud overhanging humanity. His proposal was a product of bold vision, yet it had the great virtue of simplicity. It was above all else an easily workable plan, practicable yet uninvolved.

In the months following President Eisenhower’s proposal, discussions were undertaken among those nations having either developed resources of nuclear raw materials or advanced atomic energy programs, and on December 4, 1954, the General Assembly of the United Nations by unanimous vote endorsed the proposal to create an International Atomic Energy Agency.

In late February of this year, representatives of 12 nations met in Washington. After 4 months of earnest, cooperative labor, they produced the draft statute which will be before you.²

This statute, or charter, is not a panacea for all the ills of the world. It will not within any precisely measured time turn all deserts into green pastures. It will not relieve man of the necessity to labor for his daily bread. It will not usher in the millennium.

**Functions of Agency**

However, the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency under the conditions envisaged by the draft statute will do these things:

- It will accelerate the application of the peaceful uses of atomic energy everywhere, reaching the uttermost parts of the earth.
- It will divert important amounts of fissionable material from atomic bomb arsenals to uses of benefit to mankind, and those amounts will steadily grow with the maintenance of peace. More tons of these materials will be devoted to welfare, fewer tons to weapons.
- It will stimulate the discovery of new fundamental data on which all progress depends.
- It will provide an opportunity for nations which have little or no atomic capability at present to acquire atomic facilities best suited to their needs either individually or in combination with their neighbors.
- It will increase man’s knowledge of his own body and that of the plants and animals that nourish him, and of the pests which threaten him, to the end that the art of healing will be advanced and new ways found to increase the food supply of the world. Man’s span of useful life thereby should be prolonged.
- It will be the means by which nations may obtain electrical energy to lighten their burdens and increase their productivity. It will thus contribute to higher standards of living in the world.
- It will encourage young and imaginative minds in many countries to seek careers in the new disciplines of nuclear science and engineering to the end that they may improve the economy and health of their homelands.
- And, of course, most important of all, the successful operation of the agency will contribute mightily to focus world attention and understanding on the gifts which atomic energy can make toward enriching human life and thus dispel some of today’s doubts and fears.

The cooperation which is foreseen under the provisions of the draft statute will be international. This is proper, for the atom itself is international. It has no politics, follows no party line, and recognizes no geographical frontiers or allegiances. The language it speaks is universal.

The little group that witnessed the first controlled chain reaction in Chicago in December 1942 included men native to many lands. Their leader was the great Enrico Fermi, by birth a son of Italy. Among his colleagues were scientists from Canada, Hungary, and Germany. And contributing to that moment of triumph were the genius and the accumulated discoveries of other men and women from other lands. Such names as Einstein, Hahn, Strassman, and Meitner of Germany, Bohr of Denmark, Rutherford and Chadwick of England, the Curies of Poland and France, Mendeleev of Russia, and Raman of India, to name only a few of an illustrious galaxy.

² For text, see Bulletin of May 21, 1956, p. 852.
Pooling Atomic Knowledge

Knowledge of the atom cannot be claimed as a monopoly of a few large countries. This fact was dramatically highlighted at the great Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva in August of last year, when the scientists and engineers of 73 nations met in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual purpose and exchanged information on the peaceful development of the atom. I am happy to have been concerned with the inception of that fruitful and memorable gathering.

This process of pooling knowledge of the atom has continued in the year that has passed since the conference. Scientific delegations have been exchanging visits and ideas, motivated only by the spirit of human progress. A scientific committee has been established under the aegis of the United Nations to study the effects of radiation. Nuclear science symposiums have been held in a number of countries, and a large and important sharing of the results of current research has resulted from smaller international conferences, such as those dealing with high-energy physics held earlier this year.

In the spirit of these events, it is our hope that while in the United States you will find it possible to visit our national laboratory at Brookhaven, which is not far from this city, and—if your time permits, and I hope it will—journey to Shippingport, Pennsylvania, to see our first full-size atomic power plant exclusively for commercial power production, which we began just 2 years ago this month and which is nearing completion there.

Through all of these activities, the United States has contributed in keeping with our confidence in the eventual success of this conference. The steadily expanding extent of our cooperation with other nations in atomic energy matters, including agreements which we have negotiated with 39 nations, is an earnest of that fact. We believe that our technology and atomic materials should benefit other peoples as well as our own. We also believe that necessary safeguards to health and peace must accompany the development of the atom.

You will recall that President Eisenhower in his address of December 8, 1953, spoke of allocations of fissionable material to the agency, by ourselves and by others, “to the extent permitted by elementary prudence.”

Last February 22, the President gave concrete form and vitality to the determination of the United States to aid other countries when he announced that the Atomic Energy Commission would make 20,000 kilograms of uranium 235 available for distribution to other nations for peaceful uses. This was an amount exactly equal to the uranium 235 made available for such uses in the United States. The President, in announcing the allocation, emphasized that the United States welcomes the progress toward the international agency and will cooperate with it wholeheartedly when it is established.

The faces of millions of people of every race and faith are turned toward this place today. Their hopes, indeed their prayers, that success shall here reward your efforts will surely overcome any barriers and resolve any differences that may yet block attainment of the great goal which is within your grasp.

STATEMENT BY JAMES J. WADSWORTH

We now approach the last steps in the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency which President Eisenhower proposed in this hall on December 8, 1953. If our work prospers as I hope and believe it will, this great conference of 81 nations will not rise until it has adopted a statute of the agency in its final text. Thereby we shall have taken a decisive step in translating into fact the vision which has inspired us all, the vision of world atomic cooperation and peace.

Many nations in the past 3 years have shared in this creative effort—nations from every quarter of the globe. In scope and in constructive spirit, the records of diplomacy in the past decade scarcely reveal its equal. It may be in order to take a brief glance over the road we have traveled.

In proposing that this agency be created, the President of the United States had in mind two major purposes, both aimed at strengthening world peace. The first was to channel nuclear materials from national stores into a new international agency and thereby begin, in his words, “to di-

3 Ibid., Mar. 19, 1956, p. 469.

4 Made before the conference on Sept. 24 (U.S. delegation press release). Ambassador Wadsworth is U.S. Representative to the conference and chairman of the U.S. delegation.
minish the potential destructive power of the world's atomic stockpiles.” The second purpose was to devise methods whereby fissionable material would be allocated to serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind.

The United States has ever kept these twin objectives in view. We have been aware from the beginning that neither aim could be achieved by one nation, or even by a small group of nations, and that we were embarked upon a truly international enterprise. For that reason, throughout these proceedings we have frequently turned to the United Nations. For the same reason our negotiations themselves have proceeded in ever-widening circles. The main steps in those negotiations are worth reviewing.

**Main Steps in Negotiations**

*First*, an eight-nation group worked early in 1954 to prepare a first draft of a statute for the proposed agency.

*Second*, the subject was thoroughly debated at the Ninth General Assembly in 1954.

*Third*, on August 22, 1955, the draft statute as it then stood was circulated to get the views of all members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies—a total at that time of 84 states.

*Fourth*, the subject was again debated at the Tenth General Assembly in 1955, and a resolution endorsing the efforts of the negotiating group was unanimously adopted.

*Fifth*, the working group, now expanded to 12 nations by the inclusion of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India, and the Soviet Union, met in Washington starting last February 27. For almost 2 months this group, encouraged and guided by a resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, worked to revise the draft statute. In doing so, it considered, and often adopted, ideas and suggestions not only of the four new members of the drafting group but of other nations the world over from whom comments had been received.

*Sixth*, the resulting draft, unanimously approved on April 18 by the 12-nation working group, now lies before this conference for final action.

---


Mr. President [João Carlos Muniz], you who served so ably as the distinguished leader of the Brazilian delegation at that working group meeting in Washington will agree, I am sure, that it was an impressive success. We found that the differences of view were often great. But even greater was the will to bridge those differences. All the delegations, without exception, showed patience and persistence equal to the task. As a result, the draft statute before us today was adopted unanimously. This unanimity, in a world plagued by many deep political differences, augurs well for this meeting. Though some reservations have been entered on specific points, we are encouraged by the fact that, in comparison with the differences which our joint efforts have met and overcome, the questions still to be resolved do not loom too large.

Mr. President, the United States was one of those which joined in the unanimous approval of the draft statute without reservation. There are parts of the statute which we might wish were different. In fact, I am sure that none of the sponsors regards the statute as perfect from its own particular point of view. I am equally sure that all of the sponsors believe, as we do, that the draft statute lays the foundation for an agency that will work and work well, one to which we can all give wholehearted cooperation. The United States is prepared to support this statute. We have no present intention of proposing any amendments other than one, which we plan to sponsor with others, which would clarify the functions of the preparatory commission provided for in annex I.

At the same time, the United States comes to this conference prepared to give respectful consideration to any amendments submitted. We shall support those which we believe would improve the statute and enhance its acceptability. Mr. President, we shall oppose those which, in our view, would not do this—especially those which might make full cooperation of any specific group of states difficult or impossible.

I submit that this is a sensible approach. The draft statute reflects to a great degree a balance of views of a large number of states. Any proposed change should therefore be carefully scrutinized in order to insure not only that it is in fact a change for the better but also that it does not
Mr. President, this is not the time for me to draw a picture of the material blessings which may come to the human race through the full harnessing of the atom for peace. The marvelous potential of atomic technology is known to the world. The agency will greatly advance the peaceful atomic revolution. It will multiply manifold the energy at the service of man, stimulate economic development, and promote the interchange of scientific knowledge. The draft statute before us, in our view, would permit the agency to realize these high aims and would justify generous support by the United States.

Problem of Safeguards

In addition to the requirement that the statute empower the agency to promote peaceful uses of atomic energy, it is indispensable that there be real assurance that the agency's activities will not further the use of atomic energy for military purposes and will not jeopardize health or safety. Atomic energy, as we all know, is uniquely dangerous as well as uniquely promising. The fuel for a reactor can be made into the explosive of a bomb; the radiation which cures can also kill.

The United States has given much thought to the problem of safety and security with all that it implies. This problem has also been of great concern to other states. We recall that the Soviet Union initially took the view that to encourage peaceful development of atomic energy throughout the world would increase world insecurity by increasing the supply of materials from which nuclear weapons could be made. We are very glad that the United States and the U.S.S.R. both agree that the right solution to the problem is to apply adequate safeguards and not to curtail peaceful development.

The provisions in the statute on safeguards are designed to permit peaceful development of atomic energy without jeopardy to world safety and security. I would like first, Mr. President, to refer to article II, which sets forth the agency's basic objectives. It reads as follows:

The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to the peace, health, and prosperity of the world. It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.

To accomplish the latter objective, article XII prescribes certain definite safeguards. The application of these safeguards would be a common effort with international participation. The statute would also permit the agency to apply its safeguards to bilateral or multilateral arrangements otherwise not subject to its supervision or control, if the parties to such arrangements so request. The United States hopes that parties to bilateral arrangements throughout the world will avail themselves of this provision, thus contributing toward the eventual establishment of a uniform system of safeguards of universal application. If this is done, Mr. President, the United States can look forward to making the agency the cornerstone of its international activities in the field of atomic energy for peace.

In supporting these safeguards, we are quite aware that their aim is somewhat limited—even if all "outside" bilateral and multilateral arrangements were ultimately to come under agency safeguards. We well understand that much of the military danger of the atom lies beyond their reach—indeed beyond the reach of the agency itself. We know there is nothing in the draft statute to prevent states from building nuclear weapons with their own resources. We also know that the draft statute in no way limits the ability of states which today produce nuclear weapons to continue producing them. But the fact that the agency will not be able to solve the whole immense world problem of nuclear weapons control does not exempt us from the duty to do all we can to provide full safeguards for the agency's own sphere of operation.

Let me recall to my fellow delegates that the President of the United States has recently made a proposal that future production of fissionable materials should no longer be used to increase the stockpiles of explosive weapons. "My ultimate hope," he said, "is that all production of fissionable materials anywhere in the world will be devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes." Acceptance of this United States proposal would mean the application of safeguards to the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and other states capable of making atomic weapons. These safeguards would certainly have to be more complete and more pervasive than those applied to recipient states under this statute.

We shall continue to strive for agreement which will translate President Eisenhower's proposal.

\[1\text{Ibid., Mar. 26, 1956, p. 515.}\]
into reality. Meanwhile what we do to safeguard operations in the new agency is a significant step toward the goal. By its own safeguards the agency can increase mutual confidence and provide technical and political experience helping us toward our still more ambitious goal—a world where the atom is devoted exclusively to the arts of peace.

Mr. President, I have gone into some detail in this matter of safeguards in order to emphasize what the International Atomic Energy Agency can do, and indeed must do, to curb the destructive misuse of atomic energy. Its still more basic purpose is the positive and creative development of the atomic era for human prosperity and welfare. Let us be under no illusions: there is much to be done, much to be learned before the atom can be widely and economically used for power. It is the duty of the agency to hasten the doing and to hasten the learning.

**Work of Preparatory Commission**

At the conclusion of this conference, the preparatory commission for which the statute provides should meet as soon as possible to begin the tasks required to bring the agency into being. One of the first questions which the preparatory commission will consider will be the location of the agency’s headquarters. In this connection, the United States was one of the first to express its support for Vienna, a great center of civilization which we think would be an ideal site.

The general conference of the agency should be convened as soon as enough ratifications have been received to make this step worth while. In the meantime, we would urge that the preparatory commission draw up, for discussion and approval by the first general conference and board of governors of the agency, a realistic, responsible, practical program of operation.

In this way we should, within a year from now, see the International Atomic Energy Agency a going concern, actually at work making its vital contribution toward a peaceful and a stable world.

Mr. President, the statute we are considering here exists only because of the dogged determination of every one of the 12 nations which took part in writing it. These countries, with all their strong and differing views, were united in one thing—the will to agree.

We have already seen the fulfillment of a fervent wish voiced by President Eisenhower—the wish that this proposal might, in his words, “open up a new channel for peaceful discussion.” That channel is open today. For my part, Mr. President, I believe that it will stay open because I am confident that every delegation present here has the same faith and the same determination to succeed that has made it possible to bring this draft before you.

Last year’s conference on atomic energy in Geneva created a new atmosphere for scientific and technical interchange, an atmosphere of openness and mutuality where before there had been secrecy and insularity. One great challenge of our conference—and indeed it is one of the great challenges of our time—is whether we can bring about the same kind of change in the international political atmosphere, whether we can devise institutions that will permit man’s most impressive scientific achievement to be put to work for his well-being.

Tomorrow’s world will largely depend upon what is done with atomic energy. What is done with atomic energy will largely depend on the outcome of this conference. Let us hope—and pray—that a few weeks from today we shall be able to say to our fellow men: “We have done something here that makes it more likely that we and our children will live out our lives in peace”; that, in the words of the United Nations Charter, we have done something “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.”


On September 24 the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State (press release 503) announced that the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada have entered into an agreement interchanging rights in inventions and discoveries in the atomic-energy field on which patents were held or applied for by one government in one or more of the other countries as of November 15, 1955.

The purpose of the tripartite agreement is to allow use of the inventions in each country by government and industry without interference of the other governments. This is done by a “cross assignment” of rights, under which each government assigns to the others the rights, title, and
interests owned by it in the other countries. Each assigning government retains a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up license on each invention for its own purposes and for purposes of mutual defense.

The exchange gives full rights to each government in its own country and permits it to grant licenses to industry in accordance with national policy. It will permit the U.S. Government, with respect to the inventions acquired from the Canadian and United Kingdom Governments, to grant royalty-free licenses to American industry. The exchange also will permit the Canadian and United Kingdom Governments to follow their own domestic policies relating to patents.

A nondiscrimination clause in the agreement binds each government to grant licenses to nationals of the other governments on the same terms accorded its own nationals.

The agreement is expected to be of particular benefit to the growing private atomic-energy industries in each of the signatory countries by eliminating questions of patent infringement. Firms engaging in home manufacture will need licenses only from their own governments, and, in view of the agreement’s antidiscrimination provision, firms of one country engaging in business in one or both of the other countries cannot be discriminated against by the governments of the other countries.

All inventions and discoveries which are the subject of government-owned patents or patent applications as of November 15, 1955, are affected. These are of two classes:

1. Inventions known as CPC (Combined Policy Committee) inventions, which arose from wartime collaboration among the three governments. In these cases, the inventors assigned their rights to the governments employing them and the patent rights obtained or applied for were held in trust pending settlement of the interests of the three governments.

2. Inventions and discoveries which, though within the cooperative arrangement, were developed independently and are owned by one government.

The cutoff date of November 15, 1955, was selected as a matter of convenience. The intent of the agreement is that the interchange of rights shall cover the period during which atomic-energy operations were largely a government monopoly in each of the three countries. The agreement does not commit the governments for the future, nor does it affect inventions made as a result of the agreements for cooperation in atomic energy entered into by the United States with the United Kingdom and Canada on June 15, 1955.

CPC inventions total about 50, and patent applications have been filed on many of them in all three countries. The number of patents or patent applications relating to work carried on independently of the wartime cooperative arrangement amounts to several hundred. Many of the applications are still classified, and this has limited the number of patents issued so far.

Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America, the Government of Canada, and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as to Disposition of Rights in Atomic Energy Inventions

The Government of the United States of America, the Government of Canada, and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

Recognizing that the rights, title and interests in certain inventions and discoveries (known as Combined Policy Committee inventions) resulting from wartime cooperation of the Governments of the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom are held in a fiduciary capacity at present; and

Believing (1) that it is desirable at this time to make the final disposition of the rights, title and interests in those inventions and discoveries, and (2) that mutual benefit will result from the interchange of rights, title and interests in existing inventions and discoveries in the field of and related to atomic energy which are the subject of patents or patent applications by one Government in the country of one or both of the other Governments;

Have agreed as follows:

**Article I**

The term “Government” or “Governments” in this Agreement shall be deemed to include:

1. In the case of the United States, the United States Atomic Energy Commission;
2. In the case of the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority;

**Article II**

It is desirable to make final and ultimate disposition of the rights, title and interests in the Combined Policy Committee Inventions, thereby terminating the fiduciary

---

provision heretofore applying. To that end, the Government or Governments employing the inventor or inventors shall own the entire rights, title and interests in any such Combined Policy Committee invention which is the subject of a patent or patent application in one or more of the three countries.

ARTICLE III

In addition, it is desirable and to the mutual benefit to exchange certain rights, title and interests in all inventions or discoveries in the field of atomic energy which are the subject of patents or patent applications by one Government in the country or countries of either one or both of the other two Governments as of November 15, 1955.

ARTICLE IV

With respect to any invention or discovery within the scope of Articles II and III, each Government, within the limits of its ownership as of November 15, 1955:

1. Shall transfer and assign to the other Government or Governments such rights, title and interests as the assigning and transferring Government may own in the other's country, subject to the retention by the assigning and transferring Government of a non-exclusive, irrevocable, paid-up license to make, use and have made or used such invention or discovery by or for the assigning and transferring Government or for purposes of mutual defense.

2. Shall accord the right to a non-exclusive, irrevocable, paid-up license to the other Governments to make, use, and have made or used such invention or discovery by or for such other Government or Governments or for purposes of mutual defense in all countries.

3. Shall not discriminate against nationals of the other Government or Governments in the grant of licenses in any patents or patent applications owned by each Government or in which each Government acquires ownership or rights under this Agreement, but shall accord licenses to nationals of the other Government or Governments on the same or as favorable terms as it accords licenses to its own nationals (including its Government owned or controlled corporations when such corporations practice the invention or discovery in the performance of services for a party other than the licensing Government).

4. Shall waive any and all claims against the other Government or Governments for compensation, royalty or award as respects any invention or discovery within the scope of Articles II and III, and release the other Government or Governments with respect to any claim on any such invention or discovery.

ARTICLE V

This Agreement shall come into force on the date of signature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Agreement.

DONE at Washington this twenty-fourth day of September 1956, in three original texts.

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
C. Burke Elrick
Lewis L. Strauss

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA:
A. D. P. Heeney

FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND:
Roger Makins

Icelandic Foreign Minister Invited to Washington

Press release 513 dated September 29

In response to a suggestion made by Icelandic Foreign Minister Emil Jonsson, he has been invited to come to Washington to exchange views with U.S. authorities concerning the defense installations in Iceland. Mr. Jonsson is expected to arrive in Washington September 30.

Letters of Credence

Uruguay

The newly appointed Ambassador of Uruguay, Julio A. Lacarte Muro, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on September 28. For the text of the Ambassador's remarks and the text of the President's reply, see Department of State press release 511.
Transcript of Secretary Dulles’ News Conference

Press release 508 dated September 26

Secretary Dulles: I have a short statement to read, copies of which will be available, I hope, before you leave.¹

U.S. Objective in Suez Situation

The purpose of the United States in relation to the Suez situation is precisely that which is set forth in the first article of the charter of the United Nations, namely, to seek a settlement “by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.” Now this is not easy to do quickly. There is not acceptance by all as to what is “just,” nor as to the rights of the nations under international law. Therefore, a settlement in accordance with the provisions of the charter calls for patience and resourcefulness. We are confident that with these qualities there will be an agreed settlement.

Some may ask what are the inducements for the kind of settlement that we seek if force is not used. How can a nation be brought to accept a settlement which recognizes the rights of others? The answer is that no nation can live happily for long or live well without accepting the obligations of interdependence.

When a nation’s conduct frightens others, there are inevitable consequences. For example, the tone of some of the official utterances of the Government and of the press in Egypt has been so intensively anti-Western that many foreigners are being frightened away and tourists are not coming to Egypt and thus Egypt loses foreign exchange needed to pay for the imports which the Egyptian people want. Some commercial activities in Egypt are drying up because they depend upon foreign markets and foreign sources of credit and these are not readily available to a nation which rejects the implications of interdependence. Until recently important business and financial interests were thinking in terms of enlarging and deepening the Suez waterway with consequent benefit to Egypt. Now their thoughts are of big tankers and additional pipelines which will make it possible for nations to be less dependent upon the Suez Canal.

It is understandable that a country which until lately has been under foreign rule should be highly sensitive on matters of sovereignty. We must, in this respect, be tolerant. But we need not feel frustrated, because if we are patient, yet persistent and resourceful, there is a good chance that Egypt will come freely to recognize the importance of working with, and not working against, the many important countries which use the canal and which want good relations with Egypt.

We believe that the proceedings which are to begin this afternoon in the United Nations Security Council will help to bring about the just solution called for by the first article of the charter.

Now if you have any questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, will the United States back the British-French position in that U.N. debate, as we know it so far?

A. Well, I think in general that we will. There has not yet been any definitive formulation of precisely what relief the British and French will seek of the Security Council, so that I can only say we assume that it will follow the general lines of what was found at our first London conference to be a just and fair solution.² It will probably also follow the lines of the second conference as to what we think might be a provisional solution which might be adopted pending agreement on

¹The following seven paragraphs were also released separately as press release 507 dated September 26.

²For text of 18-nation proposals of Aug. 23, see BULLETIN of Sept. 3, 1956, p. 373.
a permanent solution. Within the context of those two conferences and their actions will probably be found, basically, the British and French position. On that assumption we would expect to be in accord with them.

Q. Are you going yourself to New York, sir?

A. I am not going today. I quite possibly will go when the matter comes up for substantive discussions, particularly if the other Foreign Ministers, or several of them, are present to present their case. I think it would be courteous for me to go there and hear their presentation and perhaps make a substantive presentation of my own in view of the active part I have taken in this matter so far. I wouldn’t expect to be up there for a long period to follow the entire proceedings, which might be somewhat protracted.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said at some point the users association, which will now shortly be formed, will present a ship or convoy to go with a pilot to the Egyptian Government at the mouth of the Suez Canal to determine whether the Egyptian Government will permit one of the association’s pilots to operate in the canal.

A. Well, I think it is quite likely that that practical situation will be presented, although probably not in the immediate future, because it is going to take a little time to get the association organized and to make the arrangements to get pilots. But one of the things that we hope for is that, if the problem is presented in a practical way at the working-level basis, there may be at least a provisional result which will be temporarily acceptable to both sides and that would be a good way to present the issue.

Q. Now I would like to ask one followup question. At a previous press conference when this kind of situation was discussed the question of alternatives also came up. If the Egyptian Government should refuse this or other acceptable terms of transit, would you be prepared to take alternative measures such as sending ships around the continent of Africa?

A. We have no legal power to direct ships to particular voyages. But we assume, if they can’t get through the canal upon reasonable terms and in view of the decision of the United States, at least, as I put it, not to shoot its way through the canal, that they would in fact go around the Cape. That, in turn, would involve a diminution in the amount of cargo that could be carried. That would be particularly felt in terms of oil. It would involve some cutdown in the oil which is drawn from the countries of the Middle East and its replacement with oil presumably from this hemisphere. That might involve increased exports of United States oil, and under those circumstances the Export-Import Bank, as I indicated, would be ready to play its normal role in helping to finance those exports.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would the United States vote for the inscription of the Egyptian item in the Security Council?

A. I don’t want to anticipate what our position will be on those matters which will be coming up in the next 2 or 3 hours in New York. I would rather wait, because we don’t know precisely how those issues will be formulated. Ambassador Lodge will have the immediate responsibility, and I don’t want to prejudice the situation by making comments which might not be applicable since we can’t tell exactly what the procedure will be this afternoon.

U.S.–Argentine Relations

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you discuss the scope of the role of Dr. Milton Eisenhower in United States diplomatic relations in Argentina?

A. Well, I suppose that you are referring to a piece which we both may have read in the paper this morning.

Q. Yes, sir.

A. I am quite willing to comment on that because it does relate to some factual matters relating to the conduct of United States foreign policy. I would say, first of all, that the relationship of Dr. Eisenhower to Latin America has been a highly constructive one. It has never involved any interference whatsoever with the normal functioning of the Department of State in relation to departmental matters and policy matters. He did, after his first trip, come back with certain recommendations with respect to increased

---

3 For text of joint statement and declaration of Sept. 21, see Ibid., Oct. 1, 1956, p. 507.
5 See p. 560.
trade, increased credit, increased investments, increased technical assistance, which were adopted and which have formed the basis of our foreign policy toward Latin America. In all those respects our relationship is at a new high.

Now as far as relates to the Perón government, I could just make these comments:

The first is that the Perón government came into power under our preceding administration. It went out of power under this administration.

The Perón government received loan agreements from our prior administration totaling upwards of $100 million. It received no loan agreement from this administration, although we have extended credits now to the successor government.

Under our prior administration many of our newspapering agencies were denied facilities in the Argentine. One of the first acts of this administration was to see that those facilities were restored.

Under our prior administration La Prensa had been seized and taken over by the Argentine Government. During this administration, through the action of the new Argentine Government, La Prensa has been restored and is functioning in freedom.

That is a record which, I think, ought to be known and of which this administration is proud.

**Legal Rights of User Nations**

**Q. Mr. Secretary, in your prepared Suez statement you mentioned the fact there is a disagreement over the legal rights in this case. Is it the position of the United States that the legal right of user nations is to have a voice in the operation of the canal?**

A. The user's association is to help the ships, the vessels of countries who have rights under the 1888 treaty, to get the benefit of those rights on a de facto or practical basis. We are not, through that association, seeking primarily to raise a question of legal rights, however, but to see whether we can't get on to a practical operating basis with the Government of Egypt.

**Q. I wasn't referring to the user's association. I meant in the broad, legal context do you believe the user nations as a body or as individuals have a legal right to have a voice in the operation?**

A. We believe that the treaty of 1888 internationalizes, you might say, the right of use of the canal. It creates a sort of an easement across Egyptian territory, of which we believe the beneficiaries of the treaty as well as the parties to the treaty have the right to make use. And we believe they are also entitled to organize to exercise the right of use and, generally, their rights under the treaty.

**Q. Mr. Secretary, in your statement you discussed the possibility of the construction of an alternative pipeline. There was mention today that the British and French today were considering pipelines by Israel or Turkey to bypass the Suez. Is the United States prepared to help in the financial cost of such construction?**

A. Well, I haven't gone into that because I don't think there would be any occasion for the United States Government to help. I believe that the oil companies which are interested in assuring the steady and regular transit of oil have themselves the resources to do whatever they deem necessary in that respect; so the question of Government help has not come up so far as I am aware.

**Q. Mr. Secretary, have we had any informal talks at the diplomatic or other level with the Soviet Union on the subject of the Suez, and, if not, do you think they might be useful or enlightening?**

A. Well, of course, I had talks with Mr. Shepilov, the Soviet Foreign Minister, at the first conference of the 22 nations. We have had no talks since that time. It may be that, in view of the activities which will be going on now in New York at the Security Council and the fact that the Soviet Union is a member of the Security Council, there could be further informal discussions between any or all of the Security Council members. I don't exclude that as a possibility, but nothing has taken place of that sort since the first Suez conference in London. And nothing of a concrete nature is in contemplation.

**Q. Mr. Secretary, could you define for us the position regarding tolls—both the present position and the prospects for the immediate future? I refer to the tolls paid for by United States ships and also for ships owned by the United States but under foreign registry.**

A. It is planned, as I indicated in a letter which I left with the Foreign Minister of the United

Kingdom in London just before I left last week, it is indicated that we will take steps to amend the present Treasury license so as to preclude any direct payments to Egypt and to permit such payments to Egypt only as they might occur through payments to the users association. Of course, you know the users association under its charter is authorized to make certain payments over to the Government of Egypt, because we do not expect Egypt to help maintain the canal entirely out of its own funds. And there could in that way be payments to Egypt through the users association, which would act, you might say, as an agent for the vessels. But outside of that, we would not expect that there would be any payments to Egypt by United States flag vessels. We do not have in mind extending that to vessels which are not of United States registry. That involves possible questions of conflict of laws, and, until we know more clearly what the views might be of the countries of registry, we do not expect, certainly initially, to impose a restriction upon those vessels. We would hope that they might find it desirable voluntarily to conform to the same practice as U.S. flag vessels. But the extension of our authority to vessels which are owned by corporations of other nations and incorporated under the laws of other nations and which fly under the flag of other nations is a step which we do not contemplate taking at the present time.

Q. Mr. Secretary, is there a legal power in the United States Government to direct shippers to pay funds to the users association? My impression was that you could only prevent them being paid directly to Egypt if they were paid into blocked accounts in this country.

A. There is no authority to compel payments to any particular person. There is authority to prohibit payments to particular persons. Now, as I tried to explain, the action contemplated would be to prohibit direct payments to Egypt. We would not prohibit payments which might flow to Egypt through the users association if they chose to make payment in that way.

Q. That would be their choice?

A. That would be their choice. We can’t compel them to pay the users association, but, if they pay neither Egypt nor the users association, their chance of getting through the canal becomes considerably less, so that we would assume as a practical matter they would, at least until they saw how it worked, pay into the users association.

Q. Mr. Secretary, Israeli sources say that some 70 tankers, among them Norwegian, Danish, and American, have been blacklisted over the last 2 years by the Egyptian Government in its blockade of Israel for attempting to haul food to Israel. In addition to that you will recall within the last several months, perhaps it’s more than a year, an American ship was fired on by the Egyptians in the Gulf of Aqaba. Protests—diplomatic protests—have been made over these incidents to Cairo. But so far, unless I am misinformed, no other action has been taken and no results from Egypt. Against this background, is there any reason to believe that a ship brought by the users association to the canal under circumstances mentioned a minute ago, that anything would happen on our part, on the Western nations’ part, if Egypt wouldn’t let us through?

A. Well, I have said, when you talk about anything “happening” on our part, if by that you mean that we would try, as I put it, to shoot our way through, there is no reason to think that we would shoot our way through. I have excluded that, so far as that concerns any present United States policy. Now, I tried to point out in my opening statement that attitudes by any country which seem to be in defiance of the rights of others may, if that defiance is widespread, bring about repercussions which are undesirable, and undesired by the country which engages in that defiance. There are pressures which gradually grow up, not artificially stimulated but as quite natural and inevitable. I believe, if we are patient, resourceful, persistent, we can count on those pressures having some positive result. But I do not believe that the situation is such now as to call for any drastic action like going to war.

Q. Well, perhaps it would be helpful if you could clarify, sir, a point that you made the other day. I believe you said, in connection with the Suez, that, although pointing out that merchant ships usually are not armed, if a merchant ship was attacked in the canal, it would have the right to defend itself. Could you elaborate a little bit on that, as to what might ensue if something of that kind happened?

A. Well, I don’t think it would be very useful to do that, because these ships that go through
the canal, these merchant ships and tankers, so far as I know, do not have any means to defend themselves; so it's a rather hypothetical question. I was asked, I think, what would happen if it was attacked. I said a vessel that is attacked has a right to try to defend itself. I doubt whether there is sufficient means to do that, to make it worth while to go any further than I did.

**Route Around the Cape**

**Q.** Can you clarify the going around the Cape, Mr. Secretary? If the canal remains open to the principal maritime powers, would we send our ships or expect our ships to go around the Cape if the users association were not able to get its ship through on its own terms, that is, on its own power?

**A.** Well, do you mean would we be the only country to send our ships around the Cape?

**Q.** If the canal remained open to the powers—that is, it wasn't closed to functioning normally—and the only ship that was turned back was a ship of the users association with its own pilot, would we expect it to go around the Cape? Would all members of the users association go around it?

**A.** Well, there is no obligation which results from joining the users association to act in unison, in respect to that matter, or to use the Cape. Each country decides for itself, or perhaps you can say each vessel decides for itself, what it will do. There are certain compulsions on tolls which apply to the United States registry vessels, or will apply after we have taken the action which I described, and there would be comparable compulsions which will be operated as regards the British and French ships and some of the others. But that results from the voluntary action of their governments, and nobody, by joining the users association, is obligated to take that action. Undoubtedly there will be some vessels which would try to use the Suez Canal under any circumstances. We can't prevent that. We cannot create, nor do we attempt to create, any universal boycott of the canal.

**Q.** But there would be an American boycott of the canal if the ships of the users association were turned back?

**A.** I didn't quite get the question.

**Q.** But there would be an American diversion of shipping if a ship of the users association were turned back?

**A.** Well, any ship that was diverted would automatically, I suppose, go around the Cape. But because one ship was diverted wouldn't necessarily mean that all would be diverted. Any ships that couldn't get through the canal would presumably go around the Cape.

**Q.** If Egypt closed the canal to shipping, I mean, it would be diverted. If Egypt closed the canal to a given ship, then it would go around the Cape?

**A.** That's right.

**Q.** Only under those circumstances?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** In order to clarify this point, Mr. Secretary, for a moment, at least in my mind, would an association ship which goes to the mouth of the canal insist on using its own pilot even though an Egyptian pilot might be available to guide that ship through the canal?

**A.** No, I don't think so. I pointed out in a statement which I made in London—I think it was released to the press—it was in answer to a question put by the Japanese delegate, that the availability of association pilots was a convenience and not a matter of necessity. We have no power to compel American flag vessels to take any particular pilot or to refuse to take any particular pilot. That is a matter primarily for the master of the ship to decide for himself.

**Q.** Well, Mr. Secretary, just to go one step farther on that. If an American ship came up there, a member of the users association, with its own pilot, and asked permission to go through, and Egypt said very politely, "Well, you can go through if you use our pilot, but your pilot can't go through"—I think that's what Jack had in mind—then what would the action of that ship probably be?

**A.** It would be up to the master of that ship to decide what he wanted to do. If he wanted to take the Egyptian pilot, he is entitled to do so. We can't prohibit that. The issue is more likely to arise with reference to dues than it is with reference to the pilots, I think, because there the
master may be under a prohibition against paying directly to the Egyptian authorities.

Q. But isn’t it a matter of fact, Mr. Secretary, that, since you are limiting this dues freeze or diversion only to United States flag ships, this does not greatly affect the ships owned by United States citizens or corporations since the bulk of those using the canal are under Panamanian or Liberian registry? So that, in effect, it probably would have little effect, and it would alter very little the amount of money now being paid by these companies and ships to the Egyptian Government?

A. That is a fact. But bear in mind that the amount of money which Egypt gets out of the Suez Canal is not a major factor in the Egyptian economy and the pressures which could be exerted by going around the canal would be relatively little. There will still be plenty of boats to go through the canal, because there are a lot of ships of some other registry. Ships will be transferred maybe to a registry which makes it easier for them to go through the canal, and there always will be as long as the canal is open—there will always be a certain amount of revenue to Egypt from that source. Perhaps it won’t be quite as much, but, on the other hand, the burden on Egypt will not be quite as much either.

And I think we have to think a bit in terms of the fact that, if you try to hurt Egypt to the extent of a dollar at the cost to yourself of $1,000 or $10,000, that isn’t a very profitable enterprise in the long run. It isn’t as though this canal were vital to Egypt’s economy. The amount of revenue that Egypt has derived from it has been somewhere between, I think, $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 in the past in terms of its share of the profits from the canal company, and the idea that any grave economic blow can be struck at Egypt through the nonuse of the canal is a quite false conception.

Now we do believe that there are certain rights involved which raise questions of principle. But the attitude we take is primarily in the exercise of our rights as a matter of principle, not because we believe that that is a profitable enterprise from the standpoint of ourselves or from the standpoint of striking any grave blow at Egypt and then the Western bases in the Arab countries. Some Soviet diplomats in London were also quoted to that effect. Would you care to comment on such a possibility?

A. Well, I do not accept the possibility that Egypt, as you put it, is going to “get away with it.” And the reasons why I don’t accept that possibility are set out in my opening statement: that a nation which attempts to defy the reasonable rights of others, the reasonable requests of others, loses in an infinite number of unpredictable but certain ways. And the way in which Egypt will suffer the most is not, perhaps, through the diversion of a few ships from the canal, but it will be in these other ways. I think that Egypt will come to recognize that it is not good business to deny what I call the implications of interdependence. We live, all of us, in an interdependent world, and you cannot deny the principle of interdependence in one respect without suffering from that denial in a whole lot of other respects, and the consequences, in the long run, of persistence in this course to Egypt would be very bad. And I don’t see any prospect of Egypt making a success out of the path it is now going. I believe that Egypt will lose in terms of its own economic development; it will lose in terms of the relationship which it has with other states, excluding other Arab States. Therefore, I do not think that the course Egypt has embarked upon is a course which is going to lead to an Egyptian success. But the way to bring about a change, as I say, in my opinion, is not to go to war about it. This kind of Egyptian action is going irrevocably, inexorably to bring about certain consequences. Those are not consequences, I say, which are artificial, which are stimulated—these just are inevitable, and I think that that will gradually become apparent.

Q. Mr. Dulles, are you reconsidering any action on the Aswan Dam financing?

A. No, I am not.

Q. There have been some reports in the paper that you were.

A. Those reports are inaccurate. I explained at the time when we announced our decision about the Aswan Dam that the basic reason for not going ahead with it was because that Aswan Dam project, as then formulated, was a project of great magnitude, which required close cooperation of Egypt and foreign countries over a period of
around 15 years. I did not think it likely that that kind of an intimate, close relationship could be depended upon for that period of time. And those considerations and others mentioned at the time still prevail at the present time. In other words, the reasons why we didn’t go ahead are just as valid today as they were before.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in connection with your previous answer—just previous to this one—if Egypt should persist in trying to get away with it, as it were, what other measures—economic, psychological, or otherwise—are we studying with an idea of applying them to increase the pressure?

A. We are not studying any methods with a view to applying them. We are not engaged in economic warfare against Egypt. But, as I point out, there are consequences, consequences which we couldn’t obviate if we wished, the kind of consequences I talked about in my opening statement. Those are inexorable and are going to be there and constantly working. And it is those kinds of pressures, influences, which lead nations to accept the consequences of interdependence, because they gradually realize that an assertion of sovereignty to such an extreme that it frightens others destroys their credit and confidence in them. That, in the long run, is a policy which leads only to negative results, and I believe that gradual recognition of that fact will bring about a basis for a reasonable settlement here.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what view does the United States take of Israel participation in the Suez Canal Users Association?

A. Well, that matter has not come up. The provisional view which was taken at the second London conference was that the qualifications for membership would probably be similar to those which prevailed at the time of the first London conference, namely, 1,000,000 net tons or more of shipping through the canal during the prior calendar year, or a pattern of trade which showed approximately 50 percent or more dependence upon the canal. If those are adopted, as seemed to be forecast by the talks of the second London conference of the 18, then Israel would not be eligible to be a member.

On the other hand, you may recall that the proposal—that the statement that was issued about the users association did say that the facilities of the association would be made available to any vessels whether or not members. Because we believe that the principle of nondiscriminatory passage through the canal, in accordance with the 1888 treaty, is one we should recognize ourselves and that we should not try to set up an organization which obtained preferential rights for our members. So if any other vessel wants to get the facilities of the association, those facilities will be available to it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, then Israel, on the basis which you have just now discussed, would actually be deprived, as a consequence of the blockade that Egypt has practiced—Israel would have no way of having tons go through, because in the past 5 years, at least, no tonnage has been permitted to go through the canal and, consequently, this trade has had to be rerouted. Now in this sense wouldn’t you say that Egypt would be in a sense again getting away with it as she has been with regard to Israel?

A. Well, as I pointed out, whether or not Israel is an actual member of the association is irrelevant from the standpoint of the facilities of the association being made available, let us say, to Israeli ships and to Israeli cargoes. They would have all the facilities of the association.

It is awfully hard to guess as to what the volume of Israeli trade would have been through the canal if it had been permitted, or what the number of vessels would have been, and so forth. So I doubt whether you could establish any criteria which would be based upon that kind of guessing, you might say. But I don’t think that Israel is prejudiced by that result, because of the availability, as I say, of the facilities of the association to all ships.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there has been a new outbreak of border incidents between Jordan and Israel. Do you see in this new situation any danger of an adverse impact on the efforts to get a Suez Canal settlement?

A. Well, I deplore and regret the outbreak of additional border incidents. They seem to indicate the nonacceptance of the principles for which the Secretary-General of the United Nations strove when he undertook his recent mission to that part of the world. At the moment I do not see any likelihood of a direct relationship of nationalization to the Suez Canal situation. Conceivably, one might develop, but so far the two issues have been rather independent of each other.
Foreign Governments Invited To Send Election Observers to United States

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Press release 512 dated September 28

In consonance with the program of increasing contacts between the people of the United States and the countries of Eastern Europe, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a policy which was announced June 29, 1956, by the President, the Department of State has recently issued through its missions abroad an invitation to the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania to send representatives to the United States in October to view at first hand the free electoral processes in this country. As in previous election years, a number of representatives from other countries will arrive in October as guests of the U. S. Government.

The Department assumes that the invitation would be of special interest to government officials or to professors of government, political science, or law and has suggested that the representatives named be selected from these groups. It also assumes that, since such visits are understood to have a reciprocal basis, Americans would be invited to view elections in their countries on the next appropriate occasion.

TEXT OF INVITATION

In the interest of promoting mutual understanding, the United States Government invites the Government to send two or three representatives to the United States for a fifteen-day period in order to familiarize themselves with the two-party electoral processes whereby the Chief Executive and Members of the Congress of the United States are chosen. It is assumed that this would be of special interest to certain government officials or to professors of government, political science or law and therefore suggests that the representatives named be selected from these groups. It is also suggested that a working knowledge of English would be most desirable to permit maximum advantage to be derived from the visit, although interpreters will be available as required. Travel to and from New York and expenses of the representatives while in the United States will be arranged as well as an itinerary and program to permit the most advantageous observation of the two-party campaign. Representatives should plan to depart for the United States not later than October 22 and would finish their tour about November 7.

Since such visits are customarily understood to have a reciprocal basis, it is assumed that on the next appropriate occasion Americans would be invited to view elections in .

When the Foreign Office has responded to this invitation and nominated its representatives, the Embassy [Legation] will be glad to supply information and assistance regarding travel arrangements and visas.

Deputy Under Secretary Murphy To Visit Germany

Press release 506 dated September 25

The Department of State announced on September 25 that Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy will represent the U.S. Government at the laying of the cornerstone of the new Conference Hall (Kongresshalle) in Berlin on October 3. Representative Kenneth Keating will also be present, as well as Mrs. Eleanor Lansing Dullas, Special Assistant to the Director of the Office of German Affairs.

The Conference Hall, dedicated to Benjamin Franklin, will be the U.S. participation in the International Building Exhibition in 1957. It is a unique structure, both because of its advanced design and because of the joint United States and German effort which has made it possible. It is now being built in the Tiergarten area near the sector border separating West Berlin from the Communist Sector. Its facilities will include various halls for assembly and discussion, including an auditorium for 1,200 persons.

During his visit to Berlin, Mr. Murphy, in addition to an address at the cornerstone-laying ceremonies of the Conference Hall, will address the Ernst Reuter Gesellschaft. This society honors the name of the late Mayor of West Berlin, who personified the courageous struggle of his fellow citizens against Communist pressure particularly during the Berlin blockade in 1948-49.

Mr. Murphy also will visit Bonn during his brief trip to Germany. In the course of his career in the Foreign Service Mr. Murphy has had close associations with Germany. He served at Munich in the 1920's and from 1948 to 1949 as political

1 Bulletin of July 9, 1956, p. 54.

1 For background, see Bulletin of Jan. 2, 1956, p. 15.
adviser to the United States High Commissioner at Frankfort. He is also a former Acting Director of the Office of German and Austrian Affairs in the Department of State.

International Understanding in the Business World

Remarks by President Eisenhower

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this great audience:

It is a very definite honor for this Nation's Capital to be the host to such a distinguished body. I assure you that we are complimented by your presence.

I suppose seated here before me is the greatest concentration of financial genius that this world could produce. That being so, you can be sure of one thing: I am not going to talk about international finances. I think I would prefer to talk for a minute or two about some of the meanings—some of the results—of the kind of cooperation that you people are here to undertake.

International cooperation is the key to peace. It must come about. It must progress from year to year—or the world must be the poorer by reason of that failure.

We have the United Nations in order to spread understanding—one of the other—a place where we may debate our differences, rather than resort to the ancient arbiter of force—an organization to promote and sustain peace. We have such defensive organizations as Nato and Seato and the Organization of American States—all having as one of their main purposes the security of all of the member states against unwarranted attack.

In this International Bank and the International Monetary Fund, we have the possibility of extending this cooperative field into our business life—the international business life. As mutual understanding and good will and, above all, confidence in each other are the basis of any successful business within a nation, so it is in the international world.

As confidence grows, in turn based upon mutual understanding, and based upon meetings such as these, we are bound to have a general rise in the living standards of the world. Business thrives in the spirit, the confidence, thus engendered.

So, you pool long-term capital and provide technical advice and help for all of the organisms that are struggling to produce wealth so that all the people of the world may prosper. You do it together and therefore add to the strength of each, so that the whole total becomes one not only formidable—it is truly overwhelming in its influence.

I have only one other word to say. It has to do with an experience of mine in wartime, where I was working with groups that had among themselves to develop real cooperation or there could be no success. There are men in this audience who were my associates in that work. We early found one thing: Without the heart, without the enthusiasm for the cause in which we were working, no cooperation was possible. With that enthusiasm, subordinating all else to the advancement of the cause, cooperation was easy.

Now it seems to me you people have shown your enthusiasm for doing your part in developing this growing and expanding world economy by coming here, by coming from so many different nations—giving your time and your effort to meet with others in order that the whole may prosper.

Because you do show that enthusiasm, that kind of leadership, I venture to offer to each of you my felicitations and my complete confidence that nothing you could be now doing in your own country or elsewhere is more worthwhile than what you are doing here in this great meeting you have been holding.

Again I say, Washington—this Nation's Capital—this entire Government—the American people—are proud to have had you here. We hope only that these meetings may be frequent and each one of them more fruitful than its predecessor.

Thank you very much.

President's Citizen Advisers on Mutual Security

James C. Hagerty, press secretary to President Eisenhower, announced on September 3 that the President had on that day appointed Benjamin Fairless, former president and chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corporation, as coordinator of a committee to review the foreign
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assistance programs of the United States and to make recommendations as to the future policy of the Government with respect to military, economic, technical, and other programs in the light of foreign policy and the national interest of the United States. The group will be called the President's Citizen Advisers on the Mutual Security Program.

On September 22 Mr. Hagerty announced the names of the other members of the group:

Colgate W. Darden, Jr., president of the University of Virginia
Richard R. Deupree, chairman of the board of Proctor and Gamble Co.
John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America
Whitelaw Reid, chairman of the board of the New York Herald Tribune
Walter Bedell Smith, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency, former Under Secretary of State, vice chairman of the American Machine and Foundry Co.
Jesse W. Tapp, vice chairman of the board of directors of the Bank of America

The group held its first meeting at Washington on September 27.

President's Views on U.S. Aid to Refugees and Escapees

Representative Kenneth B. Keating of New York on September 20 wrote to President Eisenhower in connection with his forthcoming visit to Europe as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. Following is the text of the President's reply, released by the White House on September 25.

September 24, 1956

Dear Sen.: I am delighted to learn of your forthcoming visit to Europe in the interest of refugees and escapees.

It is fundamental that free America remain an asylum for a substantial number of those who continue to risk their lives to reach freedom. I was, therefore, greatly disappointed that the Congress failed to heed my several requests to pass legislation to preserve this noble role of America in the world. It was no less than a tragedy for the people directly concerned abroad. Only nine days before the Congress adjourned, I emphasized my feelings about this in a letter of July 18 to Senator Arthur Watkins. I pointed out that this legislation was urgently needed in a critical situation, and was fully in the spirit of one of our country's proudest traditions—that of offering a haven to the persecuted and oppressed.

I will, of course, again urge such legislation in the next session of the Congress.

And I do hope that your present mission will help you to carry forward even more vigorously your efforts to persuade the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Congress of the need for early and favorable action in this field.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

U.S. Views on Polish Trials

Statement by President Eisenhower

White House press release dated September 26

Recent news from Poland indicates that at least some of the persons arrested in connection with the Poznan riots are soon to be put on trial. Friends of freedom throughout the world will be hoping that all of the accused will be given a genuinely fair and open trial with bona fide legal counsel to defend them and with an opportunity to speak their minds freely without fear of subsequent retribution and deportation eastward.

This would provide tangible evidence that some so-called Stalinist methods will be abandoned in practice as well as in theory. However, the limited information released publicly in Poland thus far regarding the trials is in no way reassuring. Apparently not even a complete list of those arrested has been made public.

Whatever the outcome of the trials, whatever the immediate and long-term effects of the Poznan riots, one fact has become clearer than ever. There can be no permanent solution of the situation in Poland until the Polish people are given an opportunity to elect a government of their own choosing.

The basic problem in Poland is not what particular type of economic or social system shall prevail; that is something which the Polish people can and should decide for themselves. What is essential is that they be given the opportunity to do so in free and unfettered elections.

1 Bulletin of July 30, 1956, p. 194.
General Pulaski’s Memorial Day

A PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS a grateful Nation has enshrined in its heart the memory of those selfless men who came from across the seas and aided in the achievement of our independence during the Revolutionary War; and

WHEREAS October 11, 1956, marks the one hundred and seventy-seventh anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, one of those heroes who left his homeland to fight in our cause, and who for that cause laid down his life; and

WHEREAS the story of his valiant assault upon the city of Savannah at the head of the Pulaski Legion, where he received a mortal wound, has long stirred the imagination and evoked the admiration of all who hold liberty dear; and

WHEREAS this distinguished Pole, who had achieved the rank of Brigadier General before his untimely death at the age of 31 years, left to posterity an inspiring example of fidelity to principle which we should cherish and emulate:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, do hereby invite the people of this Nation to observe Thursday, the eleventh day of October, 1956, as General Pulaski’s Memorial Day with suitable commemorative ceremonies; and I direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all Government buildings on that day as a mark of respect to the memory of General Pulaski.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-fourth day of September in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

By the President:

JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Secretary of State.

Ambassadorial Talks at Geneva
With Chinese Communists

Press release 504 dated September 24

For more than 13 months the United States has been carrying on discussions with the Chinese Communists at Geneva directed toward bringing about the release of our imprisoned citizens and obtaining a commitment from the Chinese Com-

munists for a meaningful renunciation of force to include the Taiwan area. Neither of these objectives has yet been achieved. On September 21 the Chinese Communists issued a statement announcing that they had proposed in the Geneva meetings that discussions be shifted to the question of relaxation of trade restrictions but that the United States had “in effect refused.”

The United States is not prepared to enter into a discussion of trade restrictions with the Chinese Communists at a time when they continue to refuse to renounce the use of force in the Taiwan area and continue to hold imprisoned American citizens as political hostages, despite their pledge in the agreed announcement of September 10, 1955, to permit them expeditiously to exercise their right to return. We have so informed the Chinese Communists at Geneva.

It is hardly reasonable to expect the United States to discuss a relaxation of its trade restrictions when the trade that would result from such a relaxation would strengthen a regime which refuses to renounce the use of force against us.

ICA Loan Agreement
With Republic of China

A $20-million loan agreement between the United States and the Republic of China on Taiwan (Formosa) has been formally signed by both countries, the International Cooperation Administration announced on September 17. The loan was planned last year as part of the $70 million in economic aid extended by the United States to Taiwan from fiscal 1956 mutual security funds.

The mutual security legislation for fiscal year 1956 instructed Ica to make loans instead of grants of aid whenever possible. Similar agreements with 12 other countries will provide for the repayment to the United States of more than $210 million of the economic aid funds extended during fiscal year 1956.

China entered a similar agreement with Ica in fiscal year 1955 for the repayment of $20 million of that year’s economic assistance, which totaled $103 million.

Both years' loans are repayable over 40 years, with interest at 4 percent if repaid in Chinese currency and 3 percent if repaid in U.S. dollars.

1 No. 3156; 21 Fed. Reg. 7309.

Repayment of the loans begins 4 years from the date of signing.

The new loan to China, like the 1955 loan, was in Chinese currency which that country paid for U.S. surplus agricultural commodities sent as part of the aid program. The Chinese Government is using the funds primarily to extend loans to industries as part of its program to increase productive capacity and bring the country closer to self-support.

The Chinese Government is spending almost 60 percent of its total budget on its military effort, maintaining the second largest army in Free Asia. U.S. aid has played a significant part in transforming the once poorly equipped Chinese forces into well-armed, effective fighting units, and has helped prevent runaway inflation during this period of heavy military spending and industrial and agricultural development of the island’s economy. Total U.S. nonmilitary aid to the Republic of China has amounted to over $475 million since 1951.

Current Chinese Government programs abetted by U.S. aid are emphasizing agricultural development, expansion of electric-power facilities, and improvement of transportation and manufacturing facilities.

Chinese efforts coupled with U.S. assistance have resulted in remarkable economic gains in Taiwan during the past 5 years. Overall local production in 1955 was an estimated 50 percent above the 1950 level and has continued to expand in 1956. Farm output rose about 30 percent and industrial output doubled in the same 5-year period.

The new loan agreement was signed for China by P. H. Ho, chairman of the Chinese Technical Mission in this country. Signing for the United States was Samuel C. Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which executes and administers collection of Ica loans.

---

**Japanese Cotton Exports to the United States**

Following is an exchange of notes between the United States and Japan on the subject of Japanese exports of cotton goods to the United States.¹

Press release 509 dated September 27

**United States Note**

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to His Excellency the Ambassador of Japan and has the honor to refer to his note of May 16, 1956 in which it is stated that the Government of Japan intends to adopt in 1957 controls on exports of cotton goods to the United States similar to those in effect for 1956.

The United States Government would appreciate receiving from the Government of Japan further information as to plans for future controls.

**Department of State,**

Washington, September 25, 1956.

**Japanese Note**

The Ambassador of Japan presents his compliments to the Honorable the Secretary of State and has the honor to reply, as detailed in the attached paper, to the latter’s note dated September 25, 1956, in which it is stated that the United States Government would appreciate receiving from the Government of Japan information on plans for future controls relative to the export of cotton products to the United States.

**Embassy of Japan,**

Washington, September 27, 1956.

[Attachment]

The Japanese cotton textile industry and the appropriate agencies of the Japanese Government have now started discussions on the scale and scope of export adjustment measures for cotton textiles from Japan to the United States for 1957 and subsequent years.

The purpose of these measures, inaugurated in January 1956, is to effect orderly marketing by avoiding excessive concentration in any particular period or on any particular item and by con-

---


---

**Correction**

Bulletin of September 17, 1956, p. 442—The third paragraph under the heading “Statutory Authority” should read: “The Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification of the United Nations Charter on July 28, 1945, by a vote of 89 to 2.”
continued efforts to achieve broader diversification of cotton textile exports.

With a view to improving the program as far as practicable, the following points will be incorporated.

(1) The initial overall ceiling for Japanese exports of cotton cloth and of cotton apparel and other cotton manufactures will be determined by the level of trade in 1955.

(2) Within the overall ceiling mentioned above, individual ceilings will be established, in addition to those already in effect, for such items which may tend to be exported in excessive concentration, thus causing undue hardship to a particular segment of the United States industry. Velveteens and gingham, among other items, will be the subject of special study for further reduction.

(3) Efforts will be made to distribute exports equally by quarters as far as practicable, and as necessary to meet seasonal demands for certain items.

(4) This program shall be effective for some years, starting from January 1, 1957, but may be reviewed annually.

The action now contemplated by Japan is based on the condition that all feasible steps will be taken by the United States Government to solve the problem of discriminatory state textile legislation and to prevent further restrictive action with regard to the importation of Japanese textiles into the United States.

Changes in Wool Tariff

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

White House press release dated September 28

The President announced on September 28 that he has issued a proclamation invoking the so-called Geneva wool-fabric reservation. The President’s action, taken upon a recommendation from the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, means that the ad valorem rate of duty applying to most woolen and worsted fabrics entering the country will be increased when such imports, in any year, exceed an amount determined by the President to be not less than 5 percent of the average annual U.S. production of similar fabrics for the preceding 3 calendar years.

In any year the higher ad valorem duty, which will be 45 percent as authorized by the Geneva reservation, will apply only for the remainder of that year to imports in excess of the “breakpoint” determined by the President. At the beginning of the next calendar year the ad valorem duty will revert to present rates and will remain there until imports in that year reach the “breakpoint” determined by the President for that year.

The President’s action is to be effective October 1, 1956. For the last 3 months of 1956 the President specified that the higher ad valorem duty would apply only after, and if, 3.5 million pounds of imports have entered the country—and only until the new calendar year begins on January 1, 1957. The “breakpoint” of 3.5 million pounds for the rest of 1956 is equal to three-twelfths of a quantity (14 million pounds) determined by the President to be not less than 5 percent of the average annual U.S. production of similar fabrics for the calendar years 1953-55.

In 1957 and subsequent years the President will notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount of imports above which the higher duty will apply in that year.

Present rates of duty are 36¢ or 371/2¢ per pound (depending upon the nature of the fabric) plus 20 percent or 25 percent ad valorem (again depending on the nature of the fabric). When the “breakpoint” determined by the President is reached in any year, imports in excess of that amount will be subject to an ad valorem duty increase to the full 45 percent authorized by the Geneva reservation, but the specific duty (cents per pound) will be the same.

The Geneva wool-fabric reservation is a right that was reserved by the United States in a 1947 multilateral trade agreement at Geneva. It was reserved in connection with a tariff concession granted by the United States to the United Kingdom and, under our most-favored-nation obligations, it was extended to other countries. The 1947 tariff concession and the Geneva reservation apply to woolen and worsted fabrics dutiable under paragraphs 1108 and 1109 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified. Most woolen and worsted fabrics entering the United States are dutiable under these paragraphs. The President’s action applies only to imports of such fabrics.
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1. Whereas, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and the statutes, including section 320 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (ch. 474, 48 Stat. 943; ch. 118, 57 Stat. 125; ch. 269, 59 Stat. 410), on October 30, 1947, the President entered into a trade agreement with certain foreign countries, which trade agreement consists of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the related Protocol of Provisional Application thereof, together with the Final Act Adopted at the Conclusion of the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment (61 Stat. (Parts 5 and 6) A7, A11, and A2051), and by Proclamation No. 2761A of December 16, 1947 (61 Stat. (Part 2) 1103), the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said trade agreement on and after January 1, 1948;

2. Whereas items 1108 and 1109 (a), and the appropriate headings, in Part I of Schedule XX annexed to the said General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which items were given effect by the said proclamation of December 16, 1947, read as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph</th>
<th>Description of products</th>
<th>Rate of duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>Woven fabrics, weighing not more than four ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, regardless of value: If the warp is wholly of cotton or other vegetable fiber</td>
<td>30¢ per lb. and 25% ad val.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37½¢ per lb. and 20% ad val.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37½¢ per lb. and 20% ad val.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: The United States reserves the right to increase the ad valorem part of the rate applicable to any of the fabrics provided for in item 1108 or 1109 (a) of this Part to 45 per centum ad valorem on any of such fabrics which are entered in any calendar year in excess of an aggregate quantity by weight of 5 per centum of the average annual production of similar fabrics in the United States during the 3 immediately preceding calendar years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109 (a)</td>
<td>Woven fabrics, weighing more than four ounces per square yard, wholly or in chief value of wool, regardless of value.</td>
<td>37½¢ per lb. and 20% ad val.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Whereas, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and the statutes, including the said section 350 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on April 21, 1951, the President entered into a trade agreement with certain foreign countries, which trade agreement consists of the Torquay Protocol to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (3 UST (pt. 1) 615, (pt. 2) 1941), and, by Proclamation No. 2929 of June 2, 1951 (65 Stat. C12), the President proclaimed such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions of the United States and such continuance of existing customs or excise treatment of articles imported into the United States as were then found to be required or appropriate to carry out the said trade agreement on and after June 6, 1951;

4. Whereas item 1109 (a), and the appropriate headings, in Part I of Schedule XX annexed to the said Torquay Protocol, which item was given effect by the said proclamation of June 2, 1951, reads as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tariff Act of 1930, paragraph</th>
<th>Description of products</th>
<th>Rate of duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1109 (a)</td>
<td>Woven green burlaid cloths in the piece, weighing over 11 but not over 15 ounces per square yard, wholly of wool, regardless of value.</td>
<td>37½¢ per lb. and 20% ad val.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: This item shall be subject to the note in item 1108 in Part I of Schedule XX (original).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Whereas on September 26, 1956, the Government of the United States notified the Executive Secretary to the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that it invoked the reservation contained in the note to item 1108 set forth in the second recital of this proclamation, effective October 1, 1956;

6. Whereas the fourth general note to the said Schedule XX to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade specified in the second recital of this proclamation provides as follows:

"4. If any tariff quota provided for in this Schedule, other than those provided for in items 771, becomes effective after the beginning of a period specified as the quota year, the quantity of the quota product entitled to enter under the quota during the unexpired portion of the quota year shall be the annual quota quantity less 1/12 thereof for each full calendar month that has expired in such period."

7. Whereas I find that upon invocation of the said reservation set forth in the second recital of this proclamation, effective October 1, 1956, it will be appropriate to carry out the trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation that the ad valorem part of the rate be 45 per centum ad valorem in the case of any of the fabrics described in the said item 1108 or 1109 (a) in Part I of Schedule XX to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade set forth in the second recital of this proclamation, or in the said item 1109 (a) in Part I of Schedule XX to the Torquay Protocol set forth in the fourth recital of this proclamation, excepting in either case articles dutiable at rates applicable to such

---

2. 21 Fed. Reg. 7503.
fabrics by virtue of any provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, other than paragraph 1109 or 1109 (a):

(a) during the period from October 1, 1956, to December
31, 1956, both inclusive, if such fabrics are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the total aggregate quantity of 3,500,000 pounds of such fabrics has been so entered or withdrawn; which quantity I find to be not less than 13/4 per centum of the average annual production in the United States during the three immediately preceding calendar years of fabrics similar to such fabrics; and

(b) following December 31, 1956, until otherwise pro-
claimed by the President, if such fabrics are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in any calendar year after that total aggregate quantity by weight of such fabrics which shall have been notified by the Presi-
dent to the Secretary of the Treasury, and published in the Federal Register, has been so entered or withdrawn during such calendar year; which quantity the President shall have found to be not less than 5 per centum of the average annual production in the United States during the three immediately preceding calendar years of fabrics similar to such fabrics; and

8. WHEREAS the sixteenth recital of Proclamation No. 3140 of June 13, 1956 (21 F. R. 4237), amended the list set forth in the seventh recital of Proclamation No. 2769 of January 30, 1948 (62 Stat. (pt. 2) 1479), and it is required or appropriate to further amend such list:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the Statutes, including the said section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, do proclaim as follows:

1. In order to carry out the said trade agreements specified in the first and third recitals of this proclamation, until otherwise proclaimed by the President, the ad-
valorem part of the rate which shall be applied to the said fabrics described in the seventh recital of this proclamation, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in excess of the quantity specified in clause (a) of that recital, or in excess of a quantity notified to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to clause (b) of that recital, shall be 45 per centum ad valorem.

2. The said proclamation of December 16, 1947, specified in the first recital of this proclamation, and the said proclamation of June 2, 1951, specified in the third recital of this proclamation, as amended, shall be suspended to the extent necessary to give effect to the foregoing prov-
sions of this proclamation.

3. In order to carry out the said trade agreement specified in the first recital of this proclamation, the list set forth in the seventh recital of the said proclamation of January 30, 1948, as amended by the said proclamation of June 13, 1956, is hereby further amended by deleting the last line in item 1406 of such list, reading "Cigar bands . . . 35¢ per lb."

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

[seal]

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-eighth day of September in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

Dwight D. Eisenhower
Secretary of State.

Tunisia To Receive U.S. Wheat

As a gift of the American people to the people of Tunisia, the United States will ship up to 45,000 tons of wheat to the newly independent North African nation to avert a threatening food shortage, the International Cooperation Administration announced on September 19. The critical food situation in Tunisia resulted from two successive short crops due to drought and from other unfavorable conditions. The Tunisian Government requested U.S. assistance in order to prevent famine among Tunisians.

The wheat is being made available to Tunisia under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (P. L. 480). This provision of the law is administered by ICA and authorizes the use of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities for emergency purposes. The grain, which will begin to move to Tunisia as soon as shipping arrangements can be completed, will come from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and will have a Ccc value of $6.5 million.

Besides free distribution of the grain, the Tu-
尼斯ian Government will also be able to use the wheat as part payment to workers engaged in public works projects, which should alleviate serious unemployment now prevalent in Tunisia.

Immigration Quota for Tunisia

A PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS under the provisions of section 201 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, are required to determine the annual quota of any quota area established pursuant to the provisions of section 202 (a) of the said Act, and to report to the President the quota of each quota area so determined; and

By the President:
JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Secretary of State.
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WHEREAS under the provisions of section 202 (e) of the said Act, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, are required to revise the quotas, whenever necessary, to provide for any political change requiring a change in the list of quota areas or the territorial limits thereof; and

WHEREAS the country of Tunisia has heretofore constituted a subquota area within the immigration quota established for France and has, therefore, been subject to the limitation provided in section 202 (c) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 177-178); and

WHEREAS the country of Tunisia was granted its independence on March 20, 1956, and has been recognized as an independent country by the United States; and

WHEREAS the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General have reported to the President that in accordance with the duty imposed by the authority conferred upon them by section 201, (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, they jointly have made the determination provided for and computed under the provisions of section 201 (a) of the said Act; and have fixed, in accordance therewith, an immigration quota for Tunisia as hereinafter set forth:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the aforesaid act of Congress, do hereby proclaim and make known that the annual quota area hereinafter enumerated has been determined in accordance with the law to be, and shall be, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area No.</th>
<th>Quota Area</th>
<th>Quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provision of an immigration quota for any quota area is designed solely for the purpose of compliance with the pertinent provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and is not to be considered as having any significance extraneous to such purpose.

Proclamation No. 2980 of June 30, 1952 is amended accordingly.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twentieth day of September in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

[SEAL]

By the President:

HERBERT HOOVER, JR.
Acting Secretary of State.

Export-Import Bank Reports on Lending Activities

The Export-Import Bank of Washington made 156 loans totaling $375.9 million to finance exports of U.S. equipment, commodities, and services to 39 countries in fiscal year 1956, according to the bank's annual report to Congress released on September 16 by the Board of Directors.1

The bank's statement advised Congress that more than two-thirds of the bank's loans supported U.S. trade in the Western Hemisphere, which is the normal pattern of the bank's operations. During fiscal year 1956 the bank authorized 110 credits totaling $156 million in 17 American Republics.

The bank made 24 credits for $36.1 million to finance U.S. export sales in eight European countries, and 9 loans totaling $158 million in four countries in Asia.

A total of 34 credits for development loans amounting to $341.8 million, including a credit of $60 million to Japan to buy U.S. cotton,2 and 122 individual exporter credits totaling $54 million comprised the 156 loans for the fiscal year.

Large loans for industrial or economic development represented by far the greater dollar volume of the bank's business in fiscal year 1956, as heretofore, and created the major share of overseas purchases of U.S. goods for export under its loans. The bank, nevertheless, continued its services to U.S. exporters seeking smaller loans under individual applications or under lines of credit as a result of the exporter credit-line program initiated by the bank in November 1954.

Under exporter credit lines the bank has made loans as low as $2,700, as it did in connection with a current sale to an importer in Mexico, and as large as $6.3 million to an importer in Italy.

During the fiscal year, 141 credit lines totaling $177.4 million were in operation. These included 51 new credit lines for $32.8 million. Credit lines usually are granted for a period of 1 year. Ten credit lines were allowed to lapse by exporters.

The bank reported a gross income of $84.1 mil-
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lion for the fiscal year. After payment of $23.9 million to the U.S. Treasury for interest on borrowed money, the net income established a record of $60.2 million. The Directors voted, as in other years, to pay a dividend of $22.5 million to the Treasury on its holdings of Export-Import Bank stock.

Summarizing its financial transactions for the fiscal year, the bank advised Congress that "total receipts were $339 million, total disbursements were $251.6 million, leaving $87.4 million as the net receipts paid to the Treasury to be applied toward the balancing of the federal budget, or a rate of approximately $1.6 million a week." The bank also brought its reserves to $404.7 million, the highest point so far attained.

At the close of business June 30, the bank had paid to the Treasury during its 22-year service a total of $166.3 million in interest and $150.9 million in dividends, or total payments of $317.2 million.

Administrative expenses of the bank were slightly higher this year, the report said, as the bank continued to increase its staff in order to facilitate its loan operations and handle an increased number of loan applications. The bank currently operates with a staff of 172. Administrative expenses for the year were 1.7 percent of gross income. The average ratio of administrative expense to gross income over the past 22 years has been 1.67 percent.

During the year the President, Directors, and members of the staff traveled abroad to 32 countries. The bank maintains no field offices, finding it more practicable to send representatives abroad periodically for investigations, inspections, or negotiations.

In an effort to make the services of the Export-Import Bank better known to overseas traders in the United States, the President and Board of Directors endeavored this fiscal year to make more information available about the bank. The bank reported to Congress that these efforts were directed primarily toward reaching businessmen and commercial bankers who benefit directly from its facilities.

Meetings were held in major cities of the country with commercial banks under the sponsorship of the Federal Reserve System. The report to Congress stated that "the Bank anticipates that it will be substantially more useful to United States private enterprise in the future as a result of this program of explanation and information," which is being continued.

The bank reported to Congress that one of its borrowers in Brazil paid off a $14 million loan during the year, approximately 13 years in advance of the stipulated final repayment date. This came about, the report said, as follows:

In 1942-43, the Bank loaned $14 million to Cia. Vale do Rio Doce, S. A., to finance a project for developing its iron ore mining operations for export from the Itabira region of the State of Minas Gerais. By means of this loan, additional capital, and subsequent financing, 350 miles of railway were rebuilt and re-equipped, and loading facilities provided at the port of Victorina. In 1942 the Brazilian company exported 55,000 tons of Itabira ore through this port. Thirteen years later, in 1955, the company exported 2,262,000 tons of ore from the same mines through the same port.

As a consequence, this project has earned more than $100 million of dollar exchange for Brazil after service of the relative financing. The greater part of Itabira ore has been purchased by steel companies in the United States.

The loan was repaid by Cia. Vale do Rio Doce in April 1956, some 13 years before the final note on this credit was to become due.

$3 Million World Bank Loan to Costa Rica

The World Bank on September 18 announced a loan of $3 million in Costa Rica. The loan was made to the Central Bank of Costa Rica and will assist it in carrying on a lending program for the development of agriculture and light industry. The Chemical Credit Exchange Bank of New York is participating in the loan, without the World Bank's guaranty, to the extent of $366,000, representing the first maturity and half the second maturity, which fall due October 1, 1958, and April 1, 1959.

Costa Rica is primarily an agricultural country. Its requirements for capital goods are mostly for agriculture, for the processing of agricultural products, and for light industries. To meet the need for imported capital goods the Government, at the end of 1952, initiated a credit program through the banking system. Under this program the Central Bank extends credit to commercial banks for the importation of capital goods required by individuals or private enterprises. The
commercial banks in turn extend credit to their customers for the purchase of these goods through normal trade channels. Applications for credit under this program are carefully examined, being considered, where appropriate, by the Rural Credit Boards or by the Ministry of Agriculture and Industries and the National Production Council to assure that they are for purposes significant to Costa Rica's development.

The program has proved to be effective and has been an important factor in the improvement in agricultural output and efficiency during the last few years. The World Bank loan will provide the foreign exchange needed by the Central Bank to carry forward the program until 1958. It is expected that most of the loan will be used for imports which will directly aid the further expansion of agriculture.

Agriculture now contributes 45 percent to the national income, accounts for 90 percent of exports, and directly employs over half the population. The availability of credit and the efficient administration of policies to promote agriculture have increased agricultural output in recent years. Technical services have been developed to an unusual degree. The research and training center of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences is located at Turrialba and has become a major agricultural and livestock research station. There are adequate extension services to spread the results of research and to demonstrate opportunities for technological improvements. Farmers are receptive to the adoption of improved practices, and many of them have been able to take advantage of credits under the program for the purpose of investment in equipment, materials, and property development.

The loan is for a term of 7 years and bears interest of 4¾ percent, including the statutory commission of 1 percent. Amortization will begin October 1, 1958. The loan is the first World Bank loan in Costa Rica and is guaranteed by the Government of Costa Rica.

After having been approved by the Executive Directors, the loan documents were signed on September 18, 1956, by Gonzalo J. Facio, Ambassador of Costa Rica to the United States, on behalf of the Government of Costa Rica; by Jaime Solera, Chairman of the Board, on behalf of the Central Bank of Costa Rica; and by Eugene R. Black, President, on behalf of the World Bank.

---

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES**

**Inscription of Suez Items on Security Council Agenda**

*Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.*

*U.S. Representative to the United Nations*

The United States welcomes the initiative which the Governments of the United Kingdom and France have taken in bringing the Suez Canal matter to the Security Council for its consideration. It is a further demonstration of the determination of these two governments to fulfill their charter obligations and to seek a peaceful solution. This is precisely what they and numerous other governments concerned with this situation have been doing since the action of the Government of Egypt against the Universal Suez Canal Company on July 26 of this year.

These governments and the United States Government have sought, consistent with our obligations under article 33 of the charter, to resolve the differences which have arisen between them and the Government of Egypt through negotiations with Egypt. The documents before the Council summarize in some detail the events which transpired at the first and second London conferences on the Suez Canal. Eighteen nations which attended the first conference agreed to proposals which they deemed just and practical as a basis for negotiating a new treaty for the control and operation of the canal. Unfortunately, these proposals were not accepted by the Government of Egypt. The same 18 nations met again in a second conference and again demonstrated their resourcefulness in the interests of peace by initiating the formation of the Suez Canal Users Association.

The Governments of the United Kingdom and France and of the United States, as well as other
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governments, have consistently sought a settlement based on justice and on their rights as users of the Suez Canal. The Governments of the United Kingdom and France have now come to the Security Council, and we hope the other users of the canal will support them in their determination that a lasting settlement which protects the rights of all concerned shall be achieved. It is essential that the rights of users of the canal rest on a basis other than unilateral promises.

Mr. President, in the Security Council debate which is to ensue, the United States will seek a peaceful and just settlement of the Suez Canal situation, and it hopes that this will be the attitude of all members of this body.

In this spirit, the United States will vote in favor of the adoption of the provisional agenda as circulated. We will vote in favor of the inscription of the item proposed by the United Kingdom and France, and we will also vote in favor of the inscription of the item proposed by Egypt.

The United States will be acting in accordance with its generally liberal policy with respect to the inclusion of items on the agenda despite the serious reservations which we may have as to the merit of certain of those items. This is consistent with the United States action in voting in favor of the inscription of items on at least four previous occasions when the proposed item was directed against the United States.

In 1950, for example, we voted in favor of inscribing an item charging the United States with armed invasion of the territory of China and violation of the charter. Again in 1950 we voted for the inscription of an item charging the invasion of China by United States air forces and bombing by those air forces of the territory of China. In 1952 we did not object to the inscription of an item charging—of all things!—the United States with engaging in bacteriological warfare. And in 1953 we did not object to the inscription of an item charging the United States with actions in violation of the Italian peace treaty and threatening the peace. In each of these previous cases the charges against the United States, preposterous and fallacious though they were, did not deter us from not objecting to the inscription of the item.

We therefore do not feel that we should oppose the inscription of an item such as the one proposed by the Government of Egypt making charges against the United Kingdom and France. This of course does not mean that we agree with the contention contained in the Egyptian item—that the United Kingdom and France have acted in any way inconsistent with their obligations under the United Nations Charter. It should also be understood, Mr. President, that we vote as we do in the belief that the Anglo-French proposal should have complete priority and that consideration of the Egyptian item should be deferred until the Anglo-French item has been disposed of.

With regard to the question of our next meeting, the United States Government concurs in the views already expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France that, since several Foreign Ministers will participate in our debate, this Council should extend them the courtesy of waiting until they can conveniently arrive.

**U.S. Position on Proposed Slavery Convention**

*Statement by Walter Kotschnig* \(^1\)

In my brief remarks I will not address myself to any specific aspects of or any articles in the proposed convention. It is proper, however, at this point for me to define the position of the United States Government in this conference.

The Government and the people of the United States detest and abhor slavery in any form or any institutions or practices similar to slavery. There are few, if any, countries in the world which have made such supreme sacrifices as have the American people to abolish and exterminate slavery

---

\(^1\) In the voting on Sept. 26, the Council decided unanimously to inscribe the Anglo-French item. The vote on inscription of the Egyptian item was 7(U.S.)-0-4(Australia, Belgium, France, U.K.).

\(^2\) Made on Aug. 15 at Geneva before the U.N. Conference of Plenipotentiaries on a Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery. Mr. Kotschnig, Director of the Office of International Economic and Social Affairs of the Department of State, was U.S. Delegate to the conference.
within their own territory. The adoption of the 13th amendment to our Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land, outlawed for all times all slavery in any form or guise.

The United States also ratified the Anti-Slavery Convention of 1926. In this connection I should like to point out that in ratifying that convention we made a reservation expressing our disagreement with the concept contained in the convention permitting the use of forced labor on any basis other than as a punishment for crime. In other words, we have consistently taken an absolutist position in our opposition to any form of slavery and have not been willing to accept any half-measures.

I am reciting these facts so as not to leave the shadow of a doubt about the basic position of my Government with regard to slavery. What I have just stated must be clearly remembered to understand the attitude which my Government is taking to the proposed convention.

First, my Government has some real doubt about the efficacy of any additional convention in the field of slavery. There are a number of states which have not yet ratified the convention of 1926—among them, states which might usefully ratify it with a view to abolishing all remnants of slavery. It does seem to us that efforts to obtain additional ratification of the 1926 convention might be more fruitful than the conclusion of a new convention which again might not be widely enough ratified to make it fully effective.

Second, many of the provisions of the proposed new convention deal with subjects generally considered to be in the area of domestic jurisdiction. Wherever this is the case my Government holds that better results might be achieved through public debate, which would result in a clarification of facts and information and bring the weight of world public opinion to bear on any shortcomings. Perhaps even more effective are educational measures, which obviously take some time, and possibly economic and other assistance designed to help eliminate any traces of slavery.

In the light of this position held by my Government and under these circumstances my delegation, by and large, does not propose to take an active part in the discussion of specific articles, nor is it the intention of the United States Government to sign or ratify the convention.

We have nevertheless come to this conference considering the importance of the subject which it is discussing. We do not want to stand aloof from a United Nations effort of evident interest to many. We hope to be able to assist in the defining of some aspects of the proposed convention, such as article 9, which bears upon the broad issue of the accession to the convention of various states. We believe that any convention developed under United Nations auspices should be truly a United Nations instrument and should be exclusively a vehicle of action of the members of the United Nations and its family, that is to say, the specialized agencies. This is a self-evident principle which if integrally applied will preserve the technical nature of the conference and will avoid undesirable political discussions which are beyond the scope of this technical conference.

Mr. President, as representative of the United States Government, and on behalf of my Government, I wish this conference every success in its work.

11th Assembly of Inter-American Commission of Women

The following report on the 11th Assembly of the Inter-American Commission of Women was prepared by Mrs. Frances M. Lee, U.S. Representative on the Commission and U.S. delegate to the Assembly. Miss Jane Tupper served as alternate delegate. Miss Muna Lee of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State, served as adviser to the U.S. delegation through the first week of the Assembly.

The Inter-American Commission of Women held its 11th Assembly June 1–21, 1956, at Ciudad Trujillo at the invitation of the Dominican Republic. Its principal concern was to encourage citizenship training and full legal capacity for women under the laws of the various countries. Delegates were present from 18 of the 21 American Republics. Official representatives were present also from the United Nations, the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the International Labor Organization.

Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo addressed the Assembly at its opening session, and the Govern-
ment provided full secretariat and other services. The universities and normal schools presented special programs for the Assembly.

In accordance with plans adopted in 1953, the Inter-American Commission of Women gives attention in each Assembly to only two major fields of interest. The agenda for this Assembly dealt primarily with political and civil rights for women, the latter topic embracing matters in the field of family and property law. The U.S. delegation based its contributions to the discussion on experience in this country in legislation and community activities. Since responsibility for legislation relating to the family is reserved under the United States Constitution to our State governments, the delegation was able to take advantage of variations in legal tradition and social and economic development in many different parts of the United States.

The Commission's interest in responsible and intelligent use of the franchise has grown with the extension of woman suffrage. Whereas in 1928, when the Commission was organized, only the women in the United States had suffrage rights, today women vote in all but one of the American Republics. In 1952, when the U.S. delegation to the 8th Assembly provided a display of pamphlet material used in citizenship education programs in this country, the supply of samples was immediately exhausted. In the Assembly last year attention was called to a special Unesco publication designed for girls' schools and similar groups studying citizen responsibilities. In this Assembly interest was concentrated on leadership training. The Commission noted that the United Nations had recently established a program of advisory services in the field of human rights under which governments could request the organization of seminars, and urged the development of one or more seminars in Latin America under this program on the responsibilities of citizenship. It also urged the inclusion of civic education in school curricula.

The Assembly noted the increasing number of women in important public posts. It recommended that information about women in the professions and other aspects of public life be included in the census data to be collected throughout the Americas in 1960.

Dr. Grinberg-Vinaver, the United Nations representative in the Assembly, gave a report on the civil rights of women during the Assembly's discussion of the rights of married women. The Commission adopted a resolution urging the removal of any existing limitations on the legal capacity of married women and on their right to establish a separate legal domicile where necessary and to administer property, exercise parental responsibility, act as guardians, and fulfill other legal functions. The United States abstained on this resolution, explaining that, while in sympathy with its objectives, the United States does not regard detailed recommendations as appropriate in this field in view of the variations in the legislation in our States and because laws relating to marriage and the family are so closely related to the customs of each country.

Since the chairman of the Commission, Mrs. María Concepción Leyes de Chaves of Paraguay, could not attend the Assembly because of illness and did not expect to be able to resume her duties immediately, the Assembly authorized the Executive Committee to further the work of the Commission during the interim.

A number of nongovernmental organizations had observers at Assembly sessions. The National Council of Catholic Women of the United States had a special observer present, and the International Council of Women was also represented by a U.S. citizen. As was the case last year when the Commission met at San Juan, Puerto Rico, at the invitation of the United States; the presence of these organization leaders added greatly to the significance of the Assembly.

The Commission decided to hold its next Assembly in 1957 at the headquarters of the Pan American Union at Washington. While the United States will not be the host to this Assembly, the sessions at Washington will be an unusual opportunity for women's organizations in this country to observe the work of the Commission and offer hospitality to the delegates. The 1957 Assembly will be concerned primarily with education and economic opportunities for women. The rapid progress of women in both the political and economic fields adds to the urgency of these topics and to the need of careful planning for their study and discussion.

---
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Cultural Property
Convention for protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict, and regulations of execution. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954. Entered into force August 7, 1956.1
Ratification deposited: Poland, August 6, 1956.
Accession deposited: Bulgaria, August 7, 1956.
Ratification deposited: Poland, August 6, 1956.
Accession deposited: Hungary, August 16, 1956.

Telecommunications
Ratifications deposited: Venezuela (with reservation), August 24, 1956; Thailand, August 27, 1956.
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Ratification deposited: Venezuela, August 24, 1956.
Ratification deposited: Venezuela, August 24, 1956.
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Protocol of terms of accession of Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with annex A (schedules of the contracting parties) and annex B (schedule of Japan). Done at Geneva June 7, 1955. Entered into force September 10, 1955. TIAS 3438.
Signature: Turkey, August 16, 1956.
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BILATERAL

Greece

1 Not in force for the United States.

India

Norway

Peru

Spain
Agreement amending the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of March 5, 1956, as supplemented (TIAS 3510, 3540, 5527), by providing for the purchase of beef. Signed at La Toja September 15, 1956. Entered into force September 15, 1956. Agreement supplementing the facilities assistance program agreement of April 9, May 11 and 19, 1954, as extended (TIAS 3668, 3257), by providing for further expansion of the program. Entered by exchange of notes at Madrid September 17, 1956. Entered into force September 17, 1956.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

New Passport Agency Opening at Los Angeles

The Department of State announced on September 27 (press release 510) the opening of a new passport agency at Los Angeles on October 1, 1956. The agency will be located at 500 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif.

The agent in charge will be Miss Gene Burke, and the assistant agent will be William G. Nerren. The agency will be staffed with approximately 15 persons. The staff will include adjudicators and technicians trained in the Passport Office at Washington, D.C. The agency will be equipped to issue passports in emergency or urgent cases after obtaining clearance from Washington by wire service.

During the first 6 months of 1956, the Passport Office in Washington has tabulated a figure of

October 8, 1956

565
44,575 passport applications received from the State of California. Of this figure, approximately 40 percent came from the Los Angeles area. It is anticipated that the new agency will handle approximately 35,000 passport applications next year.

Resignations

Herbert V. Prochnow as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, effective November 15. For texts of Mr. Prochnow’s letter to President Eisenhower and the President’s reply, see White House press release dated September 26.

Designations

Ware Adams as Director, Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs, effective September 19.
Otis E. Mulliken as Deputy Director, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, effective September 19.
Edward Freers as Director, Office of Eastern European Affairs, effective September 23.
Livingston Satterthwaite as Director, Office of Transport and Communications, effective September 23.
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A new release in the popular Background series . . .

United Nations General Assembly—
A Review of the Tenth Session

The tenth regular session of the United Nations General Assembly convened on September 20, 1955, and adjourned 3 months later on December 20.

Highlights of the tenth session which are described in this Background pamphlet are:

1. The admission of 16 new members, enlarging U.N. membership from 60 to 76 countries.
2. The endorsement of further steps toward the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency and the recommendation for a second international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.
3. The decision to give priority in U.N. disarmament talks to confidence-building measures, including President Eisenhower’s proposal of mutual aerial inspection and Marshal Bulganin’s plan for establishing control posts at strategic centers, as well as all such measures of adequately safeguarded disarmament as are feasible.
5. The decision to explore the organization of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development.
6. The Assembly approval of a Charter Review Conference “at an appropriate time,” the date and place to be fixed at a subsequent session of the Assembly.

Copies of this publication may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at 15 cents a copy.
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The Problems of Peace

Address by Secretary Dulles

I speak to you today of some of the problems of peace. That is, I know, an old subject. But it is also a very live subject.

Quincy Wright, in his Study of War, lists 278 wars fought between 1480 and 1941. That is three wars every 5 years. Several of these wars, including World War II, were fought after the League of Nations was formed and after the Pact of Paris had pledged all the nations to abolish war. Also several wars have been fought since the United Nations was formed in 1945. These include the Korean war, the Indochina war, and the Israeli-Arab war. Wars are today a threatening possibility in several parts of the world.

The fact is that war will be an ever-present danger until we recognize that there are better-developed institutions for peace, such as an adequate body of international law, an international police force, and a reduction of national armaments. Today we live, and I fear for long shall live, under the shadow of war. Only if we are vividly conscious of this fact will we make the exertions needed to prevent war. So, I talk again today about peace.

Let us first of all recognize that war is not prevented merely by hating war and loving peace. Since the beginning, the peoples of the world have hated war and longed for peace. But that has not gained them peace. It has been amply demonstrated that the likelihood of peace is not measured by the intensity of peace-loving protestations. The Stockholm peace proposal is an example. By this ruse the Soviet rulers sought to turn the widespread urge for peace to their own uses. It contributed nothing to genuine peace.

Even a sincere effort like the Pact of Paris showed the futility of attempting to abolish war without creating adequate effective compensating institutions to replace it.

The fact is that love of peace, by itself, has never been sufficient to deter war.

Deterrence of War

One of the great advances of our time is recognition that one of the ways to prevent war is to deter it by having the will and the capacity to use force to punish an aggressor. This involves an effort, within the society of nations, to apply the principle used to deter violence within a community. There, laws are adopted which define crimes and their punishment. Thus there is created a powerful deterrent to crimes of violence. This principle of deterrence does not operate 100 percent even in the best-ordered communities. But it is conceded to be effective and can be usefully extended into the society of nations. That principle was incorporated into the United Nations Charter. Article 42 authorized the Security Council to use force, and the members were required [article 43] to provide armed forces necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. However, these provisions of the charter have never been implemented because of the Soviet veto. The principle of deterrence has had to find expression in collective self-defense arrangements authorized by article 51 of the charter.

The United States now has such collective self-defense arrangements with 42 other nations. These are designed to give advance notice to any potential aggressor that an attack upon one would
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involve a reaction by many, including the United States, designed to punish the aggressor to such an extent as to make the aggression unprofitable.

As Senator Vandenberg said in the Senate as he sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty:

Its invincible power for peace is the awesome fact that any aggressor upon the North Atlantic Community knows in advance that from the very moment he launches his conquest he will forthwith face whatever cumulative opposition these United Allies in their own wisdom deem necessary to beat him to his knees and to restore peace and security.

Through the development of "this 'knock-out' admonition"—to use another of Vandenberg's phrases—a considerable barrier to war has been erected. But it would be folly to consider that the admonition alone constitutes an impenetrable barrier to war. Its effectiveness depends upon the continuing possession within the collective group of both the will and the capacity to act effectively if there should be aggression. The military program of the United States, including so-called foreign aid, represents the cost of this form of peace insurance. It is necessary insurance, although concededly only partial insurance.

**Peace With Justice**

Another aspect of the problem is that there can never, in the long run, be real peace unless there is justice and law. Even today there are grave injustices such as the servitude of the Soviet satellites and the division of Germany. But even if perfect justice were once achieved, it would not automatically be a condition to be perpetuated. Change is the law of life, and new conditions are constantly arising which call for remedy lest there be injustice. Such injustices tend ultimately to lead to resort to force unless other means exist.

This point is illustrated by an historical atlas. I suppose no one would feel that the political division of the world as it was 50 years ago, 100 years ago, or 500 years ago should have been perpetuated. Yet almost the only way of change has been the use of force. Within a nation, or within the family of nations, violence is inevitable unless there are peaceful means of remedying injustices when they arise.

This relationship of peace and justice was much considered at the time of the making of the United Nations Charter. The charter, as originally drafted at Dumbarton Oaks, invoked no standard of justice. The exclusive emphasis was upon peace, as though peace could be had permanently irrespective of justice.

I recall urging, in March 1945, that "the organization should be infused with an ethical spirit, the spirit of justice." I went on to say:

I realize full well that "justice" is not readily defined. It means different things to different men. But it means something and something very vital, to all men. The charter should require the new organization, as its first order of business, to undertake the difficult but essential task of developing conceptions of justice by which it will be guided. Only thus will it survive.

At the San Francisco conference this concept was found generally acceptable. The charter was amended accordingly. The most significant of those amendments is found in the very first article of the charter. This article 1 initially stated the purpose of the United Nations to be "to bring about by peaceful means, adjustment or settlement of international disputes which might lead to a breach of the peace." At San Francisco it was said that the peaceful settlement must be "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law."

Thus, when the United Nations deals with the problem of adjusting and settling disputes and situations which may endanger the peace, it is required to operate as a court of equity applying the principles of justice as may seem relevant to any particular set of facts.

This is not always easy to do. World public opinion readily opposes force. But it does not so readily support justice, which is often a vague and disputable concept. Nevertheless, those who love and want peace must recognize that, unless they exert themselves as vigorously for justice as they do for peace, they are not apt to have peace. Peace is a coin which has two sides. One side is the renunciation of force, the other side is the according of justice. Peace and justice are inseparable.

A very practical illustration of the interdependence of peace and justice is the present Suez Canal situation. There the Government of Egypt abruptly took to itself exclusive control of the operation of this waterway, which, since its inception, had been operated through an international regime. The Egyptian Government took this action under conditions which suggested an intention to exercise this control not in the general interest but to promote the so-called "grandeur"
of Egypt by being able to exert economic pressures upon other countries and to extract tribute from them.

There are many countries for whom the Suez Canal is, in an almost literal sense, a lifeline. Their economic welfare depends upon the availability of the canal and upon its technical competence. There should be no risk of overt or covert discrimination as between users who were given the right of free and equal transit by the treaty, of perpetual duration, made in 1888. No nation should be required to live under an economic "sword of Damocles."

There has been strong worldwide sentiment against using force to right this situation. That is natural and proper. But those who are concerned about peace ought to be equally concerned about justice. Is it just, or even tolerable, that great nations which have rights under the 1888 treaty and whose economies depend upon the use of the canal should accept an exclusive control of this international waterway by a government which professes to be bitterly hostile? That is the issue now before the United Nations Security Council, and it faces that organization with a crucial test.

The Task of Waging Peace

A final point I would make to you is that peace will never be won unless there is the same constant effort to win peace as is exerted in time of war to win victory. We have seen that throughout the ages peace has been wanted; but war has been had. We also see throughout the ages that in time of war success goes not merely to those who want victory but to those who demonstrate the capacity and the sacrificial qualities needed to win it. On the other hand, peace is traditionally looked upon as a time of relaxation, when no special effort and special sacrifices are required.

The fact is that waging peace is as difficult a task as waging war. It calls for many of the same qualities and for at least some measure of sacrifice. Today this country is making considerable sacrifices in its waging of peace. These are measured by the military service of our youth; by the expenditure of about 10 percent of our gross national production for defensive purposes; by the granting of military and economic assistance to countries which are threatened and which have the will to resist; and by the sacrificial efforts of many individuals not only in the military branch of government but also notably in our diplomatic and foreign service. But even so the willingness to sacrifice is not commensurate with the need. Time after time your Government seeks the services of especially qualified persons for urgent tasks which need to be performed in the waging of peace. In time of war the persons thus sought would unhesitatingly respond. In time of peace they find reasons for not responding. The reasons may be genuine, but they reflect the general feeling that peace does not require the kind of sacrifice that would unhesitatingly be made in time of war.

Mankind will never win lasting peace so long as men use their full resources only in tasks of war. The task of peace is one that requires an effort like one required to win a great war. Why should we not make that effort? Neither voice nor pen can portray the awful horror of a third world war. Why should we not, to win the peace, develop and use the qualities that would be evoked in the effort to win a war? This is a question to be answered in national terms as we strive to institutionalize peace. Also it is a question which each one of us has to answer in personal terms. You, or some of you, may be called on to answer that question in terms of your own life effort. If you and others like you will do for peace what you would do for war, that would enable us more hopefully to face the future.

Death of President Somoza of Nicaragua

Following is the text of a statement by President Eisenhower regarding the death on September 29 of President Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua (White House press release dated September 29).

The Nation and I personally regret the death of President Somoza of Nicaragua as a result of the dastardly attack made upon him several days ago by an assassin.

President Somoza constantly emphasized, both publicly and privately, his friendship for the United States—a friendship that persisted until the moment of his death.
Transcript of Secretary Dulles’ News Conference

Press release 516 dated October 2

Secretary Dulles: I understand that there are here the representatives of 10 Latin American newspaper editors and publishers, who are here to attend a seminar sponsored by the American Press Institute of Columbia University. I am glad to welcome them here.

Now I will receive any questions.

U.S. Aid to Yugoslavia

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you have any information on the purpose of Mr. Tito’s trip to the Soviet Union, and any ideas at this stage on what effect it might have on the United States aid program to Yugoslavia?

A. We believe, first, that the trip is more than a “vacation,” and that it does, in fact, relate to serious matters which probably concern the relationship of the Soviet Communist Party to the satellite countries and to the relationship which those satellites have to the Soviet Union.

You may recall that when I was in Brioni last November I then had a press conference following my talk with Marshal Tito at which I expressed the view that the satellites ought to be independent, and President Tito was asked whether he agreed with that and he said that he did. Now that involves some very serious questions of the relationship of the Soviet State, and Soviet Communist Party, to the satellites. Our belief is that the matters upon which President Tito is now conferring probably relate to that subject. Beyond that, I would only speculate.

Of course, in answer to the second part of your question, we naturally take account of everything that happens up to the date when the President will make his determination.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there have been reports that the Soviet Union is proposing to withdraw its troops from Eastern Europe and that that question is under discussion. Do you have anything to confirm there?

A. No, I can’t confirm it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the question of the President's decision, is it necessary under the law for him to make an immediate flat determination on each of the questions in the act on, I believe, October 16, the end of the 90-day period?

A. We don’t think that it is necessary, but we are getting an opinion on that subject from the Attorney General. It seems as though, the way the act reads, there would have to be a cessation of aid at the end of the 90-day period unless and until the President made such a finding but that his finding could, perhaps, be made after that date.

Q. Has the idea of a second Panama or a second Suez ever come up lately? I know it is an old idea. I wondered if in view of the present situation it had come up again.

A. A second Suez Canal and a second Panama Canal?

Q. Yes, and through Nicaragua.

Q. Section 143 of the Mutual Security Act of 1956 (P. L. 726, 84th Con.) reads:

"Sec. 143. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this Act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this Act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the expiration of ninety days following the date of the enactment of this section, unless the President finds and so reports to the Congress, with his reasons therefor, (1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this Act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, (2) that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this Act.”

President Eisenhower approved the act on July 18, 1956.  

1 Bulletin of Nov. 21, 1955, p. 833, footnote 1.
A. Well, there has been a great deal of thought given to the matter of deepening, widening, and possibly paralleling the Suez Canal, because it is not now adequate to take tankers of large draft and large tonnage and today it is cheaper to take such tankers and large vessels around the Cape rather than to try to put them through the canal. As a matter of fact, they couldn’t get through the canal as it now is.

Now the question as to whether or not that will take place in the light of current developments is a real question. A good many people are thinking now more in terms of going around the Cape of Good Hope than they are through the Suez Canal because confidence has been so shaken.

Now as far as the Panama Canal is concerned, there is thought being given to that possibility. As you know, we have a treaty with Nicaragua which contemplates the building of a canal through Nicaragua, and as the need comes for increased facilities across the Isthmus I suppose thought would be given to the alternatives of paralleling the present Panama Canal or possibly putting it in some other place where the danger of breakdown, either through natural causes or war causes, would be somewhat reduced through greater diversification.

Q. Is that something that has come up lately?
A. No.

Q. And it is not anything that you are thinking of?
A. No, not anything we are thinking of in terms of actually starting to make the dirt fly.

Suez Canal Users Association

Q. Mr. Secretary, would the United States participation in the Suez Canal, by the users association, be by executive agreement, or will it require, as in Denmark’s case, congressional consent?

A. It will be purely by executive agreement; in fact, the decision has already been made. It does not involve any obligations upon the United States, and where we have an arrangement which does not involve obligations it can be taken by executive action. I was looking, for example, at the arrangement that we have with Iceland. That was a treaty in a sense, in the sense that Iceland ratified it; we did not. It is an executive agreement as far as we are concerned; it is a treaty as far as Iceland is concerned because it puts certain obligations on Iceland. It gives certain facilities to the United States. Therefore it was treated in one way in Iceland, another way in the United States. And where we make agreements which only give benefits to the United States and which impose no obligations, those can be done by executive action, as is being done in this case.

Q. What about the financial angle of the thing; that is, where will the money come from to pay the United States Government’s share?

A. Well, there is no great financial problem involved. The money in the main will come currently from, we expect, those who use the association, who pay their dues into the association as their agent. Now there may be a need for some small amount of working capital to get started with. That will probably be made by small loans from the different member countries, but it would only run into a matter of a few thousand dollars apiece.

Q. By the “users” you mean the ship lines, the ship operators?

A. I mean there that loans will probably be made by the governments. The earlier current payments would be by the ships.

Policy Toward Argentina

Q. Mr. Secretary, Gainza Paz, publisher of La Prensa in Argentina, made a statement which was published this morning. Gainza Paz made a statement this morning about American policy toward Argentina which is at variance with what you said last week. He points out, for example, that the $60-million loan to the steel mills was authorized by the Export Bank during the Eisenhower administration. He accuses both administrations of at times appeasing the Perón regime and ends his statement: “This policy of appeasement and friendship” (that is, during the Eisenhower administration) “was highlighted by the Milton Eisenhower visit in 1953, and praise was bestowed upon the dictator by outstanding United States officials.” Will you discuss that?

A. Well, you know one of the problems that we have is that sometimes people are very happy with
the results we get but are not happy with the means by which we get them. The fact is that Perón is gone, the fact is that La Prensa is back again in private ownership and free publication and free news. Those are both results which I guess we all welcome. Now some people think we could have gotten those results better had we more actively intervened in the internal affairs of the Argentine. As a matter of fact, that was tried by the Truman administration and it was actually that intervention which was a principal factor in bringing Perón into power. He came into power partly as a result of the resentment among the people that foreigners were trying to interfere in their internal affairs. So you see sometimes it doesn't actually get you very far to intervene openly. It often gets you backwards. The fact is that results that none of us wanted were achieved by the earlier policy; results that all of us wanted were achieved under the latter policy.

Q. Do you suggest that the United States should get the credit for Mr. Perón's departure?

A. I think we should get credit in this sense, that we did not, by our own open intervention, bring into play forces which could have kept him in power, and we allowed the natural forces to prevail which took him out of power.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you comment upon Mr. Gainza Paz' estimate that the $60-million loan for the steel mills actually was authorized by the Export-Import Bank during the Eisenhower administration while Perón was still in power?

A. Yes. The story to which I addressed myself last week was a statement which had been made that $100 million had been loaned by this Government to Perón, or upwards of that, and had been abstracted by him and largely hidden away by him in Switzerland, I believe the story was. Well, if you buy and pay for a steel mill there is no way to put that money in Switzerland as far as I know. The only money that could have been taken to Switzerland was money that was put up pursuant to the loan agreement made by the prior administration. Now this steel mill agreement, as I understand, was studied during the Perón regime, but the actual loan agreement was not signed until after Perón had gone.

Q. Would you comment on the possible future use of American cotton surpluses to induce Egypt to accept a just solution?

A. That is an extremely complicated problem because cotton is not just cotton. There are all kinds of varieties of cotton. Egyptian cotton, which is of a certain fiber length, long fiber length, has uses and purposes which are not fully met by the American type of cotton, which is generally shorter staple cotton. There is cotton of South American origin, notably Peru, which is competitive with the Egyptian cotton. But I am not quite sure that our cotton can compete with Egyptian cotton. Now it may be that ways can be found if they were sought—at the moment we are not seeking them—which would be somewhat disturbing of Egypt's cotton market. But we are not now engaging in any economic war against Egypt.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I believe that you said that intervention in Argentina was tried by the Truman administration. Would you spell out what you had in mind there, how they intervened?

A. I am afraid if I get into that I would get into politics. I have already treaded pretty close to political ground. The story, I think, is very well known. You can find it without asking me.

Q. Is there a point you can start us off on as to how this was brought about?

A. No, I am afraid not.

Q. Mr. Secretary, when do you plan to go to the U.N., and what is the position of the United States in relation to the British and French at the U.N. on the Suez issue?

A. Well, I shall certainly be there on Friday when the session opens. It is possible I might go up somewhat earlier, although I have a speaking engagement here on Thursday night before the 13th Biennial Ecclesiastical Congress of the Greek Orthodox Church. Conceivably I might meet with some of the other Foreign Ministers, particularly Mr. Pineau and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, before Friday, but my present plans, as far as they are formulated, are to go up on Friday morning.

Western European Unity

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the last week or two there has been a revival of talk of European unity both in terms of trading schemes and also political con-

---

sultations. I wondered if you could tell us your reaction to those developments.

A. My reaction to that revival is extremely favorable, as I think all who know me would surmise. I have been for many years a very strong advocate of Western European unity, and, of course, President Eisenhower has also been such an advocate. Now there are some people who interpret some of the reasoning as a slap at the United States because they say they want to be independent of the United States. I don't interpret that as a slap at the United States at all. As a matter of fact, I recall in a speech I made before the American Club in Paris in November '48 I made what I at least thought was quite an eloquent plea for Western European unity and I said that the important thing is that Western Europe, which has a capacity to be strong and vigorous in its own right, should take that possibility and realize it so that it will not be dependent upon the United States or upon any other power. It does not need to fear any other power. And the idea put forward, now most vocally, perhaps, by Chancellor Adenauer, but which has renewed support now in many quarters, that Europe should become strong by itself, not so divided that it has to fear anybody or so weak that it has to depend upon anybody else, I think that thesis is unanswerable and I hope it will prevail. I had the feeling that developments in this Suez situation were moving thoughts somewhat in that direction and, if so, that probably would be a very happy byproduct, indeed, of what otherwise is a rather tragic affair.

Q. Mr. Secretary, has there been any hint or intimation from Egypt of making a separate agreement with the U.S. on the Suez dispute?

A. Well, the United States is not going to make any separate agreement with Egypt. Any agreement that is made, as far as we are concerned, will be an agreement which will be by or in the interest of all of the users of the canal, the beneficiaries of the treaty of 1888. We are not going to make any side agreements.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there have been rather widespread reports since the ending of the second London conference, where there was a decision to set up the users association, that there is a split on the one hand between the United States and the British and French on the other, or at least a difference in degree of approach. Now could you comment on that and tell us how you view it, at least?

A. As far as the formula for the users association is concerned, there is no detectable change, at least not detectable to me, between what it now is and what was planned, at least as far as the United States is concerned, and as we made known to the British and the French before the project was publicly launched in any way. There was drawn up a draft of the charter, so to speak, the articles of the users association, and what is coming into being today is almost exactly what was planned at that time. There is talk about the "teeth" being pulled out of it. There were never "teeth" in it, if that means the use of force.

Now there has been some difference in our approach to this problem of the Suez Canal. This is not an area where we are bound together by treaty. Certain areas we are by treaty bound to protect, such as the North Atlantic Treaty area, and there we stand together and I hope and believe always will stand absolutely together.

There are also other problems where our approach is not always identical. For example, there is in Asia and Africa the so-called problem of colonialism. Now there the United States plays a somewhat independent role. You have this very great problem of the shift from colonialism to independence which is in process and which will be going on, perhaps, for another 50 years, and there I believe the role of the United States is to try to see that that process moves forward in a constructive evolutionary way and does not either come to a halt or take a violent revolutionary turn which would be destructive of very much good. I suspect that the United States will find that its role, not only today but in the coming years, will be to try to aid that process, without identifying itself 100 percent either with the so-called colonial powers or with the powers which are primarily and uniquely concerned with the problem of getting their independence as rapidly as possible. I think we have a special role to play and that perhaps makes it impractical for us, as I say, in every respect to identify our policies with those of other countries on whichever side of that problem they find their interest.

Q. Mr. Secretary, would you spell out for us a little more your reaction to the Tito trip? From your point of view, is it a good development or a
A. Well, I think that anything which calls for action as unexacted and in a sense as dramatic as this is evidence of differences which confirm the view which we have held now for some time that the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist Party, in groping for new policies to replace those of Stalin, have set in motion forces which they do not dare completely to repress but, on the other hand, are not willing to welcome and encourage. And this is evidence, I think, further evidence of the fact that they have a real and serious problem on their hands. But I wouldn't want to speculate as to how it would be resolved because I suspect that even the principal participants in this thing don't know at this particular moment how it will be resolved. We can't judge that until afterward.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the resolution of the problem, what is your understanding or estimate at this time of what Marshal Tito's role is? Is it as a nonaligned individual or as a friend of the Soviet Union or a friend of the Western Powers?

A. Well, I have no reason to doubt that his general policy is that which we discussed together when I was in Brioni and which I have already referred to, namely, that the now satellite countries should have a greater measure of independence.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you say you have no reason to doubt—do you mean you have no reason to think that he has changed?

A. That's right, I have no reason to think that he has changed his policy.

Q. May I ask something else on this subject, going back to something you said a while ago? You said you had asked the Attorney General for an opinion on the application of the law. The question related to a certain specified point which had been raised in the law. I understood your answer to relate to the date. Do you mean you have asked the Attorney General whether the President's decision might be given at a later time than October 16 and still be effective?

A. That's correct.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there seems to be reason to believe that Japan and Russia are going to sign an agreement terminating a technical state of war without getting into the question of territories, a sort of West German type settlement; that the Prime Minister will go to Moscow to settle that situation with the Soviets. I have two questions. First of all, would you care to comment about that type of settlement; and, secondly, since the United States has a partly responsible role in the territories, do we propose any type of action in the future that will settle that question?

A. I would prefer not to comment on the course that is being followed by the Japanese Government at the present time. It's primarily their problem and, so long as they work it out in ways which do not infringe upon our rights under the Japanese peace treaty, I think we must recognize and do recognize that they have freedom of action, freedom of choice. I don't know myself just what the solution will be or whether it will work, but I believe that they must be and are the masters of their own destiny in this respect.

Relations With Panama

Q. Mr. Secretary, in Panama there seems to be some misunderstanding still about the United States—Panama treaty governing the Canal Zone. The outgoing President yesterday criticized our attitude toward implementing this treaty, and the incoming President said he didn't see it as an insurmountable obstacle and he was confident the United States would do the right thing. I wonder if you would comment on that situation.

A. I was favorably impressed by the moderate tone of the statements made by the outgoing and incoming Presidents on this matter. The reality is that on all the fundamentals, I think, we get on extremely well with the Republic of Panama. It's a difficult situation. The Panama Canal cuts right through the middle of the territory of the Republic of Panama, and you can't have a situation like that without having differences. So far these differences have been discussed, discussed very frankly. The last time they were discussed was when the President and I were in Panama at the meeting last July of the Presidents. And we can talk these things over very frankly, very openly. It is difficult to get solutions which are.

*For text, see ibid., Feb. 7, 1955, p. 238.
not only agreed to on paper as they had been agreed to by the recent treaty of 1955, I think it was, but which actually operate in terms of the human beings that are there. There are natural tendencies on the part of our people, military and civilian, who are concerned with the operation of the canal, to have certain privileges which they think they are entitled to in the way of PX's and things of that sort. And stuff gets out from them improperly in ways that compete with the business of the merchants of Panama. There are questions of rates of pay and whether or not there is discrimination against the citizens of Panama. These are awfully difficult problems to work out in terms of your day-to-day application of the treaty.

Now, I think that they are being worked out; a great deal of progress has been made. I'm not such a Utopian as to think there will never be any problems between us because of the nature of the situation. As I say, where there is a strip that we control 10 miles wide running right through the middle of Panama, there are almost sure to be differences from time to time. But if the spirit that prevailed in the past continues to prevail, we will work them out.

Q. Mr. Secretary, both last week and this week you sounded like you could make a political speech on this Argentine question, and I was wondering if you might before the elections.

A. Well, I'm still holding at least the remnants of hope which I expressed earlier, that we would not get politically into this campaign. I am not sure how long I will hold out, but I haven't given in yet.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the Israel Government has expressed the desire to participate in the Suez debate in the Security Council. What is this Government's view of such a participation by Israel in the debate?

A. Well, I think that that matter had been adjourned for a decision when it came up last week, and it will probably come up again this week or perhaps at a later stage. It seems to me that the views of Israel ought to come in some form or manner to the knowledge and consideration of the Security Council. Now, we have to handle that matter with some care as a practical matter so that we don't open the door to everybody to come in, as that would make it a process which would have no end. So the precise form and manner of the presentation of the Israel case still remains to be decided. But I certainly think that Israel's point of view, and their case of violation of the treaty of 1958, as found by the Security Council in 1951, that ought to come in some form or manner to the attention of the Security Council.

Q. Mr. Secretary, another point on Latin America. Yesterday a couple of leading Argentine newspapers took exception to the expression of regret on the part of the President over the death of President Somoza of Nicaragua, the plain implication being that we should welcome, so to speak, the demise of a dictator. Against the background of your remarks about Mr. Perón, do you want to comment on that in any way?

A. Well, you know, one of the basic principles of the American Republics organization is to avoid interference in the internal affairs of other countries. I do not believe that it is productive to interfere, and I believe that a failure to practice the customary amenities as between sovereign states could be looked upon as a form of interference. I realize that the American Republics are much divided among themselves on the question of democratic governments as against so-called dictator governments. But I do not think that, whatever our own views may be, it is wise or profitable to carry those views into the current conduct of our relations with these countries.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there have been frequent reports within the last few days about the possibility of a compromise with Iceland on the base problem. Do you see the possibility of such a compromise, to leave our troops there beyond early 1958?

A. Well, we have not started any actual negotiations, nor do we know what the position of the Icelandic Government is going to be when we do start a negotiation. All I can say is that the fact that there is going to be a negotiation and that the representatives of Iceland came all the way here to try to create an atmosphere which would be favorable to a good and successful negotiation, all that gives me ground for hope that out of our negotiation, when it starts, there will come some positive, fruitful results.

Q. Mr. Secretary, coming back to Europe,
would you accept the idea developed in some European circles that the United Europe should become an independent group, a sort of a third international force which would lead a kind of neutralist policy between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.?

A. Well, you have asked two questions there. It certainly is, I think, quite appropriate that Europe should become what you might call a third great power. The Soviet Union is today a great power. The United States is today a great power. The Western European countries have it within their capacity to be a great power. I remember that Mr. Attlee remarked, "Europe must federate or perish," and, while that was perhaps somewhat of an overstatement, it does indicate the importance of there being a unity which will provide strength. Now, the idea that they would be neutral toward Soviet communism is, I think, unthinkable. All of the premises of Western society, the whole nature of Western civilization, the fact that Western Europe is now the cradle of Christianity, all of this to my mind makes it unthinkable that if that new force came into being it would be neutral toward materialistic and atheistic communism.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I believe you have an appointment with Mr. Javits. What is the purpose of this? Is it at his suggestion or yours?

A. Well, it is his suggestion that he come to see me. He is a person I think very highly of. I knew him when he was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and he is in Washington and it is quite natural that he should drop in to see me.

U.S.--Icelandic Discussions Regarding 1951 Agreement

Following is the text of a joint communique issued on October 3 at the close of discussions with Icelandic Foreign Minister Emil Jonsson.

Representatives of the Governments of Iceland and the United States have concluded frank and friendly conversations, in the spirit of their mutual obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, in which they have discussed the defense functions under the United States-Icelandic Agreement of 1951 concerning the defense of Iceland and the North Atlantic area. These conversations, which had the purpose of ensuring that each Government has a better conception of the principles underlying the other Government's approach to the problem under discussion, were preliminary to formal negotiations on the Agreement. At today's meeting it was decided that it would be mutually advantageous to begin negotiations in Reykjavik in mid-November.

Suez Canal Users Association Organized at London

Following are texts of resolutions adopted at London on October 4 by the Council of the Suez Canal Users Association.

Resolution on the Organization of the Suez Canal Users Association

The Council of the Suez Canal Users Association,

Considering the Declaration of September 21, 1956; under which the Association was inaugurated on October 1, 1956;

Desiring to provide for the organization of the Association in accordance with the Declaration;

Resolves as follows:

Part I—Organs

Article 1

The organs of the Association are:

(A) A Council;

(B) An Executive Group, and

(C) An Administrator.

Part II

Article 2

The Council consists of all members.

Article 3

(A) Sessions of the Council shall be convened once every six months. They shall also be convened whenever one of the members gives notice to the Administrator that it desires a session to be arranged, or at the request of the Executive Group. Whenever possible, notice of ten days should be given to members before the Council is summoned.

(B) The Council may hold sessions in any place other than the headquarters of the Association, if the Chairman of the Council deems it necessary or

Article 4
Two-thirds of the members shall constitute a quorum for the meeting of the Council.

Article 5
The Council shall:
(A) Elect at each session from among its members its chairman and vice-chairman, who shall hold office until the next session;
(B) Determine its own rules of procedure, except as otherwise provided herein.

Article 6
The Council shall:
(A) Elect the members to be represented on the Executive Group in accordance with Article 7;
(B) Appoint an Administrator after taking into account the recommendation of the Executive Group;
(C) Review the expenditure and approve the budget of the Association;
(D) Consider any matter within the purposes of the Association, request the Executive Group to study and report on any such matter, and give directives on the general policy and operations of the Association to the Executive Group and through it to the Administrator; and
(E) Receive, consider and take any necessary action on reports of the Executive Group.

Part III—The Executive Group

Article 7
(A) The Executive Group shall consist of seven nations which shall be chosen by the Council of the Association from among the members with due regard to use of the Suez Canal, pattern of trade and geographical distribution.2
(B) The members of the Executive Group shall be elected initially for one year.

Article 8
(A) The Executive Group shall elect its chairman and adopt its own rules of procedure except as otherwise provided herein;
(B) The Executive Group shall meet as often as may be necessary for the discharge of its duties, upon the summons of its chairman, upon request by any one of its members or upon request by the Administrator. It shall normally meet at the headquarters of the Association but meetings may take place elsewhere as convenient.

Article 9
(A) The Executive Group shall recommend to the Council a candidate or candidates for appointment as Administrator.
(B) The Executive Group shall make recommendations to the Council for the terms and conditions of service of the Administrator and the staff.

Article 10
(A) The Executive Group shall, in accordance with the directives of the Council given under Article 6(D), be responsible for giving policy guidance to the Administrator in carrying out the purposes of the Association.
(B) The Executive Group may advise the Council on means for carrying out the purposes of the Association.

Article 11
(A) The Executive Group shall report to the Council, as necessary, at each session on the work of the Association since the previous session of the Council.
(B) The Executive Group shall submit to the Council the financial statements and budget estimates of the Association, together with its comments and recommendations.

Article 12
The following provisions shall apply to voting in the Executive Group:
(A) Each member shall have one vote.
(B) All decisions shall be by a majority vote of the members present and voting.

Part IV—The Administrator

Article 13
The Administrator shall be the chief administrative officer of the Association and shall, subject to the provisions of Article 9, appoint the staff of the Association.

Article 14
The Administrator shall prepare and submit to the Executive Group financial statements and budget estimates.

---

2On Oct. 5, the final day of the organizational session, the SCUA appointed the following six members to the Executive Group: France, Iran, Italy, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States.
Article 15

The Administrator shall keep members informed with respect to the activities of the Association.

Part V—Headquarters

Article 16

The headquarters of the Association shall be established in a place to be determined by the Council. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Executive Group, establish additional offices elsewhere.

Resolution on Finance

The Council resolves that:

1. The basis for the permanent financing of the Association shall be the subject of proposals to be drafted by the Executive Group for submission to the Council.

2. Meanwhile, members of the Association should:

(i) without prejudice to whatever cost-sharing formula may be decided upon by the Council; and

(ii) subject to later adjustment between them when this formula and the budget shall have been agreed; advance in equal shares the funds necessary for the Association for the first three months, on the assumption that by then a permanent budget for the Association will have been agreed.

U.S.S.R. Accepts Invitation To Send Election Observers

Following is the substantive portion of a note from the Soviet Foreign Office received by the American Embassy at Moscow on September 29.

The Soviet Government accepts the invitation of the Government of the United States of America to send to the United States of America two or three Soviet representatives to acquaint themselves with the electoral process by which the President and members of the United States Congress are elected. On its part the Soviet Government is prepared to receive on a basis of reciprocity two or three American representatives during the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

1 For text of invitation, see Bulletin of Oct. 8, 1956, p. 550.

The Soviet Government shares the opinion of the United States Government expressed in the Embassy’s note that these reciprocal trips will facilitate the development of mutual understanding between our countries. The Soviet Government also considers that these trips will facilitate the furtherance of parliamentary contacts and ties between the officials of both states.

The composition of the group of Soviet representatives will be communicated supplementarily.

U.S. Commissioner General Named for Brussels World Fair

The Department of State announced on October 3 (press release 520) that Howard S. Cullman, honorary chairman of the Port of New York Authority, was sworn in that day as the U.S. Commissioner General of the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels for 1958. The White House announced Mr. Cullman’s appointment on September 26.

The exposition, popularly known as the Brussels World Fair, is the first major one of its type to be held since World War II. Dedicated to the theme, “A World Built By and For the People,” the fair will “sound a note of hope that man on the threshold of the Atomic Age may find a better means of achieving human understanding and peace.”

The 84th Congress authorized U.S. participation in the exposition and provided for the appointment by the President of a commissioner general who will be in charge, under the Secretary of State, of all matters pertaining to U.S. participation.

Mr. Cullman will be assisted by two deputy commissioners who will be appointed at a later date.

The Brussels Fair is scheduled to open in mid-April and to run until October 1958. It will be the latest of the traditional international expositions in which the United States has participated. It will be comparable in importance with the Paris Exposition of 1937 and the New York World’s Fair of 1939.

In addition to over 50 countries, a number of international organizations will participate in the Brussels Fair. These include the United Nations, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, and the Council of Europe. It is expected that over 35,000,000 visitors will attend.
American Policy and the Future of NATO

by C. Burke Elbrick
Acting Assistant Secretary for European Affairs

It is a pleasure and an honor to be asked to join with you today in your discussion of NATO and of its relationship to some of the problems and opportunities we Americans face in the field of international relations.

What I should like to do is to examine with you the problems and progress resulting from our position in the Atlantic Community, to focus on the economic relationships between our European allies and ourselves, and finally to deal briefly with the role that NATO and our membership in it plays in our foreign policy.

The name “Atlantic Community” has come to be used, for want of a better term, for Canada, the United States, and the countries of Western Europe which have, to a considerable degree, a common heritage and history which have been marked by a concern for justice and individual liberty.

Let me begin my stressing that one of the purposes which has consistently been a part of our foreign policy since 1945 has been the maintenance of unity and cooperation with those countries of Western Europe to which we are bound by strong economic and cultural ties. The common heritage which we share with the people of Western Europe is a bond of great importance to them and to us. More than this, Western Europe possesses 25 to 30 percent of the world’s industrial capacity, resources, and skilled manpower. If for no other reason, this fact alone makes it imperative that Western Europe remain allied with us in the struggle against the tyrannical forces of the international Communist conspiracy directed from Moscow.

We are all acutely aware that the basic Soviet Communist strategy for the accomplishment of world domination is “divide and conquer.” This is one of the reasons why we place such great emphasis on unity with those nations and peoples with whom we share a devotion to the principles of human liberty and law.

How has the very considerable degree of unity that exists today among the members of the Atlantic Community been achieved, and how can it be maintained and strengthened?

The only existing body through which the governments of the Atlantic nations can work together on all levels—political, military, economic, and cultural—is NATO. This is not to say that all of our relations with our European friends must be channeled through NATO but rather that NATO is an established, flexible mechanism which permits and facilitates as much cooperation as the countries of the Atlantic Community decide they want to engage in.

You have discussed here today some of the forms of military cooperation which NATO has made possible. It is difficult to overestimate the contribution which this cooperation has made to the morale of the people of Western Europe, who, almost wholly defenseless in 1949, faced the threat of possible Soviet aggression.

NATO has developed the largest and most powerful collective defense force ever assembled by free nations in peacetime. It has kept Europe at peace through 7 dangerous years. Since it began, the Communists have gained no territory in Europe and have, in fact, retreated from certain advance positions. The internal riots, political strikes, and other manifestations of disorder and strife which the Communists fostered with con-

---

1 Address made before the Virginia World Trade Conference at Old Point Comfort, Va., on Oct. 5 (press release 521 dated Oct. 4).
considerable effect in the early postwar years have largely died out. Meanwhile, behind the shield of NATO defensive strength it has been possible for the European peoples to rebuild their war-torn economies, increase their trade, and improve their standards of living.

NATO’s record is truly impressive. But we all know that we are living in a world that no longer permits us to rest on our laurels. Laurels were not made to sit on. They have a bad habit of turning into thorns. The survival and growth of the Atlantic Community—and of the free world as a whole—cannot be guaranteed by anything that we have done in the past but will depend upon the way we deal with the problems of the future.

These problems are numerous and complex. For present purposes, however, I would like to discuss four broad problem areas. The first is the maintenance of a sound and progressive defense system. The second is the attainment of free-world economic health and growth. The third is the advancement of unity among the European nations themselves. And the last is the further development of the Atlantic Community as a whole, in a manner that will promote cooperation in all fields of human activity and will assure the lasting solidarity of Western civilization.

Military Defense System

Paradoxically, the first major problem of the Atlantic Community is so obvious that people sometimes tend to forget about it. We have heard a great deal recently about the shift in Soviet tactics from military to nonmilitary techniques of conquest. Some people have, therefore, leaped to the conclusion that military defense no longer deserves high priority. This conclusion is as dangerous as it is unwarranted. While the shift in Soviet tactics is real—and while it is true that we must give increasing attention to the political, economic, cultural, and psychological aspects of the world struggle—this does not mean that we can afford to relax our military defenses. We should remember that the Soviet politico-economic offensive is not a substitute for their military threat but is in addition to the military threat.

The Soviet Union and its satellites continue to maintain enormous military forces, capable of either general or local aggression. These forces are steadily being reinforced by growing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, long-range aircraft, improved electronic devices, and similar modern instruments of warfare. While we have reason to hope that the prospect of devastating retaliation by American and allied military forces will continue to deter the Communist bloc from risking warfare, we have no guaranty of this. We must maintain and constantly improve our defenses as an indispensable insurance policy against aggression.

It is also well to remember that this is not the kind of insurance policy that can ever be “paid up.” Military science and technology are never static. Each year brings advances in weapons and techniques that would have seemed fanciful a few years ago. It is necessary, therefore, not only to keep our forces in being but also to keep them up to date. This is an expensive proposition for Americans and allies alike. But the alternative is to invite destruction.

There may still be a few Americans who view the problem of defense in purely national terms and who do not fully appreciate the importance of the collective effort that NATO represents. They feel, perhaps, that our own nuclear stockpile, our strategic air power, our great industrial capacity and other resources are sufficient to provide for American defense and that the contributions of our allies have little value. This is a very shortsighted concept. Europe has many things that we need. We need the $12 billion per year that our European allies are spending on the combined defense effort—roughly $6 for every dollar’s worth of United States aid they are receiving. We need their military manpower, which is more numerous than our own. We need Europe’s sea and air bases, which are so vital to effective defense and retaliation against aggression. We need their factories and mines, which, added to our own, give the Atlantic Community nearly 70 percent of the world’s industrial output. We need their science and technology, which played an indispensable role in producing the first atomic bomb and which still represent an invaluable counterpart to American scientific capabilities. In combination, North America and Europe have the means to protect themselves against any foreseeable combination of hostile powers, but the task might well prove insuperable for either acting alone.
Need for Economic Stability

It is evident from what I have said that defensive power is largely a matter of economics and that our ability to maintain an adequate military “insurance policy” depends in the final analysis upon the economic health of the member nations. It is equally true that our ability to compete with the Communist bloc in the nonmilitary aspects of the world struggle—to win and hold the allegiance of nations and peoples—is also dependent upon our economic stability and growth.

This brings us to the second major problem I mentioned. While I have already observed that Europe has huge assets, our allies also face acute economic problems. The average income and living standard in Western Europe is less than half the American average. Europeans are much more heavily dependent than we on foreign trade and investment, and their economies are easily upset by adverse developments in other parts of the world. They suffer constant difficulties in balancing international payments. At present, moreover, the rate of economic growth in free Europe is only about one-half the rate of growth behind the Iron Curtain. This is a disturbing trend despite the fact that the Soviets started from a much lower base than Western Europe. The recent increase in the rate of Western-European economic growth is an encouraging sign. In fact it has in recent years exceeded that of the United States.

We Americans cannot solve Europe’s economic problems. These problems must be worked out by the Europeans themselves. To a considerable extent, they can be solved only within the context of a worldwide improvement in economic conditions. However, it is evident that our own economic policies have an important impact upon the world economic picture.

What has United States foreign economic policy been in relation to these developments in Europe?

However independent this country may have been of the rest of the world in former years, we know now beyond any doubt that, so long as hunger, poverty, and unrest exist to any considerable extent anywhere in the world, we cannot be entirely confident about our own peace and security. These conditions will be alleviated only as we and the rest of the world continue to increase our trade, develop our economies, and raise our standards of living.

Because of the tremendous economic strength and stability of the United States it is sometimes difficult for us to visualize how delicately balanced are the economies not only of the smaller countries but even of such relatively large and economically developed countries as Great Britain, France, and Germany. Our economic health depends upon an expanding trade; yet we must constantly seek ways of permitting and encouraging the expansion of trade without adversely affecting friendly nations whose economies are not as strong and resilient as our own.

Certainly it is unnecessary in addressing this audience and in this great port area of Hampton Roads to dwell on the importance of the freest possible exchange of goods among all countries if the peoples of the world are to attain the higher standards of living which they seek. One of the foremost natural harbors of the world, this port has from the beginnings of the Commonwealth played an important part in the economic development of America. Today, as in the past, its prosperity depends in important degree upon trade with the world, which in turn depends upon the political arrangements and relationships, the stability and unity which exist around the globe.

The coal, tobacco, and other goods which leave this harbor move because there are dollars abroad with which to pay them, because there are industries abroad which can use them, and because there is prosperity around the world which makes it possible for the industries to sell the goods they make.

It has been and remains United States policy to encourage the reduction of barriers to freer trade among our European allies and in the entire free world. We do not dictate to the sovereign independent states of Europe, and we recognize that they must themselves work out solutions to their economic problems, but we can and do point out to them that our own prosperity derives in no small measure from the absence of trade and currency restrictions among our 48 States.

There is no need to recount the tremendous progress which the Western European countries have made since 1945 in rebuilding their economies, expanding their trade, and increasing their standards of living. United States aid has, of course, played no small part in this spectacular development. Yet many difficult problems remain.
In an effort to chart a course for future economic progress, the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, the so-called Randall Commission, in its report made in 1954, offered some guidelines which are worth repeating. The report declares:

The free world must build its long-term future, not upon extraordinary assistance from the United States, but upon the resources and the efforts of the citizens of each country. That the foundations for such an international economy have already been laid is now clear, and it is reasonable to believe that with mutual helpfulness and understanding a self-sustaining trade and payments system can be built solidly for the future.

There are encouraging signs that the world stands at the beginning of an era of expansion of world trade. Industrialized countries are coming to need more and more of the materials which the under-developed areas can provide. The latter, in turn, are demanding increasingly greater volumes of the machinery, industrial materials, and highly fabricated consumer goods that go with economic growth. The time seems to be ripe for obtaining the benefits of swelling international commerce.

To achieve this growth, however, the free world must remove many of the impediments which still exist to the movement of goods, capital, and currencies. All of the countries involved must seek greater stability in the economic world by adopting sound internal fiscal policies, and must demonstrate confidence in their ability to earn their own way. To a greater extent than they have hitherto recognized, many of the countries must intensify their own efforts, must strive to create an economic climate that will attract investment capital, both from their own citizens and from foreign sources, and must lift the restrictions that limit the freedom of the mechanism of international payments.

In all this, the United States must exercise wise leadership. In so doing, we must remember that the alliance of the free world consists of agreements among sovereign nations.

**European Unity**

While Western Europe’s economic position is closely related to the economic state of the free world as a whole, it is also true that there are certain economic problems peculiar to Europe. One of the major obstacles to the development of a dynamic European economy in past years has been the failure of the European nations to achieve unity among themselves. For this reason the encouragement of European unity has been a major objective of United States policy.

Europe’s production and markets are divided into many small and often economically inefficient units. In the long history of the Western European countries many customs, prejudices, and local interests, originally established for purposes of self-protection, have become solidified and now form serious barriers to freer trade. The cartels, tariff walls, and other trade and currency restrictions erected many years ago limit the progress which might be realized with modern production, distribution, and financial procedures.

As Europe began to recover after World War II, it became apparent to many statesmen and economists that established economic patterns would have to be replaced by freer trade and closer cooperation or integration if the Europeans were to compete successfully in an era of expanding trade.

In 1947 Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands agreed to take the first steps toward an economic union which would eliminate tariffs between them and levy common tariffs on imports from other countries. The purpose of the Benelux Customs Union was to create an economic unit sufficiently large to enable the participants to compete successfully with larger countries in world markets. All of the necessary measures needed to achieve full economic union have not yet been adopted, but progress has been heartening.

The Economic Commission for Europe (Ece) was established in 1947 to facilitate concerted action for postwar reconstruction, raise the level of European economic activity, and maintain and strengthen economic relations among the European members of the United Nations, the United States, and the rest of the world.

An important step toward European integration was taken with the signing in 1948 of the Brussels Pact, which provided for closer collaboration in economic, social, cultural, and collective self-defense matters by France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. When Congress in 1948 enacted the European Recovery Act, known as the Marshall plan, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OeeC) was established to assure cooperation by its 16 European member countries in their economic recovery by increasing production and trade, modernizing industry, stabilizing finances, and reducing trade barriers. With its offspring, the European Payments Union, created to facili-
tate payments among its member countries, the OEEC has proved to be an effective organization for tackling some of the knottiest economic problems of Europe.

One more important European effort in the field of economic integration deserves mention. The European Coal and Steel Community, first advanced by French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, was formed in 1952 by France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg to eliminate national barriers to trade in coal and steel among these countries and to do away with restrictive agreements on the production and marketing of these key commodities.

As the sovereign nations of Western Europe moved toward economic integration after World War II, it became apparent that a greater degree of political cooperation was necessary if significant progress was to be made in solving Europe’s problems. The destructive effects of two world wars in this century have demonstrated all too clearly the disastrous results of unchecked rivalries and rampant nationalism.

I have mentioned the Brussels Pact, which in March 1948 drew together France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom for purposes of closer collaboration in economic, social, and cultural matters and for collective self-defense. The desire for greater unity which inspired the pact resulted a year later in the formation of the Council of Europe by the five Brussels powers and Italy, Ireland, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, with Iceland, Germany, Greece, Turkey, and the Saar joining later. The Council of Europe has the power only to recommend policies to its member governments, yet it is valuable as a forum for stimulating actions and marshaling public opinion on major European problems.

One of the most far-reaching ideas for advancing European unity was the plan for a European Defense Community, under which the six member nations of the Coal and Steel Community would have merged their defense forces into a single supranational force. The failure of this plan represented a setback for the movement toward unity, although some of the specific advantages of the plan were salvaged by creating a Western European Union based on the original Brussels Pact. Despite this setback, the vision of a united Europe is still very much alive. At pres-

ent, European governments are actively considering proposals for pooling efforts toward the development and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes as well as proposals for a broad common market. While there are many obstacles to the realization of these proposals, and while it is too early to predict the outcome, there can be no doubt that many European leaders retain their determination to achieve the strength and stability which only unity can bring.

**Strengthening the Atlantic Community**

The United States Government will continue to encourage all practical steps toward European unity because we realize that the integration of Europe can contribute substantially to the strength and solidarity of the Atlantic Community as a whole. As the movement progresses, however, we must simultaneously devote attention to a parallel objective—the broadening and tightening of the Atlantic relationship itself. Specifically, we must consider ways and means of developing NATO as an instrument of political, economic, and social cooperation as well as a mechanism of defense.

The need for a further development of the NATO relationship has been accentuated by the new Soviet tactics of political, economic, and psychological penetration. The dangers of this new approach should not be underestimated. The Russians are expert at deceptive propaganda. They are keenly aware of the inevitable frictions among free nations, and they will be quick to exploit these frictions. They will lose no chance to incite division and weakness in the free world. This strategy will be supplemented by subtle economic pressures and enticements. Because the Russian economy is completely controlled by the state, it can and frequently is used for purely political purposes, and offers of Soviet markets and raw materials sometimes look attractive to the hard-pressed Western Europeans despite their awareness of the motives that underlie them. The United States can afford to ignore Soviet economic overtures, but our European friends cannot always do so. We believe that, because of their awareness of the danger of Soviet blandishments, the Western Europeans will take further steps toward economic integration, increased productivity, and reduced trade barriers so that the Soviet economic offensive, the real purpose of which is to break up
the unity of the Atlantic Community, will have to be abandoned.

What should be the direction of our efforts to strengthen Nato to meet this threat?

Should Nato seek to harmonize the foreign policies of its members?

Should Nato attempt to deal with the problems arising from Soviet economic offers to free-world countries?

Should Nato serve as a forum for the adjudication of political issues between its members?

Should Nato carry out informational and cultural activities designed to develop greater unity among the partners?

These and many other questions have been posed to each Nato member in a questionnaire, the replies to which are being studied by a committee known as the Three Wise Men. Out of this study will come, we believe, some guidelines for the future development of the organization.

While the study is not yet complete, certain key facts have emerged. It is clear that none of the countries desires any kind of Atlantic "super-government"—that what we are all seeking is more effective cooperation on a voluntary basis. There is also a general agreement that we do not wish Nato to interfere with or duplicate the functions of other international organizations, such as the United Nations and the OEEC. Nor do we wish Nato as an organization to assume operating functions which can be more efficiently performed by individual governments. Despite these qualifications we believe that there are numerous opportunities for attaining improved cooperation among the Nato countries. By extending and intensifying the processes of political and economic consultation we hope to achieve greater and more durable cohesion of purpose and action than has ever before existed among free nations.

The United States believes that, whatever changes are proposed for the improvement of the organization and functioning of Nato, the basic task is to create and preserve unity among the nations of the Atlantic Community. Instead of concentrating our attention almost exclusively upon the dangers facing us, we must now increas-

\*Foreign Ministers Lester B. Pearson of Canada, Gaetano Martino of Italy, and Halvard Lange of Norway.

**North Atlantic Planning Board for Ocean Shipping**

The Department of State announced on October 5 (press release 526) that Rear Adm. Walter C. Ford, USN (retired), Deputy Maritime Administrator, will head the U.S. delegation at the eighth meeting of the North Atlantic Planning Board for Ocean Shipping at Washington, D.C., beginning October 8. This meeting is one in a regular series of meetings attended by representatives of Nato nations for the purpose of organizing merchant shipping for the common defense in an emergency.

The chairman will be Clarence G. Morse, U.S. Maritime Administrator. The U.S. delegation will include the following advisers: John W. Mann and Lehman P. Nickell of the Department of State, Paul F. Royster of the Department of Commerce, and Rear Adm. William V. O'Regan, USN, and Capt. A. G. Schnable, USN, representing the Department of Defense.
Developing Economic Power From the Energy of the Atom

Following are the texts of remarks made at an atomic energy symposium during a meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development at Washington, D.C., on September 27 by Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and W. Kenneth Davis, director of the Commission's Division of Reactor Development.

REMARKS BY MR. STRAUSS

I will confine my remarks on the engrossing subject of atomic energy to the broad prospects and promises of that instrument for good which Providence has placed in our hands at this juncture in human history. It is my hope that I may be able to contribute now and in the future in some very modest measure to the plans which the International Bank is making for its role in the development of the peaceful atom.

Before the proceedings of many more meetings of your Board have passed into the minute books, I feel sure that the bank will be taking an active part in spreading the benefits of atomic energy and will be financing atomic power projects in various countries.

It is now nearly noon of this September 27, 1956. Before this day ends, the demographers tell us that the population of the world will have increased by some 80,000—80,000 more mouths to be fed, 80,000 more people to be clothed, warmed, and sheltered. It would be useful if we could take such a statistic, multiply it by the per-capita consumption of kilowatt hours in a year, and derive a figure of annual necessary increase in installed generating capacity. It would be a large figure but not very meaningful since average, annual, per-capita power use around the world varies so enormously by regions. There is also another variable in the statistical increase in per-capita power demand, even in the highly developed countries. Will it level off, or will it continue to increase? We cannot answer save to draw upon our imaginations.

But of one thing we can be fairly sure. The atom holds the hope of remedying much of the world's imbalance in standards of living. As this imbalance is overcome, to whatever degree—as more and more people enjoy the good things of life—the greater will become the worldwide civil use of electrical energy.

As of this moment, no large-scale power plant exclusively for civil use, generating cheap electricity from nuclear energy, exists anywhere in the world. Very soon, however, our British friends, as we have just heard from Sir Edwin Plowden and Sir John Cockcroft, will have dual-purpose nuclear plants in operation at Calder Hall, producing primarily plutonium for weapons and in excess of 60,000 kilowatts of electricity as useful byproduct. Here in the United States within the approaching year, the nuclear plant at Shippingport, Pennsylvania, designed for commercial power only, will begin furnishing in excess of 60,000 kilowatts of electrical energy to homes and industries of the Pittsburgh area. These are pioneer projects.

We have entered upon the era of the beneficent atom, and it is no longer a vague dream of things to come. True, we are just across the threshold and adjusting our vision to the broad vistas before us.

I shall not attempt here to recite, or even to summarize, the things that already are being done, and will be done in increasing measure, to apply the beneficial atom to medicine, agriculture, and biology and to improve the products of industry. These advances are concerned in the main with the rapidly expanding use of radioisotopes. I shall speak only of the prospects of economic and efficient nuclear power. It is there that both challenge and opportunity exist for bankers and
for management, no less than for the scientists and engineers who are advancing the technology of nuclear-reactor systems.

Here in the United States, because we are fortunately situated in the extent of our reserves of cheap, conventional fuels, we are some distance away from our goal of competitively priced nuclear power. The atom, as a source of commercial power, is up against much stiffer competition here than perhaps anywhere else in the world, with the possible exception of a few locations where hydro-power is still plentiful. In most other areas of the world—for example, in the home of my distinguished British colleagues on this panel—the road to competitive electric power from atomic energy, as they have so well described it this morning, is much shorter. In fact, in some fuel-short areas of the globe, in special circumstances, a power-producing reactor of existing design would probably be economic even now.

You have doubtless noticed that speculation and estimates as to how soon we will have economic nuclear power in the United States have resulted in a guessing game in which any number of persons may play; the more the merrier. Some of the estimates are obviously too rosy; others, in my opinion, suffer from extreme caution. It is well to bear in mind that the store of technological knowledge is being expanded so rapidly and we are engaged in research and development on so many different reactor concepts that a major breakthrough, putting us at or near the goal of economic nuclear power, could come with some suddenness.

Progress of Past 14 Years

One has only to look back upon the very recent past to realize how dangerous it is to predict the rate of progress on this subject. It has been less than 14 years since Enrico Fermi and his team of pioneers first harnessed the power of fission in a primitive reactor in Chicago. It was but 10 years ago that a group of specialists began serious studies of the first "power pile" at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. Only 7 years ago one of the members of that Oak Ridge group, Captain—now Rear Admiral—Rickover, began work on a project that today is the atom-powered submarine Nautilus, a vessel that has cruised upwards of 50,000 miles without refueling. In 1954, only 2 years ago, we began an experimental program embracing five different concepts of nuclear power reactors.

Progress in this brief span of time has been remarkable. Yet only a few years ago some of our most experienced advisers counseled that it would take between 30 and 50 years before atomic energy could substantially supplement the general power resources of the world.

Since the day in December 1942 when Fermi's pile went critical, producing only a few watts of heat, we have built and operated in the United States some 80 reactors of various types and sizes, including experimental power facilities with millions of times more power than Fermi's first pile. As early as 1951 an experimental breeder reactor at the Commission's testing station in Idaho was hooked up to a small turbine and generator and has since furnished useful—but not cheap—electrical power for that installation.

Industrial participation, freed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 from the smothering embrace of Government monopoly, is no longer a "study program" inquiring into the feasibility of nuclear power; it is a program of action and bold enterprise. American industry now has plans to install some 700,000 kilowatts of nuclear power and to finance it through natural banking channels, without calling on the Federal Government for any direct financial support. Another 400,000 or more kilowatts is included in the Commission's Power Demonstration Program, to be carried out jointly by Government and industry. Meanwhile, the Government's own experimental program for power reactors has grown from the five concepts which I mentioned as of 1954, to nine as of today.

The fact that all this has taken place within the short space of 14 years, and most of it within the last 3 years, demonstrates two fundamentals:

First, that the anticipated time lag between discovery and practical application has been greatly compressed where atomic energy is concerned. This is a phenomenon of our times.

Secondly, that the rapidly increasing demands for additional sources of energy all over the world are exerting powerful economic, social, and political pressures on science, engineering, and management—and on Government—urging speed in establishing the atom as one of the chief sources for meeting those demands.

I shall briefly outline the response which the United States is making to this worldwide challenge. Mr. Kenneth Davis, the director of our
Division of Reactor Development, under whose able leadership so much of this progress is being made, will then tell you about our program in some detail, particularly its technical aspects.

Domestic Nuclear Power Program

Our program has as its domestic goal a nuclear power development which will justify its financing without Government subsidy—installations which will be built and operated by industry, that is to say, private utilities or local public-power groups. To achieve this goal we have a flexible partnership between Government and industry, and we believe, on the basis of progress to date, that this approach will achieve our goal within the shortest possible time. That goal is, as I have said, cheap or, at the very least, competitively priced nuclear power.

Thus far, we have resisted pressures—mainly political—to establish arbitrary goals of installed kilowatts for a set date, since we are not entered in a numbers game. We seek to improve the technology of nuclear power reactors so that we may benefit our own people—and people everywhere—by providing the most efficient reactors. To engage in a crash construction of atomic power plants in the United States, based on the present state of our knowledge, would neither be prudent nor would it fulfill our obligation to develop the atom for peaceful purposes. Furthermore, we would be dissipating our very finite reservoir of scientific and engineering talent. It would be using a limited asset to build primitive plants when that resource should be applied to the many yet unsolved problems of reactor technology.

Scientific and engineering skill being the most critical factor, the Commission is making a determined attack upon the manpower problem, but we anticipate that the situation will be more critical before it improves. Trained people—rather than either money or uranium—are, at the moment, the element in short supply in the peaceful development of atomic energy.

It is fortunate, therefore, that our reserves of coal, oil, and gas are recoverable at comparatively low cost and are in such quantity that we have time to investigate and experiment with many types of power reactors. It will take time for the incentives of competitive enterprise to lower the costs of construction and operation and to train large numbers of nuclear scientists and engineers.

With these conditions in mind, here is the way we operate:

The Government, that is to say, the Atomic Energy Commission, conducts in its own laboratories the basic research and experimentation necessary to prove that particular reactor concepts will advance the technology of nuclear power and that, therefore, the building of certain prototype plants for the commercial production of civilian power is justified. Industry is then offered the opportunity to build and operate such plants. We know of no other way to obtain meaningful economic cost data and operational guidance, for plants constructed by the Government on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis afford no realistic estimate of how costs can be reduced under competitive conditions. However, if the building of a prototype plant should be indicated—on and beyond the experimental plant stage—and if industry should fail to come forward to share in the project with its time, talent, and money, then the Government would build the prototype plant. I hasten to add, however, that industry has not failed to accept its role in the concept of partnership. It has responded with enthusiasm to each proposal we have made thus far.

At the present state of the art, of course, the Government bears the cost of much of the research and development work necessary to build prototype reactors. However, as our store of technology is enlarged and as research costs become more predictable, we anticipate that industry will assume this expense as it does in other fields of industrial development. It is already beginning to do so.

There are a number of areas related to reactor development where we expect to encourage industry to take over work heretofore done by the Government. These include the handling and disposal of radioactive wastes; the development and production of new and improved reactor materials such as beryllium and zirconium; the design and manufacture of fuel elements; and the chemical processing necessary to separate the fission products from spent fuel elements.

This is the outline of the philosophy of our domestic nuclear power program, and it is our belief that it is designed in such a manner as to enable us to make important contributions to the development of atomic power throughout the world. I turn now to some aspects of the program directed toward international cooperation.
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During this past week there opened at the United Nations in New York an international conference from which we hope will come agreement on the charter and working plans for a worldwide agency devoted to promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I had the privilege at the opening session to welcome the delegates on behalf of our Government.¹

The International Atomic Energy Agency will represent a fulfillment of the historic proposal laid before the United Nations in December 1953 by President Eisenhower. However, during these 3 years of patient negotiations and in anticipation of their eventual success, the United States has pushed ahead vigorously a program of cooperation with many nations in the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

It will be recalled that the International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, which met in Geneva in August of last year,² reopened lines of scientific and technical communications that had been closed for many years. The subject of paramount interest there among the 1,400 delegates from 73 nations was the progress and possibilities of nuclear power.

But, even before the Geneva conference, our Government was using the authorization provided in the 1954 Atomic Energy Act for inaugurating a system of bilateral agreements of cooperation between nations interested in the civil uses of atomic energy. As of today, we have negotiated 39 research or power agreements with 37 nations.

Research Bilaterals

The so-called research bilaterals provide for the exchange of unclassified information and assistance in the development of a nuclear research program, including supplying enriched uranium fuel for research reactors. A number of countries have contracted for or are negotiating for the design and construction of such reactors. We also have worked out a procedure under which up to $350,000 in each case can be given as a grant to a research reactor project in a nation having an agreement for cooperation. Four such grants have already been earmarked for Spain, Brazil, Denmark, and the Netherlands. This activity has a direct bearing on nuclear power development in that it provides these nations with an operable and useful tool for training their own nuclear scientists and engineers in what will become their own atomic power industry.

Seven of the agreements provide specifically for assistance in developing nuclear power programs. These so-called power bilaterals would have little meaning unless fuel was available. In fact, the one question most persistently asked toward the close and after the Geneva conference was, “When, and on what terms, will enriched fuel be available for power reactors?”

President Eisenhower answered this question of availability of fuel on February 22 of this year when he designated 40,000 kilograms—40 metric tons—of U-235 to be used as needed, primarily for fueling power reactors in our own country and abroad. The allocation was 20,000 kilograms for civil uses in the United States and the same amount for our friends abroad.³

The Commission is presently making a comprehensive study of the additional information needed by nations trying to estimate the cost of nuclear plants to be fueled with U-235. We are aware that the surveys made by the bank on the potentials of nuclear power have emphasized the importance of this information. I hope that this data, including a detailed pricing schedule, will be available in the near future. And while I cannot forecast this schedule, I think that the example set by our announcements at Geneva last year, where we said that the price schedules there advanced were calculated to net us neither loss nor profit, may serve as a pattern. This would be in keeping with the spirit of President Eisenhower’s program of developing the atom for peace.

In passing, you may be interested to note that within the year more than 700 scientists, engineers, technicians, educators, administrators, and political leaders from many nations have visited various of our installations and that nuclear power was the subject of most interest to the majority of these visitors. Also, with the opening of the fourth session of the International School for Nuclear Science and Engineering operated for the

² For an address made at the conference by AEC Commissioner Willard F. Libby, see ibid., Sept. 5, 1955, p. 351; for a report by Mr. Strauss, see ibid., Oct. 10, 1955, p. 555.
³ Ibid., Mar. 19, 1956, p. 469.
Commission by the Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago in cooperation with the North Carolina State and Pennsylvania State universities, we have enrolled more than 200 graduate scientists and engineers from 39 nations for an intensive 34-week course in nuclear reactor technology.

In collaboration with Great Britain and Canada we have made available a truly enormous amount of technical information, much of which is related to nuclear power development. This has all been done in the past 2 years. For example, we have recently reviewed some 30,000 documents and reports, all of them originally "classified," and as a result approximately one-third were declassified completely and are generally available. More will certainly be released as time passes.

These are a few of the highlights of our program for international cooperation in developing useful, economic power from the energy of the atom. What I would assume makes this information of particular interest to you is the fact that in many areas of the world there is an immediate pressure to obtain new sources of energy. A number of these areas must import, in whole or in large part, the coal and oil necessary to keep their economies moving even at current levels. A new source of power in some of these areas would not only be a base for expanding technology but also for improving living standards. There are, as I have said, some communities abroad where even now the difference between the cost of power from conventional fuel and nuclear fuels is either small or nonexistent.

Unfortunately, those countries which do not have sufficient power to insure a relatively good standard of living or to support adequate industrial production also frequently lack economic ability to undertake the installation of a nuclear power system—that is to say, without credit assistance. Such may be among the first projects to come before you. Such countries, however, may have resources of uranium ore but lack the means for exploration, mining, or the building of mills for extraction of the metal. That circumstance might furnish security and sources of sinking funds for long-term loans for power purposes.

In summation, I think it is apparent that there will be a large demand for nuclear power in other parts of the world before it becomes generally economic in the United States. The acceleration of experience and the accumulation of data from the versatile programs now being pursued here will continue to point the way to reduced costs. The technical and financial resources of each country will have to be weighed in determining when nuclear power is economically justifiable for its economy.

Judging by the progress that has been made in the past few years in the United States and the growing capacity of many nations to operate nuclear power systems, there should be a sound market for nuclear power installations within the near future. A major role is indicated for the

**REMARKS BY MR. DAVIS**

In considering the United States reactor development program, two factors should be kept in mind. The first is our long-range objective of economically competitive nuclear power in this country. This goal is difficult to achieve because we have adequate supplies of relatively cheap fuel as well as large, efficient, and economical conventional generating plants. In developing economic nuclear power we must, therefore, seek levels of efficiency beyond those which would suffice in most other areas of the world.

The second consideration is that we have no reason to believe that any single type of reactor system will satisfy the variety of our needs. As a consequence we are investigating many technical approaches to nuclear power. While this variety of approaches is partially attributable to the fact that we do not yet know which reactor concepts are the best, many other and equally important factors have influenced our program. For example, among these are the need for nuclear-power plants in a wide range of generating capacities; the need for a balance between burners, converters, and breeders; the possibility that natural uranium reactors may prove more desirable than enriched reactors in some instances; and preferences as to reactor types which may be dictated by geographical locations.

Our power-reactor program can be considered as going through three development phases which follow one another in logical sequence. The first is exploratory, dealing with basic research and development in such fields as metallurgy, physics, chemistry, and heat transfer. The second phase is the reactor experiment. In this phase a relatively
A small reactor is built and operated to prove the technical feasibility of a concept. Information is gained concerning such items as reactor and systems stability, control characteristics, actual corrosion rates, and mechanical component behavior. The third phase is the prototype phase. In this stage of development, large-scale reactors are built primarily for the purpose of demonstrating the economics of a certain system. While the prototype may not be economical itself, it will point the way toward improvements which will, in turn, lead to truly economical power. In addition, the prototype will give experience in the operation of a nuclear power plant which must meet certain commitments as to delivery of power on demand.

Perhaps a fourth stage, that of full-scale commercial utilization, should be included, but I think this might more logically be considered as an ultimate objective rather than as a development phase.

All concepts proceed through these phases unless they are eliminated along the line as unsuccessful or lacking promise. The selection of concepts promising enough to be carried through successive phases of development is one of the more difficult tasks faced by those administering a development program of this nature.

Power-Reactor Experiments

The Commission has assumed the responsibility of providing the basic technology for power-reactor development. This work is complicated and costly, and the results are often uncertain. The design and construction of the prototype or demonstration reactors is another matter. Here the emphasis is on economics and reduction of costs. We know of no better way to achieve this end than to bring to bear normal business incentives. Hence, we have encouraged both the reactor designers and builders and the utility companies to accept the primary responsibility in the construction of these prototype reactors.

We have insisted on limited and well-defined amounts of assistance by the AEC. This is not because we wish to reduce our cost, but because we believe this leads to real progress on cost reductions. There is increasing evidence of a desire on the part of industry to move into the field of nuclear research and development. We have encouraged such participation in the development of new reactor concepts which industrial groups may have originated and in as wide a variety of feasible approaches as possible.

We may theorize as much as we will about reactor possibilities, but theory is of most value when put to the test of an experiment. It also seems clear that the need for different sizes of reactors in different locations can most likely be satisfied by more than one type of reactor. I will attempt to appraise the various possibilities at hand.

We now have several power-reactor experiments under construction:

1. An experimental boiling water reactor. This unit will have an output of 5,000 electrical kilowatts and should be in operation early in 1957 at the Argonne National Laboratory.

2. An organic-moderated reactor experiment which will produce 16 megawatts of heat. This is also scheduled for completion in 1957 at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho.

3. An experimental fast breeder reactor with 17,500 electrical kilowatts capacity. This reactor is planned for operation beginning in 1959.

4. Three aqueous homogeneous circulating fuel reactors. One of these is being built at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and is scheduled to be in operation by next February. The output will range from 5,000 to 10,000 thermal kilowatts.

The other two reactors of this type are smaller systems. One will have an output of 1,300 thermal kilowatts and the other 2,000 thermal kilowatts. They should be in operation at Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory by the end of this year.

5. A sodium-cooled, graphite-moderated reactor experiment of about 7,500 electrical kilowatts output. This reactor is being constructed by Atomics International, Division of North American Aviation, under contract to the AEC, and should be operating late this year.

The reactor experiments we have under way are but one phase of our program. We are also going ahead with studies of a number of more advanced concepts. One such study is for the design of a circulating liquid-metal fuel reactor to have an output of 5 to 10 megawatts of heat. Another study is being made of the closed-cycle gas system with a view toward the design of an efficient, high-temperature unit.

We are also initiating further studies of the feasibility of heavy water, natural uranium reactors as power sources. The choice between re-
actors utilizing enriched uranium and those requiring only natural uranium is a marginal one, and we believe the natural uranium type warrants further serious study.

**Evaluation of Various Types of Reactors**

I have not mentioned the pressurized water system in the same category as the other reactors since it has already demonstrated its applicability and, to some extent, the economical limits within which it can operate. Each of the reactor systems I have mentioned has certain advantages and disadvantages which must be carefully weighed when considering economic feasibility and the prospect of early utilization. We still do not have sufficient economic data on the basis of which any of these concepts can be eliminated. However, I will point out briefly the advantages and disadvantages of each type.

The pressurized water reactor has one large advantage just now—we know how to build and operate it and we can make reasonable estimates of initial investment. From a technical point of view, as well as that of public safety, it is one of the more stable and inherently safe systems of which we have knowledge. Although we are most familiar with this type of reactor, there remain two major disadvantages inherent in a pressurized water system, namely, high initial cost and low steam temperature. The first disadvantage can be overcome in a very large installation in which the high cost of the reactor may be spread over a large generating capacity. The pressurized water reactor under construction at Shippingport, Pennsylvania, will provide further operating experience on this type of system. The generating capacity of this unit, the first large nuclear plant in the country, will initially be 60,000 electrical kilowatts, and it is expected that improvements in performance may raise this capacity to 90,000 electrical kilowatts. Financing is a joint AEC-industry affair.

The reactor having inherent safety characteristics most similar to those of pressurized water systems is the boiling water reactor. In this reactor we permit boiling to take place in the reactor core. The steam is then formed at essentially the temperature and pressure at which it will be used. It is easy to see that, since the reactor vessel must operate at a pressure of only about 600 pounds instead of 2,000 pounds to deliver 600-pound steam to the turbines, the fabrication cost of the reactor vessel will be much less than in a pressurized water system. This saving in initial cost will not be confined to the reactor vessel alone but will extend to a large part of the piping system. The resulting decrease in initial investment should lend this type to applications in medium-capacity generating stations. However, one present disadvantage of the boiling water reactor is the possibility of radioactive contamination of the steam, in turn leading to contamination of the turbine machinery. A possible safeguard against this condition involves the expense of an intermediate heat exchanger.

The initial costs due to expensive pressure vessels can also be avoided by utilizing some coolant other than water. One alternative is the use of sodium as a heat-transfer medium. In a reactor of this type we can achieve high temperature at essentially atmospheric pressure. This high temperature may permit the generation of steam at temperature and pressure comparable to conditions found in the best fossil fuel generating stations. These advantages are offset to some extent by the necessity for more expensive containment materials, but it is still likely that the original cost of a power plant of this type will be no more than that of a boiling water system. The major economic advantage would then have to come from increased operating efficiency. A sodium-cooled system may prove to be quite flexible as to the power range over which operation will be economical. Both graphite-moderated and fast reactors of this type are being developed.

As an alternative to the use of sodium as a coolant, an experimental reactor is under construction in which an organic material will be used as moderator and coolant. It is expected that this material will not only allow a substantial reduction in pressure-vessel costs, but, since the material is essentially noncorrosive, cheap construction materials may be used and the need for expensive fuel-element cladding may be eliminated. The experiment now under construction will give data on radiation stability of the coolant and on the costs associated with the cleaning of the organic stream. These questions will have to be answered in order to evaluate the promise of reactors utilizing organics.

In all of the reactors I have been talking about a rather severe limitation on utilization of fuel is imposed by fuel-element damage and poisoning due to fission-product buildup. The necessity for
regular shutdown to allow fuel-element replacement is an additional obstacle to efficient operation. This obstacle may be overcome by using a fuel which is not subject to irradiation damage, which may be enriched while the reactor is in operation, and from which fission products may be removed without reactor shutdown. These requirements are met by a circulating fuel reactor, and, as I mentioned previously, there are two distinct circulating fuel-reactor types under development. In the aqueous homogeneous reactor the uranium may be in the form of uranyl nitrate, uranyl sulfate, or uranyl phosphate in a circulating water solution. The water acts both as a moderating medium and as a heat-transport material. This system must be highly pressurized. The corrosion problem in all of these aqueous reactors is severe but appears capable of solution. Fuel inventories are small in these systems. The cost, a very high one, of reprocessing used fuel elements is eliminated, which contributes to the overall operating economy of the reactor.

In the second circulating liquid-metal fueled reactor, we may find the solution to two major problems—high core pressures and corrosion problems. The fuel proposed for this system, a uranium-bismuth solution, will, we hope, permit the production of high-temperature steam while maintaining the core at close to atmospheric pressure. It is believed that readily available construction materials may be used for the system and that fabrication will present no serious problem. The potential cost advantages of such a system are obvious, and, while the chemical processes are different, the economic advantages occurring from fuel stability and continuous cleaning and reenriching will be the same as in the aqueous homogeneous type. Reduction in initial construction costs should allow the economic operation of smaller plants as well as those of higher capacity. Furthermore, since the fuel has no adverse reaction with water, there is no danger from this point in using such a system in a ship or submarine.

The gas-cooled reactor, especially when operating in connection with a closed-cycle gas turbine, appears in some respects to offer possible cost advantages over other types. Some of the potential advantages are light weight, compact arrangement, ease of containment, low corrosion rates, and high efficiency. But there are many problems associated with the construction of such a system. Among them are the inherently difficult problem of control and stability, and the fabrication of satisfactory fuel elements. At the present stage of gas turbine development, this reactor type seems to be limited to the lower capacity sizes—up to perhaps 20,000 electrical kilowatts. Our techniques are improving, and we feel that in the reasonably near future we may be able to begin construction of a gas-cooled reactor experiment. We are interested in an efficient gas cycle and not in a unit where inefficient, low-temperature operating conditions lead to high operating costs.

Perhaps I have seemed to overemphasize the problems which remain to be solved and the great strides which must be made if nuclear power is to become competitive. It goes without saying that problems cannot be solved before they are known. A few years ago we could only imagine what problems might be faced. We now know that some of these imagined problems could have been ignored, but other much more real ones have taken their place. While we are sure that we have not found all the problems, we are confident that the solution of those we now recognize will move us well along toward our goal. These problems do not appear insuperable. They will not be solved easily, or overnight, or without considerable expense in time and money. The fact remains, nevertheless, that we have identified them and even this knowledge is in itself a major step forward.

I have limited my discussion so far to the production of electric power from reactors. While this appears to be the most immediate application of nuclear energy, it is not too difficult to foresee the day when reactors will be used by industry to supply process heat, and in the case of the food industry as a sterilization and preservation medium. There is also a good possibility that radiation from reactors may be used to improve such processes as oil refining and to alter and improve the characteristics of many materials presently in use. There is, at this time, under construction at Brookhaven National Laboratory a reactor for medical research and therapy. The use of reactors of this type is certain to become more widespread.

Prototype Nuclear Power Plants

I should like to turn for a minute to the subject of prototype nuclear power plants. In order to bring private industry into the field of power-re-
actor development and operation, the Atomic Energy Commission initiated the Power Demonstration Reactor Program in January 1955 with an invitation to industry to submit proposals for the construction of nuclear power plants. Encouraged by the response to this first invitation, the Commission issued a second in September 1955.

As a result of the proposals which were submitted, a contract has been signed with Yankee Atomic Electric Company covering the construction of a 134,000-kilowatt generating station. This will be a pressurized water system and will involve the use of Commission funds for necessary research and development.

Five other proposals have been accepted as basis for contract negotiations. They are all of different types and are scheduled for completion in 1960 and 1961, adding another 217,000 kilowatts to the nuclear electrical capacity of the United States.

Additionally, construction permits have been issued to two public utility companies and to the General Electric Company for the construction of nuclear plants financed entirely with private funds. One of these will be a pressurized water reactor station of 136,000 electrical kilowatts nuclear capacity. The other two will utilize boiling-water reactors, one a small plant with a capacity of 3,000 to 5,000 electrical kilowatts, and the other a full-scale plant with an electrical output of 180,000 kilowatts. These nine plants, which should be in operation by 1960, will have a combined nuclear capacity of about 660,000 electrical kilowatts.

While this is indeed an encouraging beginning, it should be kept in mind that these reactors will not be, and are not required to be, economically competitive with conventionally fueled plants. They will, however, serve as prototypes on which to base the design of more economical plants. In some cases, the excess operating costs expected during the initial years of operation will be partially offset from payments by the AEC for technical and operating data.

Making Nuclear Power Competitive

I have defined an efficient nuclear power plant as being one which, when built and operated under standard industrial financing and operating practice, will produce power at costs equal to or less than the cost of power produced by the best conventional plant built at the same time and at the same location. It is obvious that in order to meet this criterion, nuclear plants must be improved to the point where no special assistance, under any guise whatsoever, is needed. This does not mean that certain operations such as enriching of fuel cannot be carried out by the Government. It does mean that these services must be paid for, at their actual value, out of operation income.

In an effort to resolve the problems associated with the meeting of all expenses out of operating income, a vast number of studies of the economics of nuclear power have been made in recent years. In the absence of necessary development information and actual construction and operational costs, many of these studies, if not most of them, must be considered only as speculation. They have generally arrived at two conclusions: first, that the particular type of reactor favored by those making the study is more practical than other types under consideration; second, that this better reactor can produce power competitively with conventional power plants.

Although, taken separately, such studies are of limited value, I believe that, collectively, they are important since they indicate a profound belief that nuclear power can be made competitive with conventional sources even in the United States, where we have a relatively plentiful supply of cheap fuel. While there is no law of nature which says that power from nuclear fuel must be competitive with conventional power, we do know the potential is present. Certainly, no one has discovered any fundamental considerations which would appear to make economic nuclear power unlikely of accomplishment.

However, many studies and proposals overlook the development effort required to actually solve the many technical problems involved as well as the industrial effort needed to attain the desired construction and operation costs. The solution of these problems is a time-consuming and costly business requiring the imagination and ingenuity of our very best scientists and engineers.

With our present program, we will soon enter an era in which we will gain a good deal of factual data on power-reactor technology and costs. At that time it will be more appropriate to discuss the economics of such systems and to make predictions concerning future costs. In any case, the assessment of relative costs of nuclear power in comparison with conventional power cost is a difficult matter even in the United States, depending, as it
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does, upon the cost of capital, tax rates, load factors, construction costs, and many local considerations. When such a comparison is attempted for reactor locations abroad, many additional factors must be taken into consideration.

It may be possible to make some general observations based upon our present state of development and upon our hopes for the future. I believe that large power reactors, construction of which is begun in the next 1 or 2 years, will, after completion and initial operation, show total power costs somewhat above those prevailing in any area of the United States which can utilize a plant of equal size. But the cost will probably be about the same as that from conventional plants in some fuel-short areas of the world which need large blocks of power. Another 2 or 3 years should see construction begun on plants which will prove to be really competitive in relatively high fuel-cost areas of the United States—and fairly generally in other areas of the world. The following 5 years or so should lead to nuclear power plants being started on a generally competitive basis with all except extremely cheap fuels in any area.

The situation regarding the course of development of small reactors is even more hazardous to predict. In general, the economic considerations for a small unit are relatively less favorable than those for a larger reactor system. For this reason, the utilization of small reactor systems may be generally behind that of the larger plants. However, it is not unlikely that there may be many circumstances in which a small reactor will have an advantage.

To repeat then, we are moving forward on many developmental fronts in order not to overlook any system which may, in time, prove successful as a source of economical power.

In conclusion, I would like to quote from an interesting article which I ran across the other day:

Pessimists like Sir Oliver Lodge shudder when they speculate on the future. Man is not yet spiritually ripe for the possession of the secret of atomic energy, he reasons. Technically we are demi-gods, ethically still such barbarians that we would probably use the energy of the atom much as we used the less terrible forces that almost destroyed civilization during the last war.

Others are convinced that the new insight into nature which will be granted when the structure of the atom is at last known, and with it the method of controlling its energy, must be accompanied by a spiritual advance. Each new discovery about the atom makes man more consciously part of the world about him—links him with the stars, which are themselves composed of atoms, and with the dazzling light of the sun, which springs from atomic activity—and thus impresses him with the littleness of his greed and the puerility of his disputes.

This prophetic quotation is from an article on "Atomic Energy—Is It Nearer?" by Waldemar Kaempffert in *Scientific American*. The date—August 1932! The article deals with the historical importance of the then recent work on nuclear transmutations by "two young English physicists, Dr. J. D. Cockroft and Dr. E. T. S. Walton." It follows an article on the discovery of the neutron.

We are striving for the development of useful nuclear power with enthusiasm and with optimism, and with the conviction that this vast new source of energy will, one day, raise the standard of living throughout a peaceful world. While we are not unmindful of the formidable difficulties which confront us, we believe that it is not a question as to whether we will achieve economically useful nuclear power but rather when we will achieve it.

**Procedures for Obtaining U.S. Aid on Research Reactor Projects**

*AEC press release dated September 21*

The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and the State Department are distributing to interested embassies and U.S. industrial organizations the details of the program for U.S. grants of up to $350,000 for research reactor projects undertaken by friendly nations that have agreements for cooperation with the United States.

The procedures are substantially those already used and tested in handling the first requests for assistance received following the offer made by President Eisenhower last year to strengthen and advance the atomic research programs of those nations included in the bilateral agreement program.

As previously announced, grants of $350,000 each have been made to Brazil, Spain, Denmark, and the Netherlands. Negotiations for similar commitments are in progress with several other nations. The Congress appropriated $5,500,000 for the program during the current fiscal year.

These grants may be made toward the financing of an approved reactor project providing the total of $350,000 is not more than one half of the actual cost. In addition to the reactor itself, a project may include experimental equipment, sup-
supporting facilities, and activities necessary to make it an operable and useful training and research facility. The grants are payable when the recipient nation certifies that the project has been completed.

A detailed description of the procedures follows.

INFORMATION FOR NATIONS DESIRING U.S. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ON RESEARCH REACTOR PROJECTS

The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission has been given responsibility for implementing the United States offer announced by President Eisenhower on June 11, 1955, to contribute towards the cost of research reactors undertaken by “free nations who can use them effectively for the acquisition of the skills and understanding essential to peaceful atomic progress.” Contributions made pursuant to the President’s offer are financed from funds made available under the Mutual Security Act of 1956.

A prerequisite to a financial contribution by the United States toward the cost of a research reactor project undertaken by a foreign nation is an Agreement for Cooperation in the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy between that nation and the United States. Such agreements are negotiated for the United States jointly by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Under an Agreement for Cooperation in the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, the cooperating nation receives information on the design, construction and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development and engineering tools. In addition, each agreement provides a basis for authorizing private citizens and organizations in the United States to supply the cooperating government or authorized private persons under its jurisdiction, with appropriate equipment and services. Each agreement provides that the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission will furnish a specified quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235. The cooperating nation assumes responsibility for using and safeguarding the fissionable material in accordance with the terms of the agreement. Each agreement further provides for the exchange of information in the research reactor field on related health and safety problems and on the use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture and industry.

Having entered into an Agreement for Cooperation, a nation desiring U.S. participation in financing a research reactor project should submit a project proposal to the Director, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington 25, D.C. The project proposal should include, at a minimum, information on the points listed in the enclosed “Minimum Points to be Covered in Foreign Research Reactor Proposals” (enclosure A). For purposes of expediting review, it is desirable that five copies of the proposal be submitted. Interested nations should submit their proposals when they have firm plans for the scope and nature of the project, and have tentatively selected a bid for construction of a specific reactor. The project proposal should be accompanied by a letter from the interested country, stating its desire to take advantage of the President’s offer of financial assistance. It is not necessary that a contract for construction of a reactor be signed by a cooperating country prior to receipt of formal assurance of availability of U.S. funds.

The amount of the U.S. financial contribution may be set with respect to the cost not merely of a reactor per se, but of a reactor with such experimental equipment and supporting facilities and activities as are necessary to make it an operable and useful training and research tool. The U.S. grant thus envisages a “reactor project”; enclosure B lists representative items which may be considered as included within the term “reactor project,” in computing the cost estimates with respect to which the amount of the U.S. contributions will be set.

A limitation of $350,000 has been set upon the amount of the U.S. contribution to any cooperating country under the program for implementing the President’s offer; this amount is 50 percent of the estimated cost of an assumed typical research reactor project. In the case of reactor projects estimated to cost less than $700,000, the amount of the U.S. contribution will be set at 50 percent of the estimated cost. It is also required that any contracts with U.S. firms provide that such portions of the equipment furnished by firms as may be appropriately die-stamped as a product of the United States shall be so stamped.

The principal purpose of the review of the project proposal by the AEC is to confirm that the
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project qualifies for U.S. financial assistance under the President's offer, and that it conforms with the governing Agreement for Cooperation. In addition, the amount of the U.S. contribution is determined in the course of the review. The cooperating nation is considered as having complete responsibility for the project, and thus the review of the proposal by the AEC is not intended as a basis for extending United States concurrence in the technical details of the proposal. The review does seek to confirm that the principal problems inherent in the construction and operation of a reactor are recognized, including the problem of possible radiation hazard to the environment, and that there is reason to feel confidence that they will be competently dealt with. Essentially, the review seeks to establish that a proposed project gives the promise of promoting the skills and understanding essential to peaceful atomic progress, which is the main condition of qualification under the President's offer.

The AEC makes formal commitment as to the U.S. contribution when:

(a) a finding has been made based upon review of the project proposal, that the project qualifies for financial assistance under the President's offer, and that it conforms with the applicable Agreement for Cooperation, and

(b) formal assurance has been provided by the cooperating nation, that it has available and is prepared to expend sufficient funds for completion and subsequent operation of the reactor project.

The U.S. financial contribution will be made in the form of a grant, and paid to the cooperating nation in American dollars, upon receipt from the government of the cooperating country of a certification as to completion of the reactor project to the agreed scope, to be accompanied by a certification by the principal firm or firms which have contracted to render services in connection with the project, as to completion of such services. Such certifications as are rendered by U.S. firms shall also state that such portions of the equipment furnished by them as may be appropriately die-stamped as a product of the United States, have been so stamped.

In accordance with the terms of the governing Agreement for Cooperation, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission is prepared to offer consulta-

tion and advice to a cooperating nation at any stage in its prosecution of a research reactor project.

Enclosure A

Minimum Points To Be Covered in Foreign Research Reactor Proposals

1. A description of the reactor, to include:
   a. conceptual design of the reactor and important auxiliary equipment;
   b. expected operating levels—maximum power, excess reactivity and reactivity analysis;
   c. fuel, moderator, coolant, reflector and shielding;
   d. reactor control system;
   e. experimental irradiation facilities—thimble, beam holes, etc.

2. A description of the reactor building, including contemplated floor plan and elevation drawings. (If the building is to provide for containment of radioactive vapor, the estimated maximum internal pressure for which it will be designed should be approximated.)

3. A description of all the facilities, including research facilities, related directly to operation and utilization of the reactor.

4. Indication of the principal organizations with which contracts will be entered into in connection with construction of the project, including the organization which will fabricate fuel elements.

5. A detailed breakdown of the estimated cost of facilities towards which the United States' financial contribution would be applied, including building, reactor, utility and other directly related auxiliary services. (When practicable, supporting bids should be provided.)

6. A schedule for construction and completion of the project, indicating dates fuel material will be required, start-up of reactor, etc.

7. A description of the organization planned to operate and utilize the facility, with indication of the training and qualifications of the principal personnel who will be responsible for the effective and safe operation of the facility. In particular, plans should be stated for fixing responsibility for performing and evaluating the hazard analysis of the reactor, and for supervision and approval of experimental procedures subsequent to the initial operation of the reactor.

8. A description of any plans to accomplish technical training deemed necessary to effective utilization of the reactor, if availability of qualified technical personnel cannot be assumed; a statement of how any such measures will be financed. Any plans for utilizing technical personnel of qualified commercial firms during design, construction, start-up and early operation, should be included.

9. An estimate of fuel requirements for the initial five years, i.e., total inventory requirements, burn-up, reprocessing and recharging rates, etc.

10. At least preliminary information on hazards and hazards control. This should include: description of the site, with maps showing the location or alternative locations of the reactor; data on population density as a function of distance and direction from the site, and the
location of nearby buildings and residential areas; environmental data, including the general meteorology, geology, hydrology and seismology of the area; contemplated restrictions on power level and excess reactivity; a general description of operating procedures and protective devices to function in event of operational errors, instrument malfunction, electric power failure or failure of the reactor cooling system; and provision for disposal of normal gaseous, liquid and solid wastes, and of such waste materials accidentally released from the reactor. (It is expected that much of this information will be general and preliminary and that the cooperating country will ordinarily complete a comprehensive hazard summary report at a later time.)

11. A brief characterization of the proposed technical program for utilization of the reactor, including types of experiments to be performed.

Enclosure B

Representative Items Which May Be Considered as Included Within the Term “Reactor Project” in Computing the Cost Estimate With Respect to Which the Amount of the U.S. Contribution Will Be Set

A. Reactor.
1. Fuel. Only fabrication costs of the initial fuel elements may be included.
3. Core Structure. The structure containing and providing support for the fuel and moderator. (May also contain the reflector and thermal shield.)
4. Shield. Shielding as required to reduce radiation levels to tolerance dosages for personnel and equipment.
5. Cooling System. As required, may include heat exchangers, pumps and drives, piping, valves, pressure temperature and flow instrumentation, equipment for coolant, purity control and makeup.
6. Controls and Instrumentation. A complete control system for the operation of the reactor. This system will provide for normal operation of the reactor at a specified level and incorporate a number of safety features such as automatic alarms, power setbacks and reactor shutdown. It is intended to include (1) the basic sensing elements of the control system (fission and gamma chamber, thermocouples, pressure gages, flow meters, etc.), (2) the electronic and electromechanical equipment required to translate signals received from the sensing elements into motion (amplifiers, solenoid release circuits, etc.), (3) the control elements (neutron absorbing regulating and safety rods and their drives), and (4) a control console (operator’s desk with key control buttons and switches and a bank of recording and indicating instruments.)
7. Miscellaneous Equipment Directly Related to the Reactor. Equipment as needed for normal operation of the reactor, including: special handling tools to be used in loading and unloading fuel, including transfer and shipping coffins, health physics instruments, off gas disposal equipment, sampling systems, etc.
8. Design, Installation and Start-up. In addition to the detailed design, procurement and fabrication of the components listed above, installation of these components, start-up and initial operation and testing of the plant.

B. Facilities Directly Related to the Reactor.
1. Building and Ancillary Facilities. Cost of design and construction of the building or buildings, including foundation, superstructure, overhead crane, utilities, heating and ventilation, laboratory shops and office space, site improvement and utility connections.
2. Experimental Equipment. Initial equipment to be used in conjunction with experiments utilizing the reactor or its products.

C. Services Directly Related to the Reactor.
1. Consultants. Payment of qualified consultants to assist in selection of the reactor, and planning for construction and operation of the reactor project.
2. Training. On-site training of operating personnel for the reactor, prior to and during start-up.

Discussions on Current Problems in International Aviation

Press release 517 dated October 2

The Department of State has arranged for a representative group from Government and industry to meet at the Department on November 14, 15, and 16 for informal discussions on current problems of international relations in the civil aviation field.

Herbert Hoover, Jr., Under Secretary of State, has sent invitations to those who will participate. They include officers of Government agencies which have a substantive interest in this field, executives of airlines engaged in international operations, and executives of aircraft manufacturing companies.

The Department of State believes that it would be useful to both Government and industry at this time to bring a number of experienced individuals together for a full review of international developments that have a bearing on civil air relations between the United States and other governments. Information and views will be exchanged on a broad range of complex problems.
The Functions of the American Consul

by Allyn C. Donaldson
Director, Office of Special Consular Services

I appreciate your invitation to speak to the Embassy (Consular) Aides Organization and to tell you something of the activities of the American consul. Actually, the role of the consul is not limited by nationality. The consul, as an institution, is almost universal; his origins, his history, and his functions give him much the same role to play today whether he is a representative of the United States or of any other civilized nation. Consequently, what I say about the functions of the American consul will generally apply very largely to the functions of a consul of any other country.

Where did the consul come from and how does he differ from the diplomat? There were agents who performed consular functions as long ago as in the days of Tyre and Carthage, but the consul as we know him dates his origin to the early Middle Ages and his rise is simultaneous with the rise of trade and commerce. In fact, it is this early preoccupation with trade and commerce that distinguishes the consul from the diplomat, a representative of the head of a state accredited to another sovereign.

The first consuls were simply prominent traders, not appointed by their own governments, whether royal or municipal, but selected by the host government as the spokesmen for their fellow traders. Only by degrees did they eventually take orders from their home countries and finally accept appointment from them. Along with commercial functions, they had certain recognized judicial powers for settling disputes among their own nationals, powers seen in our time in the consular courts now being terminated in Morocco and abandoned in China by the United States in 1943. The first consuls fostered trade and commerce and settled disputes. They also protected the interests of their fellow countrymen in foreign lands.

Establishment of American Consular Service

This protection of their fellow countrymen led directly to the establishment of the American consular service at the time of the establishment of the United States of America. Stranded seamen in France begged help from our diplomatic representatives at the court of Louis XVI. Messrs. Franklin and Morris urged the Congress to establish a consular service to relieve them of protection duties. It was Thomas Jefferson who, as Secretary of State, established our consular service in 1790. The consuls were to foster trade and commerce, aid American seamen in distress, report on the arrivals and departures of American vessels in foreign ports, and, in general, protect the interests of American merchants abroad. This was important then, because modern types of communications were not available.

Today, the functions of the consul have not changed a great deal except in regard to visa and passport matters, which did not exist in Jefferson's day. Time does not permit me to discuss our visa and passport laws and regulations. In other matters, the consul today, just as in Jefferson's time, is required to keep his country informed of trade possibilities; he is still responsible for the protection of seamen, although many

1 Address made before the Embassy (Consular) Aides Organization at Washington, D. C., on Oct. 3.
of his former functions in this regard are now performed by the shipping agents of the various companies hiring seamen; with the great increase in travel in our time, the consul today has a serious responsibility in rendering certain protection services to his fellow citizens, particularly if they are in trouble in other lands. I would like to call your attention especially to these protection services.

**Protection of American Citizens Abroad**

My particular office, the Office of Special Consular Services in the Department of State, is concerned with the general protection of American citizens abroad and the protection of their property rights in foreign countries. Many inquiries are received of the "lost and found" variety: a young student fails to write home; his mother worries and writes to us; we have the nearest consul look up the young man and ask him to write his mother. Other cases are more complicated: some fathers have deserted their families in the United States and have formed new families abroad. In such situations, the consul is largely helpless, as all he can do is to give the aggrieved wife a list of local lawyers who can represent her in court action. Certain Americans abroad become mentally ill, and the consul must make every effort for their own sake and to spare embarrassment to his Government to assist the return of such persons to the United States. Through my office, he informs the nearest relatives of the situation, attempts to obtain the necessary funds, obtains any necessary attendants, transportation, etc., while we arrange in this country for appropriate hospitalization. Other Americans, either through misjudgment or through some misfortune such as robbery, find themselves alone in a foreign land completely penniless. A typical case of this kind occurred not long ago in Europe, where a young American tourist was robbed of her wallet, her passport, and all her luggage. After the first moment of panic, she went to the American Consulate General, which immediately cabled the Department to obtain passport data in order to be able to issue her a duplicate passport; my office got in touch with relatives and friends who were able to cable money promptly to enable her to return home.

**Cases of Infractions of Law**

The above is a typical case which can be handled without too much difficulty. A complication arises, however, if the person involved is in trouble with the local authorities for some infraction of the law. If the offense is minor, local authorities are often willing to let the consul arrange for the man's repatriation. Too many persons abroad think that it is the consul's duty to get them out of a foreign jail. Such, of course, is not the case. Where, because of the commission of an illegal act, an American is placed in jail, most civilized countries allow his consul to visit him and to aid him in any way that is appropriate, but the Department's regulations, dating back at least a hundred years, emphasize that the consul cannot interfere in the proper administration of local justice so long as the American is treated without bias and according to the same rules as apply to the citizens of the country. In other words, he is not to attempt to interfere with the proper administration of justice under local law. This right of the consul to visit one of his fellow nationals in jail is an important privilege generally included in consular conventions. It is essential that a consul interview persons in confinement in order that facts can be determined to guide his course of action. Any person who has ever been alone and friendless in another country can realize what it would mean for a man arrested by police speaking perhaps a language he does not understand to be able to get in touch promptly with his own consul. In similar manner, the Department of State uses its influence to assist consular officers of other governments accredited to the United States to obtain approval by local authorities in this country to visit any of their nationals who happen to be in difficulties with the law.

**Importance of Freedom of Movement**

While it is accepted, of course, that the consul must operate in accordance with the laws and regulations of the country to which he is accredited, it may be timely to point out that certain basic rights and privileges, generally granted by all states throughout history, must be accorded him if he is to perform effectively the duties of his office in regard to normal protection of his fellow citizens. Unfortunately, in some countries of the world today, contrary to generally accepted international principles, freedom of travel and movement within the area is not permitted and the consul finds it difficult, if not impossible, to extend
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the normal protection of his Government to those 
of its citizens who are presently resident there. 
Conversely, when such citizens are in turn denied 
free access to their own official representatives, 
the effects are equally unfortunate. It is recognized 
by all civilized states who are members of 
the family of nations that, on humanitarian 
grounds, no one should be denied his freedom and 
liberty by a miscarriage of justice.

Unlike the consuls of certain other countries, 
the American consul is not permitted to perform 
marrages, although he may serve as a witness to 
a marriage of two fellow nationals and issue a 
Certificate of Witness to Marriage, which serves 
as a marriage certificate in most of the States of 
the United States.

The consul, in general, must protect the interests 
of his own people while at the same time maintaining 
the most friendly relations possible with the 
officials and citizens of the country in which he 
resides. When the demands on him from his own 
people are completely unrealistic and exaggerat-
ed, he must reject them with consummate tact. 
He must at all times place his own position in the 
host country and the dignity and interests of his 
own Government above the unreasonable requests 
for aid which might jeopardize these relations, 
and it is not always easy to convince a fellow citi-
zen that he cannot overthrow the decision of a lo-
cal court or obtain funds from a government for 
the payment of private debts.

I have stressed the services the consul performs 
for his own citizens, but it is obvious that he also 
has a most important role to perform regarding 
the citizens of the country in which he is accredi-
ed. For many of them he may be the first Amer-
ican they meet—their entire picture of the United 
States may be colored by the impression he makes 
on them. He can be the type of consul portrayed 
in Menotti’s tragic opera, or he can be the type of 
consul who takes a warm interest in human be-
ings and tries to be helpful.

In conclusion, I believe you will be interested 
to know that the Department of State has estab-
lished a comprehensive selection and training 
program through which high standards for office-
ers will be maintained and the right type of con-
sular officer will be sent to the field. I trust that 
the American consular officers you encounter in 
your country are a credit to the United States and 
fulfill completely the historical role of the consul.

First Prize Essay Contest 
on International Travel

Arrangements have been completed for a prize 
essay contest to be conducted under the auspices 
of the Inter-American Travel Congresses. Ad-
ministrative details will be handled by the Pan 
American Union, Washington, D. C., and will be 
announced shortly.

The contest is believed to be the first of its kind 
ever held in the field of tourism. It is open to all 
residents of the 21 American Republics and Can-
da who are connected in some way with the travel 
industry, either governmental or private. The 
topic will be “Freedom of International Travel.” 
Cash prizes of $1,000, $500, and $250 will be 
awarded to the winners.

The contest was initiated by the United States 
dlegation to the 6th Inter-American Travel Con-
gress held at San José, Costa Rica, in April of 
this year. Funds for the prizes were contributed by 
four leading U.S. organizations: the Air Trans-
port Association of America, the American Auto-
mobile Association, the American Merchant 
Marine Institute, and the Rail Travel Promotion 
Agency.

Air Force Mission Agreement 
Signed With Argentina

Press release 519 dated October 3

The United States and Argentina concluded on 
October 3 at Buenos Aires a United States Air 
Force Mission Agreement providing for the as-
signment of a United States Air Force Mission to 
Argentina. Ambassador Willard Beaulac signed 
for the United States, and Foreign Minister Luis 
Podestá Costa and Air Minister Commodore Julio 
Krause signed for Argentina.

The mission will act in an advisory capacity to 
the Argentine Ministry of Aeronautics and the 
Argentine Air Force with a view to enhancing 
the technical and operational efficiency of the 
Argentine Air Force. The agreement is for an 
indefinite term and enters into force on the date of 
signature. The personnel complement of mission, 
and specific duties to be performed by it, will be 
the subject of discussions at Buenos Aires between

---

1 For a report of the meeting at San José, see Bulletin 
of June 18, 1956, p. 1029.
The United States has United States Air Force Missions or Advisory Groups in 16 of the other Latin American Republics. A United States Air Force Mission was previously assigned to Argentina from 1939 to 1951. United States naval advisers have been assigned to Argentina under separate arrangements since 1935.

Fourth-Quarter Export Quota for Salk Vaccine

A fourth-quarter export quota of 7 million cc.'s of Salk poliomyelitis vaccine was announced on October 2 by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce.

The Bureau said the quota, which reflects the improved domestic supply outlook, will permit additional countries of high incidence to initiate immunization programs for children in the age groups most susceptible to poliomyelitis. It will also permit those countries which have already received initial quantities of the vaccine to obtain additional amounts for continuation and expansion of programs now under way.

In licensing against the new quota, the Bureau therefore will continue to give priority to those countries having a high incidence of poliomyelitis and which maintain effective immunization programs. A total of 1,474,522 cc.'s of Salk vaccine was licensed for export in the third quarter. It was distributed among the following countries: Argentina, Belgian Congo, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Current Treaty Actions

MULTILATERAL

Bills of Lading
Accession deposited: Netherlands, August 18, 1956.

Copyright
Accession deposited: Iceland, September 18, 1956.
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Not in force for the United States.

Not in force.
Meeting of Foreign Service Institute Advisory Committee

The Department of State announced on October 2 (press release 515) that the Advisory Committee for the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State was holding its third meeting in Washington that day. Present and future developments in the Institute's program of in-service training for U.S. Foreign Service officers and other Government employees engaged in foreign affairs were to be considered. The 13-man committee was appointed by Secretary Dulles to advise the Institute.

The day's agenda included a meeting with the Secretary following a luncheon in the Secretary's dining room with Deputy Under Secretary Loy W. Henderson, chairman of the committee, and the Department's Counselor, Douglas MacArthur II, as hosts. Morning and afternoon sessions were held in the office of Harold B. Hoskins, Director of the Foreign Service Institute and deputy chairman of the committee.

Those present, in addition to Mr. Henderson and Mr. Hoskins, were:

Ellsworth Bunker, President, the American National Red Cross
Robert D. Calkins, President, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.
Robert Cutler, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Old Colony Trust Company, Boston, Mass.
Clyde Klueckhohn, Director, Laboratory of Social Sciences, Harvard University
William L. Langer, Chairman, Committee on Regional Studies, Harvard University
Charles E. Saltzman, Goldman, Sachs and Company, New York, N. Y.
Robert Newbigin (ex officio), Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Personnel

The Institute's immediate goals are to increase and improve language-training opportunities for Foreign Service officers in Washington and at U.S. posts abroad, to expand other training opportunities for officers abroad, and to start a course in Washington for senior officers in the Foreign Service comparable in the diplomatic field to the advanced training given at the War College and other military colleges. The present program includes courses in career training, language instruction, modern management, and international studies.

The relation of language training to other forms of instruction, and the problem of selecting mature officers for periods of full-time training lasting 6 weeks or more were to be discussed by the committee. Mr. Hoskins also disclosed that a course of basic training, now required of all newly appointed Foreign Service officers, was being extended from 3 to 6 months to allow more time for language training at the Institute. He also told of a plan whereby an officer stationed abroad may now take a course related to his work at any nearby university, such as the Sorbonne, the University of London, or the University of Perugia in Italy, provided he obtains the permission of the Institute and of his superior in the field.

Designations

William C. Burdett as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, effective October 7.
Howard L. Parsons as Director of the Office of Northeast Asian Affairs, effective October 7 (press release 518 dated October 3).
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*Not printed.
†Held for a later issue of the Bulletin.
A new release in the popular *Background* series . . .

**United Nations General Assembly—**

**A Review of the Tenth Session**

The tenth regular session of the United Nations General Assembly convened on September 20, 1955, and adjourned 3 months later on December 20.

Highlights of the tenth session which are described in this *Background* pamphlet are:

1. The admission of 16 new members, enlarging U.N. membership from 60 to 76 countries.
2. The endorsement of further steps toward the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency and the recommendation for a second international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.
3. The decision to give priority in U.N. disarmament talks to confidence-building measures, including President Eisenhower's proposal of mutual aerial inspection and Marshal Bulganin's plan for establishing control posts at strategic centers, as well as all such measures of adequately safeguarded disarmament as are feasible.
5. The decision to explore the organization of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development.
6. The Assembly approval of a Charter Review Conference "at an appropriate time," the date and place to be fixed at a subsequent session of the Assembly.

Copies of this publication may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at 15 cents a copy.
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The Suez Question in the Security Council

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES

As our general debate draws to a close, it is important to recall some fundamentals:

1. We are here dealing with a situation which endangers the maintenance of international peace and security. That is conceded by all concerned.

2. The nations of the world, and particularly and explicitly the 76 members of the United Nations, have conferred upon us, constituting this Council, the primary responsibility to maintain international peace and security.

3. We are obligated in discharging this duty to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and that means to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, the adjustment or settlement of this dangerous situation.

Our duty is clear. It is to seek by peaceful means a settlement in accordance with the principles of justice and international law. We have thus a two-phased responsibility: one aspect relates to peace; the other aspect relates to justice and conformity with law. Let us then consider these two aspects of our task.

Settlement by Peaceful Means

What are the possibilities of bringing about a settlement by peaceful means? These possibilities are good.

Nearly 2½ months have elapsed since on July 26 Egypt seized the Universal Suez Canal Company and physically prevented it from discharging the responsibilities which had been conferred upon it in 1868 to run until 1968.

The nations which are deeply aggrieved and endangered by this action have made no forcible response. They have scrupulously lived up to their obligation, under the charter, to seek, first of all, a solution by negotiation or other peaceful means.

On August 1, 1956, just 4 days after the Canal Company seizure, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States met together and decided that a solution should first of all be sought by a meeting together of the 24 nations principally concerned, including Egypt. That was Peace Move No. 1.

From August 16 to 24, a conference was held. Egypt declined to attend. But there were represented all seven of the unquestionably surviving signatories of the Suez Canal Treaty of 1888, seven other countries which are the principal users of the canal, and another eight countries whose economies depend most largely upon the canal.

This conference produced an agreement by 18 of the 22 upon a formula for settlement which they believed should be acceptable both to Egypt and to the nations which were users of the canal or dependent thereon. That was Peace Move No. 2.

During that conference, a Committee of Five Nations was established, under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister of Australia [Robert G. Menzies], to communicate the views of the 18 to Egypt and to ascertain whether or not these views would be acceptable as a basis for negotiation. A meeting at Geneva was suggested. But the Government of Egypt indicated that it was not convenient for it to meet with the Committee except at Cairo. Accordingly, the Committee, consisting of one Prime Minister, three Foreign Ministers, and one Deputy for a Foreign Minister, traveled to Cairo in their quest for peace. That was Peace Move No. 3.


The Committee met in Cairo from September 3 to 9, presenting and explaining the proposal of the 18 nations. That was Peace Move No. 4.

At Cairo the Government of Egypt rejected the proposals of the 18, even as a basis for negotiation, and it made no counterproposal. Nevertheless, on September 19, the 18 nations again met to explore further the possibilities of peaceful adjustment. They reexamined and reaffirmed their August proposals as a fair basis for a peaceful solution of the Suez Canal problem, taking into account the interests of the user nations as well as those of Egypt.

But they went on to seek to create a practical means of cooperation with Egypt. They thought that, even though Egypt might not be willing at this time to agree upon a permanent solution, there might perhaps be some practical association between the users of the canal and the Egyptian Canal Authority. So they decided to set up a co-operative association which, acting as their agent, could deal with the Egyptian canal authorities in these practical matters. That was Peace Move No. 5.

Then the Governments of France and the United Kingdom acted to bring to the attention of this Council the situation with which we now deal. That was Peace Move No. 6.

Mr. President, in the light of this history no one, I think, can fairly question the peaceful desires of those who are aggrieved by the action of Egypt. Rarely, if ever in history, have comparable efforts been made to settle peacefully an issue of such dangerous proportions. This Council knows that it is not dealing with governments bent on the use of force. Even those most aggrieved have shown their desire to bring about a just solution by peaceful means.

Settlement in Conformity With Justice and International Law

Now, Mr. President, I turn to the second aspect of our problem—that is to find a solution which will conform to the principles of justice and of international law. And here also the way is clear.

Oftentimes we are confronted by situations as to which there is no relevant body of international law. But in the present situation there is a governing treaty, the convention of 1888. It provides that for all time the vessels of all the nations shall have the right of free and equal passage through the Suez Canal. It calls for a "definite system destined to guarantee" such right of use, and it incorporates by reference the concession of 1868 to the Universal Suez Canal Company as providing such a system.

Much has been said about the need to respect the "sovereignty" of Egypt in relation to the canal.

Sovereignty exists where a nation can do whatever it wants. Generally speaking, a nation can do what it wants within its own territory. And generally speaking, no nation has any rights within the territory of another sovereign nation.

Now the Suez Canal, to be sure, goes through what is now Egypt, and in this sense the canal is "Egyptian." But the canal is not, and never has been, a purely internal affair of Egypt with which Egypt could do what it wanted. The canal has always been, from the day of its opening, an international waterway dedicated to the free passage of the vessels of all nations. Its character as an international right-of-way was guaranteed for all time by the 1888 convention. Egypt cannot rightfully stop any vessel or cargo from going through the canal. And for those who use that right-of-way to combine to secure the observance of their rights is no violation of Egyptian sovereignty but a clear exercise of their rights accorded by international law, namely, by the convention of 1888.

Mr. President, Egypt has accepted this legal view and has indeed expounded it before this Council. I recall that on August 5, 1947, the representative of Egypt spoke here before this Security Council of the situation which existed when the United Kingdom had treaty rights in lands abutting on the canal. The Egyptian representative pointed out that this did not make freedom of passage dependent on the United Kingdom. In the course of his remarks, the Egyptian representative said:

> The status of the Suez Canal is quite different from that of other artificial waterways which serve as arteries of international communication for it is fixed by that multipartite international agreement to which I have just referred [the Constantinople Convention of 1888]. The Suez Canal was an international enterprise from the very beginning, and within a few years after it was opened all the principal powers of Europe joined with the Ottoman Empire, acting for Egypt, to regulate its traffic, its neutrality and its defense.

---

1. Ibid., Sept. 24, 1956, p. 467.
2. Ibid., Oct. 1, 1956, p. 503.
And I underline the words of the Egyptian representative that under the convention of 1888 the nations organized to regulate the traffic of the canal.

On October 14, 1954, the representative of Egypt, again speaking before this Security Council in the Bat Galim case said: 7

... The Canal company, which controls the passage, is an international company controlled by authorities who are neither Egyptian nor necessarily of any particular nationality. It is a universal company, it functions, and things will continue to be managed that way in future.

So spoke the representative of Egypt before this Council on October 14, 1954.

So much, Mr. President, for the law of the case.

Then there is the question of justice, which we are also required to bear in mind and to apply. What is the just thing to do? The Council should, I believe, in this matter give much weight to the conclusions of the 18 nations which joined in an expression of their views last August. The 18 included all but one of the clearly surviving signatories of the 1888 convention; they represented over 90 percent of the total traffic; and they represented countries whose economies are largely dependent upon the canal. Among the 18 were countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and America.

They affirmed that, as stated in the preamble of the convention of 1888, there should be established "a definite system destined to guarantee at all times, and for all the powers, the free use of the Suez Maritime Canal." That is the language of the preamble of the treaty.

They enunciated four basic principles which, with due regard to the sovereign rights of Egypt, should find expression through such a system. And I quote their statement of these four basic principles, Mr. Chairman:

a. Efficient and dependable operation, maintenance and development of the Canal as a free, open and secure international waterway in accordance with the principles of the Convention of 1888.
b. Insulation of the operation of the Canal from the influence of the politics of any nation.
c. A return to Egypt for the use of the Suez Canal which will be fair and equitable and increasing with enlargements of its capacity and greater use.
d. Canal tolls as low as is consistent with the foregoing requirements and, except for c. above, no profit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how could anyone seriously dispute these principles? And indeed only one of them was disputed at the August conference, and that was seriously disputed only by the Soviet Union. That was the second principle to which I have referred, namely, that the operation of the canal should be insulated from the influence of the politics of any nation.

But is not that the essence of the matter? Here we have an international waterway which, as the Egyptian Government has said, "was an international enterprise from the very beginning." The economies of a score or more of nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa are vitally dependent upon it. If such a waterway may be used as the instrument of national policy by any government—any government which physically controls it—then that canal is bound to be an international bone of contention. Then no nation depending on the canal can feel secure, for all but the controlling nation would be condemned to live under an economic "sword of Damocles." That would be to negate the 1888 convention and to violate both justice and law.

If, Mr. President, as the charter commands, we are to seek justice, we must agree that the operation of this international utility shall be insulated from the politics of any nation.

I believe that this Council can accept unhesitatingly the principles enunciated by the 18 nations as principles of justice.

Dealing Concurrently With Peace and Justice

Now the 18 then went on to indicate a mechanism by which these principles might be applied. They suggested institutional arrangements for cooperation between Egypt and other interested nations and the creation of a Suez Canal Board on which Egypt and others would be represented. This Board, they suggested, should be associated with, and make periodic reports to, the United Nations. They suggested that arbitration should be agreed upon to settle disputes and that there should be effective sanctions against violation of the arrangement.

There exist, of course, a great variety of means whereby the four basic principles stated by the 18 could be carried out. I do not suppose that any one of the 18 regards the particular mechanism suggested as sacrosanct. And I believe that this Council ought not close its mind to any alternative suggestions in this respect which might be made.

7 Security Council, 682d meeting, p. 31.
But so far as the basic principles are concerned, I do not see how they can be disregarded by this Council when it invokes, as it must, the principles of justice.

So, Mr. President, we see that the problem that we face is not a problem of restraining nations which are bellicose and which want war, for there are no such nations. Nor do we have the problem of creating a new body of international law, or of applying justice where the equities are confused. Peace is sought by all, and the principles of justice and of international law are clear. The problem we face is that of dealing concurrently with peace and justice, as is required by our charter.

No nation has more eloquently expressed the interconnection of peace and justice than has the Government of Egypt.

It will be recalled that our charter, as drafted at Dumbarton Oaks by three great powers, contained no reference to justice. It merely called for peace, a peace which presumably would, they hoped, be durable, not because it was a just peace but because presumably it would be enforced by the might of a few great powers.

But that concept was repudiated at San Francisco. There the interdependence of peace and justice was recognized and the first article of our charter was rewritten so as to require this organization to seek "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." The words introduced, Mr. President, were those I emphasized in my remarks—the words "and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law." And the charter went on to require this Security Council, in discharging its primary responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security, to act in accordance with the principles expressed in this article 1.

At San Francisco the nation which most ardently, most effectively, and most eloquently championed this interconnection of peace and justice was Egypt. I would like to quote at this point a passage from one of the statements then made by the representative of Egypt. He said:

We feel that the Council, the Security Council, will really play the part of the political court of law and it is indispensable that the principles of justice and law should always be present in its deliberations. The last argument with which we were confronted was that if we asked the Security Council to respect justice and international law it might make the burden of the Organization heavier, and more particularly the burden of the powers which were mainly responsible for the maintenance of peace and security.

I believe (the Egyptian representative went on to say) that the adoption of our amendment would not be much as compared with the sacrifices we have all suffered and are all ready to suffer again for the sake of maintaining peace and security in the world. If we want to keep peace and security only, we would not differ much from Hitler, who was also trying to do that and who, as a matter of fact, partly succeeded. But where the difference lies is that we want to maintain peace and security in conformity with the principles of international law and justice.

So spoke the voice of Egypt, and with those sentiments we can, I think, all agree.

**Importance of Suez Question**

Mr. President and fellow members of the Council, it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of this proceeding. Our Council enjoys on the one hand a demonstrated desire for peace on the part of all the parties. On the other hand the situation is governed by principles of justice and of law such as are rarely evident. If, under these favorable conditions, with all of these assets, our Council finds itself impotent to secure a settlement by peaceful means in accordance with the principles of justice and international law, then our failure would be a calamity of immense proportions.

This seems to be recognized by those who have spoken around this table. And our general debate has on the whole been temperate and constructive.

I say "on the whole" for there have been exceptions. One such was the portrayal by the Soviet Foreign Minister [Dmitri T. Shepilov] of so-called "United States monopolies" clad, as he picturesquely put it, in "snow white robes" and with "whetted appetites" on the prowl throughout the world seeking new victims.

Another exception was the Soviet Foreign Minister's proposal that we should remit this problem to a committee to which the Soviet Foreign Minister said, and I quote from the English translation of his speech: "The most important requisite is that the composition of the committee be balanced in such a way as to forestall the prevalence of some one point of view." Now, he obviously believes it unfortunate that 18 nations, representing over 90 percent of the traffic and a diversified user interest, could agree on a solution. So he
wants to make a fresh start by establishing a committee which is so constituted that we can know in advance that it will never agree!

It is not without precedent that a government feels that it can gain by perpetuating controversy. We have a proverb about "fishing in troubled waters." But it is usually considered respectable to veil such purpose. Rarely has a scheme to perpetuate controversy been so candidly revealed.

The Government of Egypt, in a more constructive vein, has proposed that we establish a negotiating body which will have the guidance of an agreed set of principles to work on and have agreed objectives to keep in mind and to attain. This was indeed the procedure which we sought to follow at the London conference which was held last August where, as I have indicated, a set of principles was formulated and certain objectives were outlined. The heart of the problem, as I indicated, seems to me to be whether among these principles we can get acceptance of the principle that there should be a system to insure that the canal cannot be used by any country as an instrument of its distinctly national policy.

If Egypt accepts that simple and rudimentary principle of justice, then I believe that the subsidiary problems can be resolved. But if that principle be repudiated, then it is difficult to foresee a useful role for a negotiating body. Indeed, under those conditions it is difficult to foresee any settlement in accordance with the principles of justice and of international law.

And if this case cannot be so settled, then the whole system of peace with justice sought to be established by this charter will have been undermined.

Surely we can do better than that. I feel confident that no nation here desires other than friendly relations with Egypt. Indeed the settlement proposed by the user nations, representing over 90 percent of the traffic, will significantly promote the welfare of Egypt. A peaceful and equitable solution of this problem would open up a vista of new hope for an area of the world where the peoples have for long—for too long—been grievously oppressed by alarms of war and by the economic burdens of preparing for war. Also, we can open up a new hope for all humanity, which has begun, I fear, to lose confidence in the capacity of this organization to secure peace and justice.

When the choices before us are thus clearly seen, who can doubt what our choice will be?

Mr. President, the United Kingdom-French resolution embodies the basic principles to which we have referred. It will enable this Council to make a choice which we can confidently expect will preserve peace with justice. It will uphold the authority and the prestige of this organization.

Accordingly, as I said last Friday, the United States intends to vote for that resolution.

CLOSING STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES

U.S./U.N. press release 2471 dated October 13

I wish first of all to express my gratification at the large measure of progress that was made during this week of Security Council activity. This Suez Canal problem is one of vast importance and of great complexity, and it easily arouses great emotion. It is a tribute to this Council and above all to the Foreign Ministers of Egypt, France, and the United Kingdom and to our Secretary-General that the problem has been considered here calmly and constructively and that important agreements have emerged.

We cannot expect a solution all at once. A solution comes only by stages, and, by agreeing upon the principles—the requirements—of a definitive settlement, an important stage has been passed. We can enter into the next stage with confidence.

The principles here agreed upon are realistic and concrete. They will permit the future proposals and conduct of the parties-in-interest in implementing them to be judged both by this Council and by the world. In my opening statement I spoke of the principles which governed a just solution of this problem. I emphasized one in particular, namely, that the operation of the canal should be insulated from the politics of any country. I said that, if that just principle were accepted, I believed the remaining problems could

---

*Secretary Dulles made the following statement in the Security Council on Oct. 5 (U.S./U.N. press release 2465):  
"Mr. President, I should like to postpone until a later date my own participation in this debate. However, I do at this point wish to make clear that the United States adheres to the position which it took at the first London conference last August as a party to the 18-nation proposals, and that the United States intends to vote for the resolution which has been introduced by the United Kingdom and France.

"Let me add that I welcome the suggestion of the United Kingdom for a restricted meeting of this Council after the general debate is concluded."
Text of U.K.-French Proposal

U.N. doc. S/3671 dated October 13

_The Security Council,_

_Notice_ the declarations made before it and the accounts of the development of the exploratory conversations on the Suez question given by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Foreign Ministers of Egypt, France and the United Kingdom;

_Agrees_ that any settlement of the Suez question should meet the following requirements:

(1) there should be free and open transit through the Canal without discrimination, overt or covert—this covers both political and technical aspects;
(2) the sovereignty of Egypt should be respected;
(3) the operation of the Canal should be insulated from the politics of any country;
(4) the manner of fixing tolls and charges should be decided by agreement between Egypt and the users;
(5) a fair proportion of the dues should be allotted to development;
(6) in case of disputes, unresolved affairs between the Suez Canal Company and the Egyptian Government should be settled by arbitration with suitable terms of reference and suitable provisions for the payment of sums found to be due;

_Considers_ that the proposals of the Eighteen Powers correspond to the requirements set out above and are suitably designed to bring about a settlement of the Suez Canal question by peaceful means in conformity with justice;

_Notes_ that the Egyptian Government, while declaring its readiness in the exploratory conversations to accept the principle of organized collaboration between an Egyptian Authority and the users, has not yet formulated sufficiently precise proposals to meet the requirements set out above;

_Invites_ the Governments of Egypt, France and the United Kingdom to continue their interchanges and in this connexion _invites_ the Egyptian Government to make known promptly its proposals for a system meeting the requirements set out above and providing guarantees to the users not less effective than those sought by the proposals of the Eighteen Powers;

_Considers_ that pending the conclusion of an agreement for the definitive settlement of the regime of the Suez Canal on the basis of the requirements set out above, the Suez Canal Users' Association, which has been qualified to receive the dues payable by ships belonging to its members, and the competent Egyptian authorities, should co-operate to ensure the satisfactory operation of the Canal and free and open transit through the Canal in accordance with the 1888 Convention.

be resolved. That principle has been accepted, and I adhere to my belief that the remaining problems can be resolved.

I turn now to the resolution introduced by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom.

The first portion embodies the principles or requirements which have been agreed upon. From what was said here yesterday and what has been said here today, I believe that this portion of the resolution meets with our warm and complete acceptance.

Now, I should like to comment briefly on the balance of the resolution as to which certain questions have been raised.

The third paragraph characterizes the proposals of the 18 powers as being suitably designed to bring about a settlement in conformity with justice. I think, Mr. President, that that is an accurate and indeed conservative statement. Those proposals emerged last August out of a week of intensive study. I should like to read you the names of the 18 countries: Australia, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Iran, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Mr. President, this Council can, I think, confidently assume that proposals having this broad foundation, which includes countries whose nationals represent over 90 percent of the shipping through the canal, the countries whose pattern of traffic shows the greatest dependence on the canal, and countries of wide geographical and cultural distribution, must be reasonable.

Of course, the resolution does not suggest that the proposals of the 18 are the only proposals which could comply with the principles upon which we have agreed. No one has contended that.

*An earlier draft resolution (U.N. doc. S/3666) was introduced in the Security Council by France and the U.K. on Oct. 5 but did not come to a vote. The above draft was submitted following private conversations between Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold and the Egyptian, French, and British Foreign Ministers.

In the voting on Oct. 13, the Council unanimously approved the first part of the proposal, which was later circulated as S/3675. A separate vote was taken on the remainder (beginning with the paragraph "Considers that the proposals... ") ; the U.S.S.R. vetoed this part, and Yugoslavia also cast a negative vote. A Yugoslav proposal introduced on Oct. 13 (S/3672) did not come to a vote.
In my opening statement I said there exists of course a great variety of means whereby the basic principles stated by the 18 could be carried out. I went on to say, "I believe that this Council ought not to close its mind to . . . alternative suggestions."

I think this viewpoint is clearly reflected by the language of the resolution, which, while pointing out the acceptability of the proposals of the 18, goes on to invite the Egyptian Government to submit alternative proposals which would equally accomplish the desired result. The resolution as it now stands, when read as a whole, makes quite clear that alternative proposals submitted by Egypt which would also meet these requirements would be equally acceptable.

We are, I am sure, all glad to have heard the declaration made earlier today by the distinguished Foreign Minister of Egypt [Mahmud Fawzi] that indeed certain concrete proposals have been made by Egypt in the course of the confidential exploratory talks. This fact should, I think, make more acceptable this portion of the resolution which invites Egypt to make precisely such proposals.

The last paragraph of the resolution deals with provisional measures. The Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union has suggested that because this matter is before the Council no provisional or interim measures are required. That, I think, is hardly logical. Our charter itself contemplates that provisional measures may be called for by the Council in relation to matters that are before it. In other words, the charter makes it quite clear that, simply because a case is pending before the Council, this does not exclude the need for interim arrangements. The Soviet Foreign Minister has suggested that the interim arrangements contemplated would involve the exercise by the users association of administrative powers in Egypt. That is not the case. What is contemplated is practical cooperation at the working level between the users and the competent Egyptian authorities.

It has also been suggested that the resolution would substitute the Suez Canal Users Association for the Egyptian authorities in the collection of dues. That is not the case. What is said is that the users association is in fact, as organized, qualified to act in respect of dues payable by ships belonging to its members. Whether these ships decide to pay to the association as their agent is for them and for their governments to decide. Neither this Council nor the users association itself attempts any compulsory regime. Since, however, the users association already has a membership representing approximately 90 percent of the shipping, it can be a useful instrument for practical cooperation at the operating level while a definitive solution is being worked out.

Mr. President, there is nothing in the resolution which should be in the slightest degree offensive to Egypt or which is derogatory of Egypt or Egyptian sovereignty. As we read it, it represents an honest attempt to advance our pursuit of peace and justice through the next stage.

We attach particular importance to the invitation to the Governments of Egypt, France, and the United Kingdom to continue their interchanges. What has so far developed out of these interchanges held in the presence of the Secretary-General of the United Nations has already yielded important positive results. We believe that it is a procedure to be pursued.

For the reasons given, Mr. President, the United States intends to vote for the resolution as submitted by France and the United Kingdom.29

Constantinople Convention of 1888

Following is a text of the 1888 Convention Respecting the Free Navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal released by the U.N. Department of Public Information on September 25 (U.N. press release SC/1793).

CONVENTION RESPECTING THE FREE NAVIGATION OF THE SUZ Canal

Signed at Constantinople, October 29, 1888.

In the Name of Almighty God, Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India; His Majesty the Emperor of Germany, King of Prussia; His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, etc., and Apostolic King of Hungary; His Majesty the King of Spain, and in his name the Queen Regent of the Kingdom; the President of the French Republic; His Majesty the King of Italy; His Majesty the King of the Netherlands, Grand Duke of Luxemburg, etc.; His Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias; and His

For details of the vote, see footnote 9. After the voting, Secretary Dulles made the following statement:

"I regret that it has not been possible for the Council to agree on more than the principles, the requirements of a settlement. But that already is much. I think of course that it is understood that the Council remains seized of this matter and that the Secretary-General may continue to encourage interchanges between the governments of Egypt, France, and the United Kingdom, a procedure which has already yielded positive results."
Majesty the Emperor of the Ottomans; wishing to establish, by a Conventional Act, a definite system destined to guarantee at all times, and for all the powers, the free use of the Suez Maritime Canal, and thus to complete the system under which the navigation of this canal has been placed by the Firman of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, dated the 22nd February, 1866 (2 Zilkâdî, 1282) and sanctioning the concessions of His Highness the Khedive, have named as their Plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

(Here follow the names.)

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

**Article I**

The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag.

Consequently, the high contracting parties agree not in any way to interfere with the free use of the canal, in time of war as in time of peace.

The canal shall never be subjected to the exercise of the right of blockade.

**Article II**

The high contracting parties, recognizing that the Fresh-Water Canal is indispensable to the Maritime Canal, take note of the engagements of His Highness the Khedive towards the Universal Suez Canal Company as regards the Fresh-Water Canal; which engagements are stipulated in a convention bearing date the 18th March, 1863, containing an expose and four articles.

They undertake not to interfere in any way with the security of that canal and its branches, the working of which shall not be exposed to any attempt at obstruction.

**Article III**

The high contracting parties likewise undertake to respect the plant, establishments, buildings, and works of the Maritime Canal and of the Fresh-Water Canal.

**Article IV**

The Maritime Canal remaining open in time of war as a free passage, even to the ships of war of belligerents, according to the terms of article 1 of the present treaty, the high contracting parties agree that no right of war, no act of hostility, nor any act having for its object to obstruct the free navigation of the canal, shall be committed in the canal and its ports of access, as well as within a radius of three marine miles from those ports, even though the Ottoman Empire should be one of the belligerent powers.

Vessels of war of belligerents shall not revisitual or take in stores in the canal and its ports of access, except in so far as may be strictly necessary. The transit of the aforesaid vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay, in accordance with the regulations in force, and without any other intermission than that resulting from the necessities of the service.

Their stay at Port Said and in the roadstead of Suez shall not exceed 24 hours, except in case of distress. In such case they shall be bound to leave as soon as possible. An interval of 24 hours shall always elapse between the sailing of a belligerent ship from one of the ports of access and the departure of a ship belonging to the hostile power.

**Article V**

In time of war belligerent powers shall not disembark nor embark within the canal and its ports of access either troops, munitions, or materials of war. But in case of an accidental hindrance in the canal, men may be embarked or disembarked at the ports of access by detachments not exceeding 1,000 men, with a corresponding amount of war material.

**Article VI**

Prizes shall be subjected, in all respects, to the same rules as the vessels of war of belligerents.

**Article VII**

The powers shall not keep any vessel of war in the waters of the canal (including Lake Timsah and the Bitter Lakes).

Nevertheless, they may station vessels of war in the ports of access of Port Said and Suez, the number of which shall not exceed two for each power.

This right shall not be exercised by belligerents.

**Article VIII**

The agents in Egypt of the signatory powers of the present treaty shall be charged to watch over its execution. In case of any event threatening the security or the free passage of the canal, they shall meet on the summons of three of their number under the presidency of their Doyen, in order to proceed to the necessary verifications. They shall inform the Khedival government of the danger which they may have perceived, in order that that government may take proper steps to insure the protection and the free use of the canal. Under any circumstances, they shall meet once a year to take note of the due execution of the treaty.

The last mentioned meetings shall take place under the presidency of a special commissioner nominated for that purpose by the Imperial Ottoman government. A commissioner of the Khedive may also take part in the meeting, and may preside over it in case of the absence of the Ottoman commissioner.

They shall especially demand the suppression of any work or the dispersion of any assemblage on either bank of the canal, the object or effect of which might be to interfere with the liberty and the entire security of the navigation.

**Article IX**

The Egyptian government shall, within the limits of the powers resulting from the Firmans, and under the conditions provided for in the present treaty, take the necessary measures for insuring the execution of the said treaty.

In case the Egyptian government should not have suffi-
cient means at its disposal, it shall call upon the Imperial Ottoman government, which shall take the necessary measures to respond to such appeal; shall give notice thereof to the signatory powers of the Declaration of London of the 17th March, 1885; and shall, if necessary, concert with them on the subject.

The provisions of articles IV, V, VII, and VIII shall not interfere with the measures which shall be taken in virtue of the present article.

**Article X**

Similarly, the provisions of articles IV, V, VII, and VIII, shall not interfere with the measures which His Majesty the Sultan and His Majesty the Khedive, in the name of His Imperial Majesty, and within the limits of the Firmans granted, might find it necessary to take for securing by their own forces the defence of Egypt and the maintenance of public order.

In case His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, or His Highness the Khedive, should find it necessary to avail themselves of the exceptions for which this article provides, the signatory powers of the Declaration of London shall be notified thereof by the Imperial Ottoman government.

It is likewise understood that the provisions of the four articles aforesaid shall in no case occasion any obstacle to the measures which the Imperial Ottoman government may think it necessary to take in order to insure by its own forces the defence of its other possessions situated on the eastern coast of the Red Sea.

**Article XI**

The measures which shall be taken in the cases provided for by articles IX and X of the present treaty shall not interfere with the free use of the canal. In the same cases, the erection of permanent fortifications contrary to the provisions of article VIII is prohibited.

**Article XII**

The high contracting parties, by application of the principle of equality as regards the free use of the canal, a principle which forms one of the bases of the present treaty, agree that none of them shall endeavor to obtain with respect to the canal territorial or commercial advantages or privileges in any international arrangements which may be concluded. Moreover the rights of Turkey as the territorial power are reserved.

**Article XIII**

With the exception of the obligations expressly provided by the clauses of the present treaty, the sovereign rights of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, and the rights and immunities of His Highness the Khedive, resulting from the Firmans, are in no way affected.

**Article XIV**

The high contracting parties agree that the engagements resulting from the present treaty shall not be limited by the duration of the acts of concession of the Universal Suez Canal Company.

**Article XV**

The stipulations of the present treaty shall not interfere with the sanitary measures in force in Egypt.

**Article XVI**

The high contracting parties undertake to bring the present treaty to the knowledge of the states which have not signed it, inviting them to accede to it.

**Article XVII**

The present treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Constantinople within the space of one month, or sooner if possible.

In faith of which the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present treaty, and have affixed to it the seal of their arms.

Done at Constantinople, the 29th day of the month of October, in the year 1888.

For Great Britain ——— Sir William Arthur WHITE
Germany ——— Joseph de Radowitz
Austria-Hungary ——— Henry, Baron de Calice
Spain ——— Miguel Florez y Garcia
France ——— Gustave Louis Lannes, Count de Montebello
Italy ——— Alfred, Baron Blanc
Netherlands ——— Gustave Keun
Russia ——— Alexandre de Nélidow
Turkey ——— Mohammed Said Pasha

**Large Tankers To Be Built for Oil Transportation**

*Memorandum by the President*

October 12, 1956

I appreciate receiving a report from you stating that it would be possible under the authority of the Defense Production Act for the Government to enter into contractual arrangements with United States ship yard owners for the construction of large tankers—up to the total called for by the Government’s full emergency requirements—with the understanding that the Government would acquire these tankers in those cases where private ship owners did not purchase them.

I am directing, therefore, that you take steps immediately to bring together representatives of the National Petroleum Council to meet with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Commerce, to consider plans that will be helpful in assuring the efficiency

---


October 22, 1956
Correspondence With U.S.S.R. on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy

Press release 527 dated October 6

An exchange of correspondence between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the subject of the peaceful uses of atomic energy was released on October 6, 1956. This exchange supplements the publication of documents exchanged between the two Governments during the course of negotiations concerning President Eisenhower's proposals before the U.N. General Assembly on December 8, 1953.1

In response to the President's proposal for establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at first refused to participate, advancing the argument (in notes of April 27, September 22, and November 29, 1954) that the peaceful use of fissionable material leads to the production of more fissionable materials and thus to an increase in the production and stocks of atomic weapons.

The United States pointed out that this was a problem of grave concern but that diversion of materials from peaceful to military uses could be avoided by appropriate safeguards. In its note of April 14, 1955, the United States suggested the joint study of safeguards against diversion of materials to military uses.

Following the atoms-for-peace conference at Geneva, a meeting of experts of six nations, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, was held to consider the technical aspects of guaranteeing the peaceful use of atomic energy. Subsequent to this meeting, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated in a note of October 1, 1955, that it would be necessary to insert in the charter of the proposed agency a provision concerning control of materials to prevent their use for other than peaceful purposes. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also stated that, in view of the necessity for control, the agency should have a staff of inspectors to verify the use of fissionable and other materials and of special equipment received from the agency. The draft under consideration at the conference now in progress in New York contains such provisions.

In order to safeguard against the diversion to military use of material provided bilaterally, as well as that provided through the agency, the United States proposed, on June 1, 1956, that discussions be held as to the possibility of standardizing the safeguards which the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as principal suppliers of material would seek to include in agreements covering bilateral transfers. Furthermore, the United States was concerned, as stated in its aide memoire of August 15, 1956, that adequate safeguarding measures might not be taken in the period before the agency could commence operations. In its own bilateral agreements the

The Government of the United States has, with the concurrence of the other parties to the agreements, provided for safeguards modeled on those of the proposed statute of the agency.

In its aide-memoire of September 24, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics states that it has no objection to the U.S. proposal for a study of the possibility of standardizing safeguards. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics suggests that this question be considered with the participation of the nations represented at the current international agency conference, as well as other interested nations.

Safeguards in U.S. bilateral agreements are, of course, a matter of joint consent by the parties to the agreements, and the United States agrees that the question of standardizing safeguards in bilateral agreements should be discussed with nations interested in such agreements. In the view of the United States it would also be useful for preliminary discussions, of the type held among the six nations participating in the August 1955 talks at Geneva, to be continued among states in a position to supply materials, equipment, and services for peaceful atomic development.

The United States continues to believe that uniformity of safeguards is essential in the interest of states receiving assistance, as they would otherwise be without the protection afforded them by a comprehensive safeguard system. Accordingly, the United States continues to believe that discussion of this matter would be useful.

The texts of the documents follow.

U. S. NOTE OF NOVEMBER 3, 1954

The Government of the United States has considered the aide-mémoire of September 22 delivered by the Soviet Government and wishes to make the following comments:

1. The Government of the United States notes with satisfaction that the Soviet Government is now willing to continue the negotiations concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy which followed upon President Eisenhower's proposal of last December 8.

2. The Government of the United States has taken note of the "important principles" which the Soviet Government states must not be overlooked in considering this question of international cooperation in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Government of the United States is prepared to discuss these principles and their application to an agreement between nations to establish an agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy as well as their application to the operations of such an agency.

3. In its aide-mémoire of September 22, the Soviet Government states that it wishes not only to continue the negotiations on the President's plan for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, but also to continue examination of its proposal of a preliminary ban on the use of atomic weapons. However, since the delivery of this aide-mémoire of September 22, the Soviet Government has appeared to recede from its former position in the United Nations disarmament negotiations that such a ban must preceed any useful planning for an international weapons control system. Under these circumstances the Government of the United States assumes that the Soviet Government has modified its earlier position that agreement on a ban on the use of atomic weapons is a necessary condition precedent to useful discussion and agreement in the matter of international cooperation on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

4. As the Government of the United States has stressed throughout these negotiations, the President's proposal of last December 8 was not a disarmament plan. It was a definite step in international cooperation to bring the benefits of atomic energy to the peoples of the world. It was also an expression of America's sincere desire for a new international climate in which the problems of disarmament might find a readier solution. It is hoped that participation by the Soviet Government in implementing the President's proposal will, by the same token, be a demonstration of its real interest in changing the present atmosphere of mutual distrust.

The Government of the United States believes that the cause of international harmony can be substantially advanced by cooperative efforts to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy, such efforts to parallel the continuing negotiations looking to the establishment of a general and safeguarded disarmament program. The cause of humanity can only be prejudiced by deferring the international development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy until the immensely difficult problems of disarmament are solved.

5. The Government of the United States notes that the Soviet Government's aide-mémoire refers to the question of the possibility of diversion of fissionable material from power-producing atomic installations. The Government of the United States suggests that a good starting point at this stage of the United States-Soviet negotiations would be a mutual study of this problem and suggests that it be examined by experts from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States. It would be agreeable to the Government of the United States for such discussions to take place at an early date either in the United States or in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in some third country. If this is acceptable to the Soviet Government, the time and place of such a meeting could be arranged at short notice.

6. It is noted that the Soviet Government is ready to examine with the Government of the United States the opinion of the Government of the United States that there
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are forms of peaceful utilization of atomic energy in which there is no need for weapons-grade material. Such applications of atomic energy will be considered by the international conference which the Government of the United States has proposed that the United Nations convene next year. It is suggested that participation by leading Soviet atomic scientists and engineers in the work of this conference will make clear the basis for the belief of the Government of the United States that applications of atomic energy which do not require weapons-grade material can be of great benefit to mankind.

7. The Soviet Government refers to proposals by it regarding the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Government of the United States will be glad to learn the details of the proposals of the Soviet Government and the extent to which it is prepared to cooperate with other nations in fostering the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

8. The Government of the United States proposes that this note and further negotiations between the Government of the United States and the Soviet Government on this matter of implementing the President's proposal should proceed in private since confidential negotiations offer the best prospect of a fruitful exchange of views at this time.

WASHINGTON, November 3, 1954.

SOVIET AIDE MEMOIRE OF NOVEMBER 29, 1954

The Soviet Government, having considered the memorandum of the United States Government of November 3 which is in answer to the aide-mémoire of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of September 22 of this year, considers it necessary to state the following:

In the aide-mémoire of the Soviet Government of September 22 of this year it was pointed out that agreement of positions between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on a number of substantive questions regarding the use of atomic energy has important significance for the achievement of international agreement on the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. At the same time the Soviet Government drew the attention of the Government of the United States of America to certain important principles which must be taken into account in considering the question of international cooperation in the field of peaceful utilization of atomic energy.

In this connection it was pointed out that an important prerequisite of the international agreement under reference is the recognition that such agreement must not place any country or group of countries in a privileged position whereby this country or group of countries could enforce its will on other states.

In its aide-mémoire the Soviet Government drew the attention of the Government of the United States of America also to the fact that an international organ which can be created on the basis of an appropriate agreement between states will only successfully discharge its functions if this organ is not used to the detriment of the security of some or other states. At the same time the Soviet Government stated that it shares the opinion of the Government of the United States of America, expressed in its memorandum of March 19 of this year, to the effect that the appropriate international organ "should submit reports to the UN Security Council and General Assembly."

In its memorandum of November 3 of this year, the Government of the United States stated that it is ready to discuss important principles under reference which were advanced by the Soviet Government in its aide-mémoire of September 22 and the application of these principles to the agreement regarding the creation of an international organ on peaceful use of atomic energy as well as their application to the activity of such organ.

It must, however, be noted that the proposal introduced by the United States jointly with six other states at the Ninth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is in contradiction with the above-mentioned principles inasmuch as it contemplates the formation of an international organ not as an organ of the UN responsible to the General Assembly and in appropriate instances to the Security Council but as a specialized institution not obliged to report to the UN. In view of this, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics assumes that the Government of the United States of America will take steps to eliminate the above-mentioned contradiction in the position of the United States.

In its memorandum the Government of the United States of America expressed the opinion asserting that the Soviet Government had changed its previous position on the question concerning the prohibition of use of atomic weapons since it did not bring up the question that agreement concerning prohibition of atomic weapons should precede agreement on the question of international cooperation in the field of peaceful utilization of atomic energy.

In connection with this the Soviet Government considers it necessary to state that, as before, it proceeds from the premise that only conclusion of international agreement on the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons is capable of insuring wide international cooperation in the field of peaceful utilization of atomic energy and of elimination of threat of atomic war.

As an important step on the path toward the full elimination of atomic, hydrogen, and other weapons of mass destruction from armaments of states together with the establishment of strict international control, the Soviet Government has proposed and proposes that states par-


9 Handed by Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov to the American Chargé d'Affaires at Moscow, Walter N. Walmsley, Jr.
perticipating in the agreement assume a solemn and unconditional pledge not to use atomic, hydrogen, and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

In the course of the discussion in the United Nations of the question concerning the prohibition of atomic weapons and also in the course of negotiations which have taken place between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the atomic problem, it has become clear that the principal obstacle to the achievement of the above-mentioned agreement is the position of the United States of America which refuses to accept the above-mentioned proposal of the Soviet Government.

Taking this circumstance into account and striving to facilitate the achievement of this agreement on international cooperation in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy, the Soviet Government expressed agreement with the proposal that negotiations on above-mentioned international cooperation should not have as a precondition prior achievement of an agreement regarding unconditional renunciation by states of the use of atomic and other types of weapons of mass destruction. In this the Soviet Government proceeds from the fact that both the question of prohibiting atomic weapons and the question of reducing armaments of the conventional type are being considered in the United Nations. The position of the Soviet Government on this question is expressed in its proposals introduced for the consideration of the General Assembly on September 30 of this year.6

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to remind the Government of the United States that in its aide-mémoire of April 27 and September 22 of this year it drew the attention of the Government of the United States of America to the fact that the very utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is connected with the possibility of increasing the quantity of fissionable materials which serve as the basis for the production of atomic weapons which inevitably leads to increase in the scale of production of atomic weapons and to increase in stocks of them.

The Government of the United States of America, in its memorandum of November 3, proposed that the above-mentioned problem should be jointly studied by experts of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America.

The Soviet Government does not object to the joint study of this problem by experts of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America. As regards the place and time of the conference of experts, it is the opinion of the Soviet Government that this question will not meet with difficulties once agreement on the program of work of the experts has been reached.

The Soviet Government expresses agreement with the proposal of the Government of the United States of America that further negotiations on the question of international cooperation in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy be confidential.

Moscow, November 29, 1954.

6 For text, see ibid., Oct. 25, 1954, p. 625.

U.S. NOTE OF APRIL 14, 1955*

The Government of the United States has considered the aide-mémoire of November 29, 1954, delivered by the Soviet Government and wishes to state the following:

1. The Government of the United States notes that the Soviet Government agrees that negotiations looking to international cooperation in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy can be fruitful without any prior commitment by the nations concerned to renounce the use of weapons.

2. The Government of the United States repeats the assurance contained in its note of November 3, 1954, that it is willing to discuss the "principles" which the Soviet Government, in its aide-mémoire of September 22, 1954, and November 29, 1954, states that it considers important in the establishment and operation of an international agency for the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. However, the willingness of the Government of the United States to discuss these principles should not be taken to mean that the Government of the United States in advance of such discussion has accepted these principles, as the Soviet Government apparently assumes in its statements in the sixth paragraph of its aide-mémoire of November 29, 1954. It is suggested that the receipt of the specific comments of the Soviet Government on the outline of the objectives and functions of an international agency, submitted by the Government of the United States on March 19, 1954, would present a good opportunity for discussion of the aforementioned "principles" as they might apply to the actual organization and work of an agency for the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

3. The Government of the United States believes, as it stated in its memorandum of July 9, 1954, that the nations most advanced in knowledge regarding the constructive uses of atomic energy have an obligation to make this knowledge available under appropriate conditions, for promoting the welfare of peoples generally. Accordingly, negotiations have been initiated, as the Soviet Government is aware, among the eight other nations "principally involved," looking toward the establishment of an international atomic energy agency. Pending further concrete indications of interest on the part of the Soviet Government in participating in the work of this proposed agency, negotiations will continue among these eight nations. Drafting of an agreement to establish such an agency is now under way. A copy of such draft agreement when completed will be furnished the Soviet Government upon request.

4. Encouraged by the recent affirmative vote by the Soviet Government in the United Nations General Assembly on the resolution concerning the "Atoms for Peace" program, the Government of the United States wishes to renew President Eisenhower's proposal of December 8, 1953, to the Soviet Government that the powers principally involved begin now and continue to make joint contributions from their stockpiles of normal uranium and fissionable materials to an international atomic energy agency.

*Handed by Livingston Merchant, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, to Ambassador Zaroubin.
With material support for the agency by the Soviet Government, in addition to the support already announced by the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom, an international pool of fissionable material could be established in the near future which would provide a basis for encouraging the use of this material for the peaceful applications of atomic energy. In this event, the international atomic energy agency would be made responsible for the storage and protection of the contributed fissile material and other atomic materials.

5. The Government of the United States notes that the Soviet Government does not object to a joint study by experts of the two nations of the problem of guarding against possible diversion of fissionable material from power-producing atomic installations and that the Soviet Government is of the opinion that the place and time of such a conference can be set without difficulty once agreement on an agenda has been reached. Attached to this note is a proposed agenda for such a meeting of experts. If this agenda is acceptable to the Soviet Government, the Government of the United States would be prepared to commence discussions on these topics at any time after May 1, and would be pleased to receive a Soviet delegation in Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON, April 14, 1955.

[Enclosure]

AGENDA PROPOSED BY THE UNITED STATES FOR A MEETING OF UNITED STATES AND SOVIET EXPERTS

Safeguarding Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy

To discuss the safeguards required for the following peaceful uses of atomic energy under the auspices of an international atomic energy agency:

1. Research and Development
   a. Reactors for production of radioisotopes for use in science, medicine, agriculture, and industry.
   b. Reactors to provide neutron irradiations for scientific research and for testing materials and components for power reactors.
   c. Reactors as pilot plants for the development and demonstration of economic atomic power.

2. Large-Scale Utilization of Atomic Power
   a. Power reactors using as fuel either natural uranium or uranium partially enriched in U-235, but not containing thorium.
   b. Power reactors using as fuel either plutonium, U-233, or uranium highly enriched in U-235, but not containing thorium or significant amounts of U-238.
   c. Reactors containing the fertile materials U-238 or thorium for the specific purpose of producing fissionable material in addition to power.

Safeguards are to be considered in relation to:

1. The design and construction of reactors;
2. Allocation and preparation of critical materials;
3. Operation of reactors; and
4. Processing of irradiated materials.

SOVIET MEMORANDUM OF JULY 18, 1955

In connection with the memorandum of the United States Government of April 14, 1955, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to state the following:

1. The Soviet Government, guided by the desire to guarantee utilization of atomic energy only for peaceful purposes, stands for the development of international cooperation in this field. In this connection it declares its readiness to participate in negotiations on the creation of an international agency for peaceful utilization of atomic energy. For its part the Soviet Government would consider it expedient to examine now together with the Government of the United States of America and other interested countries concrete questions concerning the creation of such an agency, including its problems and functions.

The Soviet Government expresses its readiness to deposit into an international fund for atomic materials under an international agency for atomic energy 50 kilograms of fissionable materials, as soon as agreement has been reached on the creation of such an agency.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necessary to note in this connection that, as it has already pointed out, questions of development of international cooperation in the field of peaceful utilization of atomic energy are directly dependent on solution of the problem of the reduction of armaments and banning of atomic weapons. Conclusion of an international agreement on full banning of atomic weapons would facilitate weakening of international tension, strengthening of mutual trust between states, averting the threat of atomic war, and would eliminate obstacles to the broadest and most fruitful international cooperation in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy. In examining this situation the Soviet Government brought to the attention of the United Nations subcommittee on disarmament on May 10 of this year a proposal aimed at prohibiting the use and production of atomic weapons and all other forms of weapons of mass destruction and a conversion of existing stock piles of atomic weapons to peaceful purposes.7

2. In its memorandum of April 14, the Government of the United States of America expressed hope that the Soviet Government would comment on those proposals of the United States concerning aims and functions of an international agency which were set forth in a memorandum of the Government of the United States of America of March 19, 1954.

The Soviet Government considers that an international agency for the peaceful uses of atomic energy must be organized in accordance with the following basic principles:

(1) All states so desiring can join the agency.
(2) Agreement on creation of such an agency must not place any country whatsoever or group of countries in a privileged position.
(3) In rendering aid to any government whatsoever

7 For text, see Bulletin of May 30, 1955, p. 900.
the agency must not condition that aid on requirements of political or military character.

4. The agency must not be utilized to the detriment of the security of these or other states.

5. The agency is created in the framework of the United Nations. The agency must report to the Security Council of the United Nations and General Assembly whenever this is requested by either of these organs. The agency must also consult and cooperate with other United Nations organs whose work might bear on the work of the agency.

6. The agency carries out its activity of giving aid to states in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy on the following basis:

A. The agency renders to states aid of a consultative character in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy.

B. Fissionable materials and special equipment are made available by states rendering aid directly to requesting states on the basis of agreements between the interested states concluded with participation of the agency.

Responsibility for safekeeping and utilization of fissionable materials received will be borne by requesting state in accordance with agreement concluded.

C. The agency encourages the exchange of scientific and technical information among countries and will bear responsibility for the broad dissemination of data which it has at its disposal. For this purpose the agency will create scientific research institutions and will maintain a group of specialists in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy who will render necessary assistance to states in this field.

The agency renders cooperation and assistance to states in preparation of national cadres of specialists in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy.

3. The Government of the United States of America in its memorandum raises the question of undertaking a joint study by experts of both countries of problems arising from the fact that the very application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is connected with the possibility of increasing the quantity of fissionable materials which serve as the basis for the production of atomic weapons. The Soviet Government confirms its agreement to the calling of such a conference of experts and declares that it has no reservation on the agenda for such a conference which was contained in the memorandum of the Government of the United States of America. It considers that it would be expedient to hold such a conference in Geneva directly upon completion of the work of the international scientific technical conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy called for August 8 in Geneva.

4. In connection with the declaration contained in the memorandum of the Government of the United States concerning rendering of assistance to other states in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to note the following:

The Soviet Union is rendering technical and productive assistance to a series of states in the creation of scientific-experimental bases for the development of research in the field of atomic physics and the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and preparation of scientists and engineers in the field of atomic physics, radio chemistry, application of isotopes in science and technology and also in the field of technology and atomic furnaces and cyclotrons. The Soviet Government declares that it intends to broaden the circle of states with which the USSR will cooperate and assist in the field of the utilization of atomic energy for peace purposes.

The Soviet Government would like to have the opinion of the Government of the United States on the foregoing.

Moscow, 18 July 1955.

U.S. NOTE OF JULY 29, 1955

The Government of the United States has considered the memorandum of the Soviet Government dated July 18, 1955, and has the following comments to make:

1. The Government of the United States is pleased to note the readiness of the Soviet Government to deposit 50 kilograms of fissionable material into an international fund under an international atomic energy agency—the deposit to be made when agreement has been reached on the creation of such an agency.

2. The Government of the United States notes that the Soviet Government is now willing to participate in negotiations on the creation of an international atomic energy agency. As pointed out in the United States note of April 14, 1955, the United States and other countries principally concerned have been developing a draft statute for such an international agency. A copy is attached.* This draft is now under confidential study by the other nations principally involved. It is planned to submit a draft statute to all nations qualified to join such an agency when such study has been completed. The attached draft reflects current views as to the desirable nature of such an agency and covers various points made in the negotiations between the other nations principally involved since March 19, 1954. Comments of the Soviet Government on such draft would be welcome. It is hoped that the Soviet Union will be one of the states sponsoring such international agency.

3. The Government of the United States notes the statement in the Soviet memorandum of July 18, 1955, that questions of the development of international cooperation in the field of peaceful utilization of atomic energy are directly dependent on the solution of the problems of reduction of armaments and the banning of atomic weapons. The Government of the United States hopes that

*Handed by the Acting Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Walworth Barbour, to the Soviet Chargé d’Affaires, Sergei R. Striganov.

*Not printed here. Substantially the same as the text printed in the BULLETIN of Oct. 24, 1955, p. 666, except that the latter text incorporates the changes referred to in the note of Aug. 17, 1955, from the Department of State to the Soviet Embassy (see below).
the Soviet Government by this statement is not reverting to its earlier position that the establishment of an international atomic energy agency must be preceded by an agreement to ban the use of nuclear weapons. It is the understanding of the Government of the United States, as set out in its note of November 3, 1954, that the Soviet Government no longer insists on such a condition. It is believed that the peaceful uses of atomic energy should not be withheld from the peoples of the world pending solution of difficult disarmament problems.

4. The Government of the United States notes the acceptance by the Soviet Government of the United States agenda (attached to the United States note of April 14, 1955) for a joint study of the problems involved in safeguarding the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In view of their special competence in this field it is suggested that experts from the United Kingdom and Canada be invited to participate in such technical meetings. Early views of the Soviet Government on this point are requested.

A preliminary meeting of experts at Geneva following the United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy is agreeable to the Government of the United States. In view of competing demands on the time of these experts, it is suggested that such preliminary meeting last no longer than five days. If additional time is required, a second meeting can be called at a mutually agreeable time and place.

WASHINGTON, July 29, 1955.

U.S. NOTE OF AUGUST 12, 1955

The Government of the United States refers to its note to the Soviet Government dated July 29, 1955, which made reference to the acceptance by the Soviet Government of the United States agenda for a joint study of the problems involved in safeguarding the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

In the United States note it was suggested that, in view of their special competence in this field, experts from the United Kingdom and Canada be invited to participate in such technical meetings. The Government of the United States believes that experts from France could make a valuable contribution to such a discussion and proposes that they also be invited to participate.

The Government of the United States believes that the technical meeting to be held in Geneva will undoubtedly become known. It is suggested that a joint communiqué be agreed on for issuance shortly in advance of the convening of the meeting. The following text is proposed for the consideration of the Soviet Government:

"At the conclusion of the United Nations Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, experts from Canada, France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the USSR will meet in Geneva for a few days to discuss technical aspects of safeguarding the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The technical working group will meet in private."

In order that arrangements for the technical meeting may proceed without delay, an early statement of the views of the Soviet Government on the points raised in this note and in the note of July 29, 1955, is requested. It is suggested that the Soviet Government may wish to designate a representative now on its Delegation to the United Nations Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy to commence discussion in Geneva with Mr. Gerard C. Smith and Mr. John Hall of the United States Delegation concerning arrangements for the subsequent private technical talks.

WASHINGTON, August 12, 1955.

SOVET MEMORANDUM OF AUGUST 13, 1955

In connection with the note of the Government of the United States of America of July 29, 1955, containing the reply to the memorandum of the Soviet Government of July 18, 1955, the Soviet Government states that the draft statute of an international agency for atomic energy received with the above-mentioned note will be given proper study by the Soviet Government. The views of the Soviet Government on this draft will be communicated to the Government of the United States of America.

The Soviet Government expresses its agreement with the proposal of the Government of the United States of America concerning the time of convening and the duration of the work of the conference of experts of both countries for joint examination of problems arising from the fact that every application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is connected with the possibility of increasing the quantity of fissionable materials which serve as a basis for the production of atomic weapons.

As for the question raised in the note concerning the participation of experts of other countries in the above-mentioned conference, the Soviet Government considers it expedient that, together with experts of the United Kingdom and Canada, experts from Czechoslovakia should participate in the conference in connection with their particular competence in questions subject to examination at that conference.

MOSCOW, August 13, 1955.

U.S. NOTE OF AUGUST 17, 1955

The Government of the United States refers to the memorandum of the Soviet Government dated August 13, 1955, and notes that the Soviet Government is giving study to the draft statute of an international atomic energy agency transmitted with the note of the Government of the United States dated July 29, 1955. The Government of the United States will be pleased to receive the views of the Soviet Government on this draft.

Pursuant to suggestions advanced during discussions at the Ninth General Assembly of the United Nations, the Government of the United States, which together with other governments principally involved has developed the draft statute, considers that a stage has been reached at which it is appropriate to solicit the views of other states.
It is planned that, on or shortly after August 22, copies of the draft statute will be transmitted on a confidential basis to all states members of the United Nations or of its specialized agencies in order that they may express their views. The draft to be made available to such other governments will differ from the statute transmitted to the Soviet Government on July 29 in the following two respects:

a. Article VII (A) 2 will be amended to provide that fire, rather than four, states which are principal producers and contributors of raw materials will be selected for the Board of Governors in category 2; and

b. Annex II will list the names of the states proposed for inclusion on the first Board of Governors in categories 1 and 2. A copy of the draft Annex II as it will be distributed is attached to this note.

With regard to the question of participation in the meeting of experts to be convened in Geneva on August 22, the Government of the United States accepts the suggestion of the Soviet Government that experts from Czechoslovakia also participate. The Government of the United States refers to its proposal in a note dated August 12, 1955, that experts from France be invited, and requests an early statement of the views of the Soviet Government on this proposal and the other proposals relating to arrangements for the technical meeting raised in its note of August 12.

WASHINGTON, August 17, 1955.

[Enclosure]

REVISED DRAFT OF ANNEX II OF THE PROPOSED STATUTE OF AN INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

In accordance with the principles set forth in Article VII, paragraph A, the First Board of Governors shall be constituted as follows:

1. The five members of the Board under Article VII, paragraph A-1, shall be Canada, France, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.
2. The five other members of the Board under Article VII, paragraph A-2, shall be Australia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Portugal, Union of South Africa.
3. Six other members of the Board shall be elected by the General Conference.

SOVIET AIDE MEMOIRE OF OCTOBER 1, 1955

Having familiarized itself with the draft Charter of an International Agency on Atomic Energy, which was appended to the memorandum of the Government of the United States of America of July 29, 1955, and also with amendments to the draft set forth in the memorandum of the Government of the United States of America dated August 17, 1955, the Soviet Government considers that the draft referred to, with certain amendments, can be used as a basis for drawing up a Charter of an International Agency on Atomic Energy. The creation of such an Agency, in the view of the Soviet Government, could have great significance in the matter of the development of international cooperation in the field of peaceful use of atomic energy.

With a view to attracting the widest possible group of interested states to participate in the activity of the Agency, it would be appropriate to take measures so that there should be found in the Charter fuller reflection of certain principles which have, in the view of the Soviet Government, great significance for the development of international cooperation in the field of application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

In this connection, the Soviet Government considers it necessary to make the following observations on the draft Charter of an International Agency on Atomic Energy.

1. Having in view the existing close connection in the production of atomic energy for peaceful as well as military purposes and taking into account the fact that the activity of the Agency in the closest way will be connected with the use of dangerous fissionable materials, it is necessary to insert in the Charter a provision concerning control over the expenditure of materials provided the Agency, having in view not to permit the use of materials for purposes contrary to the peaceful application of atomic energy. It seems appropriate, therefore, to insure the proper observation and control over the work of the Agency on the part of the representative international organ. Proceeding from this, the Government of the Soviet Union considers it necessary that the Agency referred to should be established within the framework.
of the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly. In this connection it is necessary to make provision in the Charter that if in connection with the Agency's activity questions are raised falling within the competence of the Security Council, these questions should be turned over by the Agency for decision to the Security Council, as the organ in which primary responsibility for maintaining peace and international security is placed.

The creation of the Agency within the framework of the United Nations would safeguard appropriate conditions for its work and guarantees of security for states—both members and non-members of the Agency.

2. It is appropriate that the Agency Charter proceed from the recognition of the principle that neither one country nor a group of countries will find itself in a privileged position. This principle must find its expression in the fundamental legal and organizational structure of the Agency. In particular, it is necessary in the Charter to provide for procedure of allotting aid, which would safeguard all states needing aid the possibility of receiving it from the Agency. The Agency should carry out activity in regard to furnishing aid to states in such a way that allotting of aid would not depend on presentation to the country receiving aid of conditions of a political, economic, or military character, or requirements of any other claims inconsistent with the sovereign rights of states.

Any state, even if it is not a member of the United Nations or a specialized agency, must have the right to be among the initiators in the establishment of an International Agency for Atomic Energy.

3. The Soviet Government considers it appropriate that permanent members of the Security Council should be permanent members of the Board of Governors of the Agency and that in the initial membership of the Board of Governors there should be included India, Indonesia, Egypt, and Rumania as members of the Board according to Article VII-A-2.

In this connection it would be appropriate to increase somewhat the number of members of the Board of Governors.

4. In view of the necessity of the existence of control both over the expenditure of dangerous fissionable materials given over to the Agency and over their use by states receiving aid, the Agency should dispose of an appropriate staff of inspectors to whose functions should belong the investigation of atomic installations projected by these states and also the verification of the use of fissionable and other materials and of special equipment received from the Agency. Indicated functions should be accomplished by inspectorial apparatus of the Agency. In corresponding Charter Articles on this question, it is necessary to provide that such observations and control will be accomplished with due observation of sovereign rights of the above-mentioned states and within the framework of an agreement between a given state and the Agency.

5. Concerning the question of Agency finances, it seems appropriate to make provision in the Charter that confirmation of the draft of the budget and also of the scale of assessments of expenses among Agency members, and equally any other decisions on financial questions, should be made both by the general conference and also by the Board of Governors by a majority of three-quarters of the votes.

6. In relation to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court in disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Agency Charter, it is appropriate to make provision that such recognition can take place with the consent of interested parties.

The Soviet Government considers that the insertion of the above-mentioned provisions in the Charter of an International Agency on Atomic Energy would insure the participation of a wider group of states in the Agency's work and thereby would make possible the creation of more favorable conditions for international cooperation in the area of peaceful use of atomic energy, in this new important area of international cooperation of states.

The Soviet Government proposes to call a meeting of experts of governments of most interested states for a joint examination of questions connected with working out of the Charter of an International Agency for Atomic Energy. In this meeting there could participate experts of the United States of America, the USSR, and of all those states with which the United States of America is carrying on negotiations about the formation of an International Agency, and also experts of Czechoslovakia.

Moscow, October 1, 1955.

U.S. NOTE OF JANUARY 27, 1956

The Government of the United States has considered the aide-memoire of October 1, 1955, delivered by the Soviet Government, and circulated at the request of the Soviet Government by the Secretary General of the United Nations on October 19, 1955, and wishes to state the following:

1. The Government of the United States notes that the Soviet Government considers that the draft Statute for an International Atomic Energy Agency which was delivered by the Government of the United States to the Soviet Government on July 29, 1955, as amended by the United States note dated August 17, 1955, can with certain amendments be used as a basis for drawing up a final text of an International Agency Statute.

2. It is further noted that the Soviet aide-memoire emphasizes the need to provide in the Statute for the establishment of a system of inspection and control to investigate atomic installations projected by states receiving aid and to verify the use of fissionable and other materials supplied to such states. The Government of the United States agrees that a system of inspection and control would be useful to prevent international assistance made available for the peaceful uses of atomic energy from being diverted to other than peaceful purposes. It is noted that the Soviet Government believes that the Agency should have an appropriate staff of inspectors and an inspectorial apparatus. The Government of the United States would be pleased to receive for consideration more detailed views of the Soviet Government on the necessary scope of such Agency control and inspection system and the nature of such inspectorial apparatus.
3. It is assumed that this general question together with the other points referred to in the Soviet aide-memoire of October 1, 1955, will be discussed at the working group meeting of the twelve nations now scheduled for February 27, 1956.20

WASHINGTON, January 27, 1956.

SOVIEI AIDE MEMOIRE OF MARCH 20, 1956

Having considered the note of the Government of the United States of America dated January 27, 1956, in which the desire is expressed to get acquainted with the more detailed point of view of the Soviet Government concerning the necessary extent of control on the part of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the inspection system and organization, the Soviet Government wishes to state the following:

The Soviet Government in general has no objections to the extent and character of the Agency's powers in the field of inspection, as they are defined in paragraph D of Article XIII of the draft Statute of the Agency which was distributed by the Government of the U.S.A. on August 22, 1955. However, for the purpose of averting abuses of the right of inspection on the part of the Agency, the Soviet Government considers it necessary that it should be especially stipulated in the Statute that verification and control on the part of the Agency must be carried out with the observance of the sovereign rights of the states receiving aid and within the limits of the agreements between the respective states and the Agency.

The Soviet Government agrees with the opinion of the Government of the U.S.A. that the details of such questions as the extent of control on the part of the Agency, as well as the inspection system and organization, should be discussed at the conference of twelve countries which is now taking place in Washington.

WASHINGTON, March 20, 1956.

U.S. AIDE MEMOIRE OF JUNE 1, 1956

At the meeting between Ambassador Zaroubin and Ambassador Wadsworth21 on March 2, 1956 the following questions were raised:

19 Representatives of the United States, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Portugal, the Soviet Union, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom met at Washington from Feb. 27 to Apr. 18, 1956, at the invitation of the United States and unanimously agreed upon a draft statute of an International Atomic Energy Agency, for submission to an international conference to be held at New York in September 1956. For text of draft statute, see BULLETIN of May 21, 1956, p. 852.


WASHINGTON, June 1, 1956.

SOVIEI AIDE MEMOIRE OF JULY 3, 1956

In reply to the Aide-Memoire of the Department of State dated June 1, 1956, the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics states that the Soviet Government does not object in principle to making a joint study with the Government of the United States and the governments of other countries of the problem of safeguards to insure that special fissionable materials made available by the Agency are not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.

With respect to the proposal of the Government of the United States that the system of safeguards of the International Agency be extended to include bilateral agreements on cooperation in the field of the peaceful use of atomic energy, it is well known that Article III, Paragraph 5 of the draft Statute of the International Agency provides for possible extension of Agency safeguards to cover bilateral agreements. In this connection the Soviet Government believes that the consideration of this problem could be resumed after the Statute of the Agency is adopted by the Conference22 and after it is ratified by the countries involved.

WASHINGTON, July 3, 1956.

U.S. AIDE MEMOIRE OF AUGUST 15, 1956

The Department of State has noted in the aide-memoire of the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of July 3, 1956, replying to the Department of State's aide-memoire of June 1, 1956, that the Soviet Government does not object in principle to making a joint study with the Government of the United States and other interested

governments of the problem of safeguards to ensure that nuclear materials made available by the International Atomic Energy Agency are not used in such a way as to further any military purpose. This willingness to do so is in keeping with the emphasis placed by the Soviet Government in its aide-memoire of October 1, 1955, and on more recent occasions, on the necessity of adequate measures to safeguard peaceful uses assistance against diversion to military purposes.

Assuming that a draft Statute for the Agency will be adopted by the September Conference and will subsequently come into effect, it will still be some time, however, before the safeguards prescribed in the Statute will be operative. As indicated by the first question posed in the Department of State’s aide-memoire of June 1, 1956, the Government of the United States is also interested, therefore, in exploring the possibilities of reaching agreement to standardize the safeguarding terms on which countries would supply on a bilateral basis atomic energy assistance in the peaceful uses field.

In this connection, it is recalled that the Soviet Government in its Memorandum of July 18, 1955, stated that the Soviet Union had already initiated a program for rendering such assistance to a number of states and that it intended to broaden this circle of states.

The Government of the United States has recently entered into bilateral agreements for furnishing certain countries assistance in the application of atomic energy to the production of power. For the information of the Soviet Government, there is enclosed the text of the safeguards provisions (Enclosure One) that have proved acceptable to the governments concerned and have been incorporated into these agreements. These provisions are designed to be substantially the same as those set forth in the draft Statute of the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency.

Canada and the United Kingdom are also making bilateral arrangements for supplying assistance in the peaceful uses field. France, it is understood, has similar plans.

The Government of the United States believes that early agreement on the application, to new bilateral arrangements for peaceful uses assistance, of uniform safeguards no less comprehensive than those now contained in the draft Statute of the Agency, would not only help to assure the future effectiveness of the Agency but would also serve to advance the cause of world security. The Government of the United States, therefore, would like to propose an early commencement of staff level talks to explore the possibility of reaching such agreement.

It is noted in the Soviet aide-memoire of July 3, 1956, that the Soviet Government considers that the question of agreement on Agency application of its safeguards system to bilateral assistance arrangements should be postponed until after the adoption of the draft Statute by the forthcoming International Conference and its ratification by the countries involved. The Government of the United States suggests that this question could be given further consideration as one aspect of the proposed exploratory talks. In this connection, there is also enclosed the text of the provision (Enclosure Two) being included in the United States bilateral agreements concerning the possibility of the future application of safeguards by the Agency.

Canada, France, and the United Kingdom have indicated their interest in participating in such talks.

Assuming that the Soviet Government is also interested, it is proposed that the talks be held in Washington, D.C., in the first part of September. As early a reply as possible would be appreciated.

The question of safeguarding peaceful uses of atomic energy assistance against diversion to military purposes is a matter of great public interest throughout the world. Accordingly, if the Soviet Government sees no objection, it is suggested that the recent exchange of aide-memoire on these proposed talks be made a matter of public record.

WASHINGTON, August 15, 1956.

[Enclosure 1]

ARTICLE INCORPORATED IN BILATERAL AGREEMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES FOR EXTENDING ASSISTANCE IN RELATION TO THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Text of Article on Safeguards

The Government of and the Government of the United States emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XII, by safeguards of the proposed international atomic energy agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

1. With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (i) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the United States Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate or process any of the following materials so made available, source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or any other material designated by the United States Commission.

2. With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available: (i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission, (ii) reactors, (iii) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provision of this subparagraph A-2 will
apply, (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in insuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of ____________ or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guarantees set forth in article XIV;

3. To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A-2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in ____________ and which is not purchased pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties;

4. To designate, after consultation with the Government of ____________, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of ____________, shall have access in ____________ to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A-2 of this Article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

5. In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guarantees set forth in article XIV and the failure of the Government of ____________ to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A-2 of this article;

6. To consult with the government of ____________ in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of ____________ undertake to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

[Enclosure 2]

ARTICLE INCORPORATED IN BILATERAL AGREEMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES FOR EXTENDING ASSISTANCE IN RELATION TO PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Text of Article on International Atomic Energy Agency

The Government of ____________ and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

1. The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this agreement for cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards, including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

2. In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of ____________ shall return to the United States Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

SOVIET AIDE MEMOIRE OF SEPTEMBER 24, 1956

In its Aide-Memoire of August 15, 1956, the Department of State raises the question of the standardization of safeguards against the utilization for military purposes of assistance rendered under bilateral agreements on the peaceful use of atomic energy even before the Statute of the International Agency and corresponding safeguards provided by it enter into force. This Aide-Memoire also raises the question of the extension, after the Statute enters into force, of the system of safeguards provided by the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency to bilateral agreements on such safeguards.

The Soviet Government has no objection to the proposal of the United States Government for a study of the possibility of standardizing safeguards. Taking into consideration the fact that the question of safeguards directly affects the interests of all countries receiving assistance, the Soviet Government deems it desirable to consider this question in participation with the nations represented at the General Conference on the Statute of the International Agency, as well as with other interested nations. The desirability of such a procedure in studying this question is dictated by the fact that, as is well known, the governments of a number of nations express certain considerations concerning the safeguards—considerations which must be taken into account.

As far as the question of the extension of the system of safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency to bilateral agreements is concerned, the consideration of this question, in the opinion of the Soviet Government, could be taken up after the Statute of the Agency is adopted, taking into account the results of the Conference, after the necessary ratification of the Statute.

The Soviet Government has no objection to the publication of the recently exchanged Aide-Memoire concerning safeguards.

WASHINGTON, September 24, 1956.

13 Handed by the Counselor of the Soviet Embassy, Sergei R. Striganov, to Under Secretary Hoover.
Need for Reunifying Germany Through Free Elections

Press release 531 dated October 10

U.S. NOTE TO GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

The following note was delivered by the Government of the United States to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany at Washington on October 9.

The Government of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Federal Government’s note of September 2, 1956, which enclosed a copy of the memorandum addressed to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the question of the reunification of Germany.¹

The Government of the United States fully shares the Federal Government’s view that it is incumbent upon the four powers to fulfill the task undertaken by them in the directive issued by the Heads of Government at Geneva in July 1955 for the reunification of Germany by means of free elections carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security. This is a task which, as the note of the Federal Government points out, cannot be adequately fulfilled “by mere assent to the principle of reunification, without any agreements being reached regarding practical ways and means of realizing it.”

The achievement of German reunification in freedom is a fundamental goal of United States policy. Together with the governments of France and the United Kingdom, the Government of the United States put forward proposals at the Geneva meeting of Foreign Ministers in 1955 for the reunification of Germany by free elections and for a treaty of assurance giving the Soviet Union far-reaching security safeguards when Germany was reunified. So far, however, the Soviet Government has refused to discuss these proposals. The Government of the United States nevertheless continues to hope that the Soviet Government will fulfill its responsibilities in accordance with the agreement reached by the Heads of Government. For its part, the Government of the United States will not cease to pursue its efforts to achieve the reunification of Germany, the continued division of which constitutes a grave injustice to the German people and makes impossible the establishment of a basis for lasting peace and security in Europe.

To this end, the Government of the United States welcomes the initiative taken by the Federal Government and shares the desire set forth in the latter’s memorandum that it may lead to an exchange of views which might promote agreement among the Four Powers on reunification, as well as on a sound system of European security, which can be achieved only if Germany is reunited.

In transmitting to the Soviet Government a copy of its reply to the note of the Federal Government, the Government of the United States is conveying the hope that the Soviet Government will respond to the initiative of the Federal Government in such a way that the Four Powers may be able to give effect to the agreement made at Geneva to achieve the reunification of Germany by means of free elections.

U.S. NOTE TO U.S.S.R.

The following note was delivered by the U.S. Embassy at Moscow to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on October 10. Parallel notes were delivered at the same time to the Soviet Government by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom.

The Government of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to refer to the memorandum which was addressed to the Soviet Government on the second of September by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and of which a copy was sent to the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States now has the honor to transmit to the Soviet Government a copy of the reply which it has returned to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Government of the United States attaches great importance to the reunification of Germany, which is a basic objective of its policy. It is con-

vined that the continued division of Germany must be brought to an end in the interests not only of the Germans themselves but of all nations anxious to safeguard the peace of Europe. The Governments of France, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States have on various occasions acknowledged their responsibility for bringing about the reunification of Germany, and agreed in the directive given by the Heads of Government of the Four Powers to their Foreign Ministers in July 1955 to carry out this responsibility. No progress has been made since then. The detailed proposals put forward by the Western Powers at the subsequent Foreign Ministers' Conference, which were designed both to end the division of Germany and to establish a firm system of European security, have met with no affirmative response from the Soviet Union.

The Government of the United States therefore hopes that the Soviet Government will give careful consideration to the German memorandum and will, in response to the initiative taken by the Federal Government, state its view as to how effect can be given to the agreement made by the four Heads of Government at Geneva to restore German unity by means of free elections.

Military Procurement Agreement With Germany

Press release 538 dated October 12

An agreement on procedures for the sale by the United States to the Federal Republic of Germany of military equipment, materials, and services was signed by Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., and German Ambassador Heinz L. Krekeler in Washington, October 8, 1956. The agreement establishes arrangements for payment for the material, control and inspection, shipping, and other procedural arrangements relating to sales to the Federal Republic pursuant to section 106 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

Controls Over Dollar Imports Relaxed by Austria

The Department of Commerce and the Department of State (press release 532) announced on October 11 that a significant expansion of the list of items which may now be imported into Austria from the dollar area without import licenses has been decided by the Austrian Cabinet and will become effective on October 15. At that time the Austrian "Dollar Liberalization List" will be expanded to include approximately 40 percent of Austrian imports from the dollar area based on imports in 1953.

As only 8 percent of Austria's dollar imports had previously been free from quantitative restrictions, this new action is an important step toward reestablishing free, competitive trade between Austria and the United States without discrimination against dollar goods.

Included in the new liberalization list are many types of industrial machinery and various ores, cotton (as of January 1, 1957), wool, iron and steel sheets, ferro alloys, crude oil and fuel oil, vehicle tires weighing more than 100 kilograms, some leathers, hides, and skins, various agricultural machinery items, and textile machinery and equipment. Also included are electric motors, television transmitters, tape recorders, X-ray tubes and film, electric razors, electric room heaters, dish-cleaning machinery, spare parts for automobiles, car heaters, typewriters and calculating machines, cameras, various chemical products, railroad engines and steam engines, books and magazines, gutta-percha, and cocoa beans.

It is expected that a copy of the new Austrian "Dollar Liberalization List" (in German) will soon be available for consultation in the European Division, Bureau of Foreign Commerce. Announcement of the arrival of this list will be made in the Foreign Commerce Weekly.

United States To Participate in Tangier Conference

The Department of State announced on October 8 (press release 528) that Cavendish W. Cannon, Ambassador at Rabat, would head the U.S. delegation to a conference opened that day at Fedala by the Sultan of Morocco. The Moroccan Government has invited to this meeting the representatives of the eight powers now participating in the international administration at Tangier. The purpose of the conference is to negotiate a settlement of questions raised by the reintegration of Tangier into Morocco and to examine possibilities for preserving the benefits of the special economic and financial regime characteristic of Tangier.
Working sessions of the conference will be held in Tangier. In addition to the host Government, the participants are Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

In addition to Ambassador Cannon, the U.S. delegation includes the following advisers:

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., Consul-General of the United States at Tangier
John M. Raymond, Acting Deputy Legal Adviser, Department of State
Joseph M. Sweeney, Professor of International Law, New York University; consultant, Department of State
Harold Wright, Telecommunications Adviser, U.S. Information Agency
John Parke Young, Chief, International Finance Division, Department of State

Alfred J. Erdos of the Office of International Conferences of the Department of State will serve as secretary to the delegation.

**Special Committee on Question of Defining Aggression**

The Department of State announced on October 8 (press release 529) that William Sanders has been designated U.S. representative on the 1956 Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression. This Committee was established by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its ninth session. The Committee will report to the eleventh session, which meets in November.

The Special Committee will hold a series of meetings at the United Nations Headquarters in New York beginning on October 8.

**IFC Designated as Public International Organization**

**WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT**

White House press release dated October 4

The President on October 2 issued an Executive order designating the International Finance Corporation as a public international organization entitled to the benefits of the International Organizations Immunities Act of December 29, 1945.

The International Organizations Immunities Act provides that certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities shall be extended to such public international organizations as shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order, and to their officers and employees and the representatives of the member states to such organizations.

The International Finance Corporation is a new international organization closely affiliated with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The United States became a member of the Corporation pursuant to the act of August 11, 1955, and the Corporation was formally established on July 25, 1956, with headquarters in Washington. The objective of the new organization is to encourage the growth of private enterprise by providing, in association with local and foreign investors, risk capital for financing the establishment, improvement, and expansion of productive private enterprises in member countries when other sources of funds are not available on reasonable terms.

The designation made by the Executive order will extend to the International Finance Corporation the same benefits as were extended in 1946 to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

**EXECUTIVE ORDER 10680**

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act, approved December 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 669), and having found that the United States participates in the International Finance Corporation under the authority of the act of Congress approved August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 669), I hereby designate the International Finance Corporation as a public international organization entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the said International Organizations Immunities Act.

The designation of the International Finance Corporation made by this order is not intended to abridge in any respect privileges, exemptions, and immunities which such corporation may have acquired or may acquire by treaty or congressional action; nor shall such designation be construed to affect in any way the applicability of the provisions of section 3, article VI, of the Articles of Agreement of the Corporation deposited in the archives of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

**The White House**

October 2, 1956.


\(^{1}\) 21 Fed. Reg. 7047.
U.S. Economic Policy and Programs in the Far East

by Howard P. Jones
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Economic Affairs

This morning I shall endeavor to outline some of the economic aspects of what your Government is trying to do toward maintaining the independence of the free nations of the Far East and to describe something of the political climate in which we must work. In approaching this subject, I shall focus to some extent upon the Philippines as an example of how we work in partnership with these free nations. The accomplishments of the Philippines since independence are well known to most of us here, as well as the part played in those accomplishments by our distinguished friend and colleague, Governor Cuaderno, who shares this platform.

I shall start out by making two assumptions: first, that the problems which face us in Asia and the major trends in Asia are well known to this group, and I shall therefore not take up time in preliminary analysis; second, that your main interest in what a representative of the Department of State may say will center around the question, "What is your Government doing about it?"

American policy in the Far East can be stated very simply. It is to strengthen the countries of the free world, and to curb the power and prevent expansion of communism. To do this, it is essential to help the people of free Asia in their aspirations for independence and a better life in an atmosphere of peace and prosperity while at the same time insuring military strength adequate to resist aggression. The mutual security program, through technical and economic development assistance, is helping them to achieve their objectives. The military assistance part of the program is assisting some of these countries in maintaining internal order and security and in creating a first line of defense against aggression while they build up internally.

These Asian people must have hope that they will be more secure and better off tomorrow than they are today. So long as this hope exists, we may assume that, barring aggression, these free nations will remain free. There will be no reason for them to succumb to the blandishments of communism. And thus our aid programs, in helping the governments of these countries to make such faith and hope possible, are forwarding United States objectives.

You have all heard so much about the mutual security aspects of our foreign economic aid programs so often, that the words may have lost their meaning. The essence of the relationship, however, between the U.S. Government and these governments is one of partnership in achieving a mutually desired goal. But what are these programs? What do they accomplish?

Our foreign economic aid program is a diversified portfolio. Economic aid extended by our Government to the countries of the Far East consists of grants for programs of technical assistance or "know-how." It consists also of grants and loans (repayable in dollars or local currency) for economic development programs. It includes development loans by our Export-Import Bank.

We also sell our agricultural food surpluses for local currency. Then, usually, we reloan the bulk of this money on a long-term basis to the Asian...
governments for economic development. We also have programs for the exchange of teachers and students. We offer financial and other assistance in the building of nuclear research reactors. We train scientists under the U.S. atoms-for-peace program.

In addition to what we do on a bilateral or country-to-country basis, we contribute to the fine work being done by the United Nations and its associated organizations and to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These programs are, of course, substantially supplemented by American private resources made available through private investment in the area as well as through the important work being done in Asia by such private organizations as the Ford, Rockefeller, and Armour Foundations.

In order to encourage private American investment, we have endeavored to negotiate investment-guaranty agreements. Because we recognize the advantages of cooperation among free Asian countries, we have a special fund to foster regional cooperation for expanding economic growth in Asia. This fund is being used, among other purposes, a central regional nuclear research and training center soon to be established in the Philippines. Another example of a project under this fund is the development of a regional telecommunications system to link Thailand, Laos, Viet-Nam, and other countries in Asia more closely together. There is not a free country in Asia which has not benefited from at least a part of this portfolio.

What the United States does serves only as a supplement to what the peoples of Asia themselves do. Theirs is the effort. We can only help. But this help can mean the difference between success or failure for these countries—between remaining free and succumbing to Communist pressures. At the least we can know that the progress which has been made in the economies of Asia has been in some part the result of our contribution.

Economic Aid to the Philippines

But even these are generalizations. Let us be more specific. This is a Philippine discussion. Let me use the Philippines as an example of America’s response to the problems of underdevelopment and see how the economic aid program in the Philippines is assisting the Philippine Government to that end. Please note again that I said “assisting the Philippine Government,” for the major responsibility is in the hands of the individual governments which are hosts to our aid programs. And no aid program can accomplish much unless, working as partners with us, the governments concerned take the action necessary to encourage economic development. By the same token, the credit for accomplishment goes, and should go, not primarily to the country which makes the aid available or to the American administrators of such a program but rather to the officials of the governments directly concerned. The assistance program is in fact a joint enterprise between the recipient government and the U.S. Government, and no projects or programs are ever undertaken which do not have the full support of these governments and on which, consequently, there is complete mutual agreement.

It is readily apparent to even the most cursory observer of the Philippine scene that it is essential that there be improvement in the lot of the rural inhabitants of the Philippines. This is necessary both for political stability and for economic development. Since the vast majority of Filipinos are dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood, it is essential to raise living standards in the rural areas if the internal market in the Philippines is to grow and thus attract increased investment. President Magsaysay is strongly encouraging a rural development program designed to accelerate the development of a self-reliant citizenry capable of increasing their living standards through administering self-help programs.

United States economic assistance in the rural development field is designed to encourage this self-help process. Typical projects include the assistance of rural credit and marketing cooperatives, irrigation, and agricultural extension services; also, local health centers. Available evidence indicates there has been a measurable improvement in the conditions in those barrios where the rural development program has operated for some time.

The interest of the Philippine Government in this program is shown by its plans to spend more than $40 million over the next 5 years for expanded rural community development. The training for the expanded rural development project was begun at the Agricultural College at Los Banos in April of this year. Plans have been considered for two additional training centers. In view of the importance of this program and
its expected benefit to the Philippines, the United States provided an additional $4.2 million in fiscal year 1956 to help meet initial local costs for essential training.

In addition to the assistance given to the rural areas which endeavors to increase income levels, I should like to spend a few moments describing what the Philippine Government and the United States economic assistance program jointly are accomplishing in directly assisting industrial development. It is of particular interest in view of the criticism by some Filipinos that the United States aid program is placing too much emphasis on agriculture.

**Industrial Development Center**

In February 1955, the Industrial Development Center (I典礼) was established. The purpose of this center is to stimulate private investment in small and medium-sized industry through providing financial assistance and technical advisory services for prospective investors and local industries. In this fashion, American aid encourages local private investment in industry by providing financial and technical assistance.

An industrial loan fund was established to supply qualified enterprises with peso financing in order to help overcome the shortage of capital. The banks are encouraged to change their lending habits and make funds available to industrial enterprises. This is done by making time deposits available to the banks from counterpart funds equal to the size of the banks' loans to the borrowing firms. In the 6-month period from August 1955 to February 1956, 90 manufacturing firms received financing aid; 51 of these were new establishments.

In March 1956, the Export-Import Bank extended a $65 million line of credit to the Philippines. This included a $15 million line of credit for importing capital goods from the United States for I典礼-type projects. The I典礼 has been given the responsibility for processing for subsequent approval by the Central Bank all applications for credit under this $15 million program.

In order to alleviate the problems created by the shortage of qualified technicians in the Philippines, the I典礼's Engineering and Technology Department is giving technical-engineering assistance to firms in fields as diverse as brickmaking machinery, electroplating, and chemical-product manufacture. The I典礼 is also engaged in advising manufacturers in accounting procedures and cost control. Another function which has given promise of being of considerable benefit to industry in the Philippines is the training of industrial supervisors by the I典礼's Institute for Industrial Supervisors. It thus may be seen that the U.S. aid program in the Philippines jointly with the Philippine Government is attacking each of the major bottlenecks—the lack of balance and diversification in the economy, the lack of trained personnel and lack of capital, the low productivity and low income levels.

**How successful is this program? How well is it performing its function of encouraging private investment and thus advancing the economic progress of the Philippines?** Unfortunately, there is no way of measuring what the results would have been if there had been no program in the Philippines. All we can do is to look at the economy of the Philippines and decide if it is stagnating, retrogressing, or moving forward. Examination of the available statistics leads to the optimistic conclusion that the Philippines has embarked on the right road to economic advancement.

The latest information indicates that the general expansion of economic activity which has been present in the Philippines for the past 2 years is continuing. All of us here are aware of the new industries continually being established in the Philippines. Manufacturing activity is reported to be about 20 percent higher than the same period of last year. Investment, as measured by the paid-up capital of newly registered corporations and partnerships in the second quarter of 1956, was almost 50 percent above the second quarter of 1955.

There are, of course, serious dangers ahead. But there is every reason to believe that the Philippine Government will follow an economic course which will bring a more plentiful life to all Filipinos, and, at the same time, increase the strength and already high prestige of the Philippines throughout the world.

**Other Aid Programs**

**Viet-Nam**

So much for the Philippines. Let us take a look at the accomplishments of another type of program. A little over a year ago, the newly inde-
dependent government of Viet-Nam was fighting for its life. It was faced with the military and subversion threat of the Communists to the north of the 17th parallel; it was confronted with internal strife. Self-seeking religious sects were challenging the government with their own armies. Hundreds of thousands of refugees who had fled from the Communists in the north had to be cared for and resettled. The problems facing this new nation were well nigh overwhelming.

What is the situation today? We now find a firmly entrenched nationalist government under the leadership of President Diem. This government has proved its capacity not only to survive in face of Communist subversive efforts but to assume the responsibilities of independence, including the holding of free elections for an assembly which is now drafting a constitution for a free Viet-Nam.

The American aid program, concentrating on:

(1) strengthening the internal security of the country,
(2) assisting in the resettlement of the 800,000 refugees,
(3) aiding the Viet-Nam government in stabilizing and developing the economy,

was a factor in this achievement.

**Indonesia**

In Indonesia the American aid program, apart from our agricultural disposal program, has been largely in the form of technical assistance. A brief recital of some of the accomplishments of that program may bring home to us the significance of these efforts.

Malaria in Indonesia is called the swamp dragon. It is the most feared and most common disease. It has been estimated that 30 million people in Indonesia 5 years ago were under constant exposure to malaria. Four years ago in some areas of east Java, one baby in two was destined to have malaria before he reached his first birthday. Most children born today in these same areas will never have the disease. Extensive checks made last year in controlled parts of east Java failed to find a single case of malaria among children born after three annual DDT sprayings of the area. The disease chain had been broken. Under the cooperative Indonesian-American control program, four million Indonesians have been so protected from malaria. The gains come not alone in better health and happier people. The program is conservatively estimated to be responsible for an annual increase in rice production of 58,000 tons, or more than 2 days' rice ration for every man, woman, and child in Indonesia. In one area alone, over 50,000 acres of land abandoned because of malaria have been put back into production. This program is currently being expanded, and it is estimated that 4 years from now the danger of succumbing to malaria will have been practically eliminated for the 80 million people of Indonesia.

Indonesia is one country of the Far East which still has a frontier. The young man of Indonesia can in fact "go west." Thousands of acres of land in Sumatra, Sumbawa, Sulawesi, and other islands are yielding to the advance of agricultural machinery piloted by young Indonesians who are, directly or indirectly, U.S.-trained. Last year some 30,000 families went "west" and established new farms in frontier areas.

Most Indonesians are farmers. Holdings are small, frequently no larger than one acre; the farmer's problem is simply that of increasing production on his own piece of land so that his family may have a better living. The farmer's problem is also the Government's problem, because insufficient agricultural production in Indonesia has necessitated large food imports requiring foreign exchange which the young nation needs to spend on the import of capital goods.

As a result of research by the Indonesian Agriculture Research Station in Bogor, which has two U. S. rice-breeding specialists on its staff, purified rice seed has been developed which produces 333/4 percent higher yields per acre. Approximately one-third of the farmers on Java are already using this purified seed. U.S. corn breeders working with their Indonesian counterparts have developed a new variety of corn which has already proved able to produce 300 percent higher yields than indigenous varieties. The U.S. program in Indonesia has helped set up mechanized production units in cottage industry villages; assisted in the Indonesian Government's loan fund, which extends credit to private industry to mechanize its operations; provided consulting services for privately owned factories; and assisted the Government in the exploration of its natural resources. Improvements made at Tandjong Priok, Djakarta's harbor, in efficient handling of cargo have
resulted in a saving of a total of $8 million over a 15-month period.

Finally, Indonesia is being assisted in the vital area of education—in vocational education at the trade-school level and higher education in the fields of medicine, engineering, and agriculture.

These are just samples selected at random, but they may serve to illustrate what is being done.

Private Foreign Investment

One of the great forces in Asia today is nationalism. Nationalism is a positive force. It can be a great constructive force. But there are some in Asia who are demanding bans against foreign investments, who are urging their governments to amplify their role as entrepreneurs, and who maintain that all important sectors of the national economy should be in the hands of nationals of the country, not outsiders. And at this point I should like to emphasize that there are some things economic aid on a government-to-government basis cannot do.

Economic aid in any form must be marginal. A priceless component of economic progress in a free society is the impetus and drive of private capital. It is a heartening fact that virtually all the free countries of Asia are now themselves taking steps to encourage and stimulate the growth of a private, indigenous, entrepreneurial community. In almost every one of these countries there are now special institutions or programs to assist would-be local private investors in financing new productive enterprises. Burma and now Laos are the most recent examples of countries undertaking such a program.

As highly desirable as private local investment is, however, it still is unable to inject into the national economies of these countries many of the modern skills, technical knowledge, and the large sums of capital and foreign exchange required for large-scale enterprises. The one best and by all odds most efficient source for this is private foreign investment. There are today ample capital, managerial, and technical skills available in private industry to do the job that has to be done in Asia. But these skills are not present to any degree in Asia as of today.

The question may properly be asked, Why should the United States Government through taxation funnel American capital into Asian countries as, at best, a poor substitute for what private American investors themselves could do? Is it because our private investment capital won’t go there? Because these countries are suspicious of private foreign entrepreneurs and won’t let them in? Because they are suspicious of the West? Because these countries believe in socialism and insist on government operation of enterprises that are privately owned in most Western countries? Because they are nationalistic and insist on running their own economic as well as political affairs?

Some of these answers apply in some countries; others, in other countries. Whatever the reasons, they are likely to be based more upon fear than upon reality. The United States itself was to a significant degree built by British and European capital. In 1790, the year after the United States of America came into being, total foreign assets in the United States (about $75 million) comprised as much as 10 percent of our total national wealth. During the 19th century net foreign capital amounting to over $3 billion poured into the United States; yet the percentage of foreign assets had fallen early in the 19th century to 4 percent of our total national wealth and remained at approximately that figure throughout the century.

What happened was that we used this foreign investment as a nucleus, around which our national economy grew. By 1955 total foreign assets in the U.S. were estimated at about $29.6 billion, yet this amount was only about 2 percent of our national wealth. The less developed countries of today can utilize foreign capital in the same way. Private foreign investment should properly be judged less by its effect upon the balance of payments, through profit remittances, than by the catalytic effect which it may have upon the increase in the rate of growth of national income. It is your job and mine to help remove the fear which is forestalling private capital from moving into and being accepted by Asia. It is our job to convince the leaders of these nations that there is more mutual aid in foreign private investment for productive purposes which does not intrude upon national objectives than there is in all the governmental aid programs in the world—sound though the latter may be and proud though we as Americans can be of the part our country is playing in extending this aid.
Let me cite just one small instance. I shall not mention the country, but in one underdeveloped nation last year a single American industry began investments of more than $160 million. In this same country, the United States aid program, making an important contribution too, totaled little more than $10 million a year. This puts the matter in proper perspective, providing a hint as to what these countries might anticipate from private foreign investment, once they establish a climate in which it can operate. And it should not be forgotten that, in addition to providing basic facilities in the country, employment, and technical education for the workers, the government itself gains at once and substantially through its power of taxation. The arrangement is one of mutual benefit and should be so regarded.

New Communist Tactics

This brief examination of "what your Government is doing about it" can perhaps be made more meaningful by some reference to the new Communist tactics in the Far East.

To the leaders in the Kremlin, ever eager to capitalize on situations of weakness, the mass Asian frustration over their economic lot must have seemed readymade for the Communists' exploitation. Almost as soon as mainland China became Communist, it began to flood free Asia with propaganda of fantastic achievements which the Communists asserted were the fruits of a Marxian approach. That many of the claims were beyond the realm of plausibility did not wholly detract from their propaganda value among the unsophisticated and those yearning for, and ever ready to believe that there might be, an economic panacea. Until 1955, however, the Communist bloc largely limited itself to eulogies of its achievements and to admonitions to the free Asian countries not to accept foreign aid lest they lose their independence and revert to their colonial status. The Communists shed crocodile tears for the plight of the underdeveloped countries. Since they gave no foreign aid themselves, they denounced it as iniquitous and an instrument of imperialism.

Speaking at the 6th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1951, the Soviet delegate decried all Western aid to the underdeveloped countries and stated, "the underdeveloped countries should not respond to the blackmail practiced against them in the guise of technical assistance." He warned the underdeveloped countries that "the United States and the United Kingdom had greater interest in exporting capital than the underdeveloped countries had in importing such funds." He urged instead that the countries achieve their economic progress through the sweat of their own efforts.

This was typical of the Communist line until the end of 1954. Communist trade with the Far East up to that point was negligible and consisted primarily of samples of industrial equipment which could not be bought.

Suddenly the Communist line shifted. The Soviet economic policy veered from one of autarchic within the Soviet bloc to a view that foreign trade is both an "organic part of the socialist economic system" and "an integral element of Soviet foreign policy." Soviet trade groups and economic missions suddenly arrived on the Asian scene. That genial pair of salesmen, Bulganin and Khrushchev, took the long trip to the Far East to drum up business.

As a result, the bloc countries now have trade agreements with five of the countries of the Far East and South Asia: Burma and India each have 8 and Indonesia has 7; Ceylon 6; and Cambodia one. Such agreements generally do not go beyond specifying amounts and types of goods for which the two countries involved will provide official trading facilities. They do not assure that trade will reach the specified levels, and in actual practice exchanges have often been much lower. In effect, these much-touted trade agreements amount to little more than simple declarations of intent to trade. Nevertheless, the Sino-Soviet bloc's trade with free Asia has been increasing. For South Asia and the Far East taken together, the value of this trade has increased about 20 percent above the level in 1953. However, it still remains a small percentage of free Asia's total trade.

In its trade drive, the bloc has based much of its appeal on the needs of underdeveloped countries to expand their markets for agricultural products and to stabilize their export earnings. They were not deterred from doing this by the fact that in previous years they had consistently denounced Asia's trade with the West on the grounds that that trade consisted primarily of agricultural and other raw materials and was therefore colonial in nature. This was overlooked, however, by much of Asia when the bloc publicized its willingness to take agricultural commodities in surplus in free
Asia—sometimes at premium prices, as in the case of Ceylon rubber. State trading organizations have stood ready to carry out central decisions rapidly, and all the organs of Communist propaganda lost little time in playing up the advantages of such trade and in fanning already strong prejudices against Western economic policies—particularly surplus-disposal programs and various aspects of U.S. aid policy.

The Sino-Soviet bloc, however, has not had unqualified smooth sailing. There has been dissatisfaction in Burma with Communist barter arrangements. The former Prime Minister of Burma has been quoted as saying that “anyone who takes barter when he can get cash is out of his mind.” The Burmese have found the Communist goods overpriced for their quality and uncertain as to delivery. Much-advertised large Russian shipments of cement turned into an utter fiasco when the cement caked on the docks because of improper packing and became unusable. Fountain pens manufactured in Communist China proved balky when applied to paper. Burma disposed of large quantities of its surplus rice to China but could scarcely have been pleased when Communist China turned around and exported rice to Burma’s traditional cash customers.

The final score on this Communist game of “clap in, clap out” is not yet in. The Communists are intensifying their trade efforts. In this arena the competition is between Communist bureaucrats and American and other Western private businessmen. Even though the Communist competition is likely to be anything but fair, we have no fear of the outcome.

There is another aspect of this problem to which we all need to be alert. The Chinese Communists are buying rice from Burma at fictitious prices and selling rice to Burma’s own customers—Ceylon and Pakistan. They are even selling some rice to Japan. This is better than a triple play; it helps entangle the free countries in the Communist economic spider web and reduces the amount of rice Taiwan and other free countries such as Burma, Thailand, and the United States can sell to Japan.

While this is going on, an intensive effort is under way to invade Southeast Asian markets and incidentally elbow out Japan. Red China consumer goods—from bicycles to bandanas—are beginning to pour into such centers as Bangkok and Singapore. The goods are priced below the market, but the quality is poor. A large thermos bottle, for example, is priced at less than $1.00 U.S., but purchasers find it only lasts a short time. Both bear and artificially favorable terms play their part in this campaign. Chinese merchants are assigned quotas by the Communists, and the goods are delivered on consignment.

Perhaps even more spectacular than the Communist trade offensive is the completely new face which the Communists are showing in extending foreign aid. It is a sobering fact that since 1954 members of the Sino-Soviet bloc, after years of denouncing foreign aid as an unvarnished instrument of Western imperialism, have agreed to extend to 11 underdeveloped countries in the world the equivalent of $1 billion in credits for the purchase of Communist goods and technical services. The bulk of these credits have gone to Yugoslavia, Egypt, India, and Afghanistan. Indonesia and Cambodia have now been added to this list. Indonesia recently agreed to accept a line of credit from Soviet Russia equivalent to $100 million. According to the announcement, the terms of the loan call for 2½ percent annual interest to be repaid in 12 years in commodities, pounds sterling, or other convertible currency. The individual projects for which the credit is to be utilized are to be agreed upon by the two governments.

In assessing the attractiveness of the Russian economic aid offers, it is well to bear in mind that, although the Communists offer interest at 2 percent and 2½ percent, their loans are generally payable within 10 to 15 years and usually do not provide for any grace period before the beginning of payments on principal. Under our mutual security program, the United States makes 40-year loans with interest at 3 percent if repaid in dollars or 4 percent if repaid in local currency. The development loans of our own Export-Import Bank, although they currently bear a somewhat higher rate of interest, are often for a longer term than are the Communist offers and usually provide for some grace period.

These new Communist efforts need not throw us off stride. It is important for us not to outbid but to outperform the Communists. As President Eisenhower pointed out in his message to Congress on the Mutual Security Act last March 19, “Our programs which were conceived in the common

\[4 \text{Ibid., p. 545.}\]
interests of the free nations must go ahead affirmatively... to meet the common need.” Indeed, one of the surest indications that our programs have been sound and have been serving to strengthen the cause of freedom in Asia is the very fact that the international Communists have now felt compelled to undertake a program which superficially resembles our own.

Enough has been said to give a brief glimpse of some of the things your Government is doing to meet the basic problems of the Far East, and to outline the political climate in which it works. I return to the theme with which I started—it is the policy of the United States Government to strengthen the governments of the free world and to curb the power and curtail the influence of the Communists. To accomplish this, it is essential to assist the governments of Asia in insuring that their people have hope that they will be more secure and better off tomorrow than they are today. If we remain steadfast in this policy, we may assume that, barring aggression, these free nations will remain free. As a partner in a great enterprise, the U.S. Government is helping the free countries of Asia to help themselves in the realization of this goal.

Advancing the Security of the Free World

EXCERPTS FROM THE TENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Tenth Semian-
nual Report on the operations of the Mutual Secu-

rity Program, for the period January 1, 1956

through June 30, 1956.

The accomplishments during this six-month
period under this program of mutual effort have
further advanced the security, the economic prog-
ress and the well-being of the United States and
our partners in the free world.

The White House,
September 20, 1956

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE HALF-YEAR JANUARY–
JUNE 1956

Factors Affecting Mutual Security Policies

The basic reasons for the mutual security pro-
gram are clear. They have been spelled out many
times in previous semianual reports and discussed
thoroughly and extensively by the President, the
Secretary of State, and various congressional com-
mittees. Summed up in one sentence, the program
rests on the simple and hard fact that United
States long-term security and welfare are insepa-
rably interwoven with the security and welfare of
other free nations just as their security and welfare
are tied in with ours.

The reasons why it is in the best interests of the
United States to carry on the cooperative military
and economic effort with other independent na-
tions were reiterated in March by the President in
these words:

... because there are still nations that are eager to
strive with us for peace and freedom but, without our
help, lack the means of doing so.

... because there are still forces hostile to freedom
that compel the free world to maintain adequate and co-
ordinated power to deter aggression.

... because there are still peoples who aspire to sus-
train their freedom but confront economic obstacles that
are beyond their capabilities of surmounting alone.

1H. Doc. 481, 84th Cong., 2d sess.; transmitted on
Sept. 24. Reprinted here are excerpts from section I of
the report, “Highlights of the Half-Year January–June
1956,” and section II, “Use of Funds in Fiscal Year 1956.”
The remaining two sections deal with program activities
in selected countries and with other aspects of the pro-
gram, including investment guaranty insurance, liaison
with U.S. business firms, and the escapee program.

2From the President’s message to Congress on the mu-
tual security program, March 1956 (Bulletin of Apr. 2,
1956, p. 545).

Department of State Bulletin
These facts are as fundamental to our own security and well-being as the maintenance of our own armed forces.

**Mutuality of Effort**

One point should be strongly underlined. The "mutual" element in the mutual security plan is the key to the achievement of the "security" it seeks. By pooling its particular capabilities and resources and working in concert toward common goals, each nation participating in the program can achieve far more in terms of true military and economic security than it could obtain solely through its own efforts, and at considerably less cost to itself. This applies as well to the United States as to the other nations in the program.

The concept of mutuality in our program operations is illustrated by the following facts:

- During the 6 years of the Nato defense buildup, European Nato nations have paid for 85 percent of the total cost; they have supplied 60 percent of the materiel used by European Nato forces; and they have provided the bulk of the manpower assigned or earmarked to Nato commanders.

- In addition to men and funds, nations in Europe are furnishing bases and facilities for U.S. troops stationed abroad. A large number of these bases and facilities are being provided under the Nato infrastructure program to which the United States has contributed about 38 percent of the cost. To date, over 140 airfields have been constructed under this program, many of which are occupied by units of the United States Air Force. In time of emergency, all these bases and facilities will be available to us. Without these bases, the effectiveness of our principal deterrent, our nuclear retaliatory power, would be seriously impaired.

- European countries generally are maintaining their defense expenditures at a high level. In 1954 and 1955, these expenditures averaged about $12 billion a year, only a moderate decline from the postwar peak of $12.8 billion in 1953. Total defense expenditures for Nato countries are again rising and are now estimated to be running at a rate of $13 billion annually; U.S. military assistance furnished to these countries amounted to $1.9 billion in 1955.

- In the Middle East and South Asia, the major portion of U.S. military assistance goes to four countries—Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. Defense expenditures of these countries in the 1956 fiscal year are estimated at substantially more than double the value of military aid delivered by the United States. Greece and Turkey are making their military contributions to Nato. Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey, as members of the Baghdad Pact, have assumed responsibility in the collective defense of the Middle East area, so vital to the interests of the United States and other Western nations.

- In the Far East, South Korea, Taiwan, and free Viet-Nam are devoting 50 to 60 percent of their budgetary expenditure to defense, maintaining large military forces to guard that important area against Communist aggression. U.S. contributions of military items and economic assistance enable those nations to place their forces in strategic positions for the defense of the free world.

- While the United States is contributing a portion of the financial resources as well as the technical advice required for economic development, generally the bulk of the investment is provided by the participating countries themselves. For example, the U.S. contribution to India’s first five-year plan has been about 6 percent of the total expenditure involved. In the 1956 fiscal year, the Philippines Government contributed more than 70 percent of the total cost of joint economic development projects in which the United States participated.

- In Latin America, where technical cooperation is the most widespread element of the mutual security program, U.S. obligations of $27 million for joint technical cooperation projects in fiscal year 1956 have been combined with host countries’ own contributions of about $50 million in currencies and an additional $23 million in goods and services.

**Reappraisal of Program Direction**

While the fundamental objectives of the mutual security program remain clear and unchanged, several important developments have unfolded in the last year or so which bear directly on the methods and techniques we are using to achieve those objectives. As they affect mutual security operations, these developments center around two main points. One concerns the rising cost of building and maintaining a modern military establishment in participating countries and the growing competition between defense claims on a nation’s resources and the claims of economic...
growth. The other concerns the Soviet "new look," their growing industrial strength, and the expanded economic activities of the Sino-Soviet bloc in the Near East, South and Southeast Asia, and other strategic parts of the world.

These two considerations have raised a number of questions on adapting the mutual security program to meet the issues that have grown out of new circumstances. The questions, in turn, involve a series of complex problems, few of which have an easy or pat solution. There is the problem for example of keeping a proper balance between the military and economic components of the mutual security program. In certain cases, there is unfortunately no satisfactory alternative to the maintenance of large and powerful but expensive forces. It would be foolish for instance to let down our guard in Europe, Korea, Taiwan, and free Viet-Nam. However, even accepting the necessity of maintaining adequate strength in those areas, we must consider to what extent existing military forces should be modernized, and how much of a military burden the economies of the participating countries can stand.

There is also the problem of the impact of sharply stepped-up Soviet economic efforts in the free world's newly developing countries. In directing ourselves to this problem, we come up against a host of related questions. Should the program be enlarged? Should it be given greater flexibility to meet the new Soviet economic tactics? How much can other countries, particularly in Europe, contribute to the progress of less developed areas? How much assistance can these areas effectively absorb? Should we give greater stress to short-term projects of popular appeal or continue to emphasize long-range projects which though basic to economic improvement, may excite less popular interest? To what degree might it be effective to provide more assistance through multilateral channels and less through our bilateral programs? Can our economic assistance be put on a loan basis to a greater extent or would the widening of loan activities and the softening of their terms be self-defeating?

Several intensive studies of the mutual security program are planned or under way in an effort to find answers to these difficult questions. The results of these various studies should insure that mutual security operations in the coming years will be conducted in a manner which will bring maximum returns to the American people and provide our free world partners with the most effective kind of military and economic cooperation.

USE OF FUNDS IN FISCAL YEAR 1956

The Total Picture

During fiscal year 1956, total obligations or reservations made from funds available for the mutual security program amounted to nearly $2.4 billion. Of this total, $843 million was obligated or reserved by the Department of Defense for direct military assistance; $1.5 billion was obligated by ICA [International Cooperation Administration] for other than direct military programs. By far the largest share of total available funds was used for direct military aid and defense support programs. About $158 million was used to pay the costs of ocean freight for surplus agricultural commodities, for support to various multilateral programs such as the activities of United Nations organizations and the Organization of American States, for escapee programs, and for other purposes related to mutual security objectives.

Direct military assistance under the mutual security program is extended by providing weapons and other military supply items, by carrying out training programs, and by sharing in the financing of joint military facilities.

Nonmilitary assistance is extended in one of three ways, depending on how the needs and circumstances of the participating country relate to the policy objectives of the United States: (1) defense support and technical cooperation; (2) development assistance and technical cooperation; or (3) technical cooperation alone.

Defense support programs are designed to help certain countries which are receiving military assistance to support appropriate levels of military strength while also maintaining and promoting political and economic stability. Such support involves furnishing economic resources to enable the recipient country to undertake defense activities that otherwise would not be possible or to increase the recipient's capacity to do so in the future. Without such support the security of the United States and other free world nations would be diminished to a serious extent, or would have
Development assistance is aid given primarily to promote economic development or to deal with other problems whose solution is necessary to create or maintain economic and political stability. In most nations, development assistance also complements programs of technical cooperation by providing needed supplies, commodities or funds. Usually this type of aid is required to make possible or accelerate activities required to promote basic U.S. interests.

Development assistance differs from defense support in that the former is directed wholly toward goals which are not military in character, whereas the latter has as one of its essential aims the attainment of military objectives.

Through technical cooperation programs, we share knowledge, experience, techniques, and skills with the peoples of the economically less developed areas of the world for the purpose of helping them to advance their economic progress and raise their standard of living. These programs emphasize and consist largely of advisory services, teaching, training, and exchange of information; they do not include the provision of supplies and equipment beyond that which is required for effective demonstration purposes. Participation and interest in these programs are steadily growing, as evidenced by the increasing share of host country contributions.

**Direct Military Programs**

**Military Equipment**

During the first 6 months of 1956, $1.9 billion worth of military equipment and supplies was shipped to nations cooperating in the mutual defense of the free world. The greatest portion of this amount, almost two-thirds, was shipped to countries in Europe; the Asia and Pacific area was the next largest recipient, with about one-quarter of the total. Over 50 percent of the value of the military deliveries was made up of planes and related Air Force items. Another substantial portion, some 40 percent, represented ammunition, tanks and combat vehicles, artillery, and other equipment for ground forces. Ships, naval aircraft and supporting items for naval forces accounted for the remainder.

These 6-month deliveries brought to $14.2 bil-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,506.3</td>
<td>1,420.0</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>114.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia—Total</td>
<td>922.7</td>
<td>824.0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par East...</td>
<td>709.6</td>
<td>729.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia...</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia...</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan...</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea...</td>
<td>224.6</td>
<td>319.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos...</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines...</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand...</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam...</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional...</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia...</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan...</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon...</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India...</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal...</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan...</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East and Africa—Total</td>
<td>253.1</td>
<td>187.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt...</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia...</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece...</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran...</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq...</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland...</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan...</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon...</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya...</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya...</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey...</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Territories...</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional...</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe—Total...</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (Fed. Rep.)...</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain...</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia...</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Exchange—Western Europe</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional...</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America—Total</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina...</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia...</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil...</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile...</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia...</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica...</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba...</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic...</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador...</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador...</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala...</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti...</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras...</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico...</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua...</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama...</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay...</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru...</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay...</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela...</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Territories...</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional...</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Programs—Total</td>
<td>157.6</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>109.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Fund...</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Regional...</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other...</td>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>109.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Preliminary figures.

These obligations represent the cumulative total of military equipment and supplies furnished to other friendly nations since the beginning of the program of military assistance in fiscal year 1950, with the proportions
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going to the respective areas for the entire period being roughly similar to those for the half-year period. Ammunition, tanks and combat vehicles, and aircraft accounted for over 60 percent of all materiel furnished. Of the cumulative total, the ground forces received by far the largest share, 61 percent.

Nonmilitary Programs

Almost half of the $1.5 billion obligated by Ica in fiscal year 1956 for other than direct military aid programs was used for the Far East, and within that area largely for South Korea, Taiwan, and free Viet-Nam. The great bulk of the total funds for nonmilitary programs was earmarked for activities in the category of defense support; development assistance and technical cooperation combined accounted for less than one-fifth of the overall amount. In the Far East, for example, about 95 percent of the funds obligated was for defense support programs. In Europe, virtually all of the nonmilitary programs, primarily in Spain and Yugoslavia, were in the defense support category. Except for the $4.4 million used in programs under the Asian Development Fund, all of the obligations for development assistance, $157 million, were for countries in the Near East and South Asia, and in Latin America. Funds for technical cooperation were used in a wide range of activities throughout all parts of the free world.

Notice of Intention To Participate in Limited Trade Agreement Negotiations With Cuba

The Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements on October 8 issued notice of the intention of the U.S. Government to participate, under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act as amended and extended, in limited trade agreement negotiations with the Government of Cuba.

In these negotiations, the United States will give consideration to possible tariff concessions on certain types of unmanufactured tobacco (see below) in exchange for concessions by Cuba. The listed types of tobacco are imported into the United States, chiefly from Cuba, for use in the manufacture of cigars.

The negotiations will supplement those conducted at Geneva, Switzerland, earlier this year in which the United States, Cuba, and 20 other contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade participated, and any resulting exchange of tariff concessions will be embodied in the respective schedules of the United States and Cuba supplemental to their present schedules to the General Agreement.

In the case of most of the tobacco items listed, imports into the United States which are the product of Cuba are now entitled to preferentially lower rates of duty than are applied to like products of other foreign countries. Any reduction in a rate applicable to the product of Cuba will apply to the Cuban product exclusively, but, in order to prevent increases in margins of preference, such a reduction may involve a reduction also in the rate applicable to the same type of tobacco which is the product of other countries.

Tariff concessions by the United States will be considered within the limitation of the authority available to the President under the Trade Agreements Act as amended by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. The pertinent part of the legislation provides that rates might be reduced by 15 percent below the January 1, 1955, rates by

---

1 For a survey of nonmilitary programs in the Far East, see Bulletin of Aug. 13, 1956, p. 269; for similar summaries of programs in Latin America and in South Asia, see ibid., Aug. 20, 1956, p. 317, and Sept. 24, 1956, p. 403.
2 This material is also available as Department of State publication 6394 and may be obtained from the Division of Public Services, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. See also 21 Fed. Reg. 7748.

stages of 5 percent a year over a 3-year period, but that no stage or reduction may be made effective after June 30, 1958. Consequently there remains authority to reduce rates by only 10 percent below the January 1, 1955, rate in two annual stages of 5 percent each.

In accordance with past practice and the requirements of trade agreements legislation, the committee's notice sets in motion preparations for the negotiations, including opportunity for presentation by interested persons of both written and oral views on possible concessions which may be granted or obtained, and the determination of "peril points" by the United States Tariff Commission on all products on which the United States will consider granting concessions.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information, which will receive the views of interested persons concerning any aspect of the proposed negotiations, has announced that its hearings will open on November 14, 1956. Applications for oral presentation of views and information should be presented to the committee not later than 12 noon, November 8, 1956. Persons desiring to be heard should also submit written briefs or statements to the committee by 12 noon, November 8, 1956. Only those persons will be heard who have presented written briefs or statements and have filed applications to be heard by the dates indicated. Details concerning the submission of briefs and applications to be heard are contained in the committee's notice.

The members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Committee on Trade Agreements are the same. They include a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission and representatives from the Departments of State, the Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Interior; and the International Cooperation Administration.

Domestic producers, importers, and other interested persons are invited to present to the Committee for Reciprocity Information views and all possible pertinent information about products on the published list. All views and information will be carefully considered in deciding whether or not a concession should be offered by the United States on each product. Consideration will also be given to all relevant information submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with its hearings in October 1955 and January 1956 in preparation for the Geneva tariff negotiations. Accordingly, persons who presented information and views at those hearings and who do not desire to modify or supplement such material need not—but may if they wish—repeat their written or oral submissions.

The U.S. Tariff Commission also announced on October 8 that it will hold public hearings beginning November 14, 1956, in connection with its "peril point" investigation, as required by section 3 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, on the extent to which U.S. concessions on listed products may be made in the negotiations without causing or threatening serious injury to a domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products. Copies of the notice may be obtained from the Commission. Views and information received by the Tariff Commission in its hearings referred to above will be made available to the Committee for Reciprocity Information for consideration by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements. Persons who appear before the Tariff Commission need not—but may if they wish—also appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information if they apply in accordance with the procedures of that Committee as outlined above.

Persons wishing to suggest items on which the United States might request concessions should present their views to the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON TRADE AGREEMENTS

Trade-Agreement Negotiations with Cuba under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 945, ch. 474; 65 Stat. 73, ch. 141) and to paragraph 4 of Executive Order 10082 of October 5, 1949 (3 CFR, 1949 Supp., p. 126), notice is hereby given by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements of intention to conduct trade-agreement negotiations with the Government of Cuba, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, for the purpose of negotiating mutually advantageous tariff concessions to be embodied in schedules to the General Agreement.

There is annexed hereto a list of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import
restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or specific continuance of existing customs or excise treatment in the trade agreement negotiations of which notice is given above.

The articles proposed for consideration in the negotiations are identified in the annexed list by specifying the numbers of the paragraphs in tariff schedules of Title I of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in which they are provided for together with the language used in such tariff paragraphs to provide for such articles, except that where necessary the statutory language has been modified by the omission of words or the addition of new language in order to narrow the scope of the original language. Where no qualifying language is used with regard to the type, grade, or value of any listed articles, all types, grades, and values of the article covered by the language used are included.

In the case of any article in the list with respect to which the product of Cuba is now entitled to preferential treatment, a reduction in the rate applicable to the product of Cuba may involve a reduction also in the rate applicable to other contracting parties to the General Agreement, in order to give effect to the provisions of that Agreement limiting increases in margins of preference.

No article will be considered in the negotiations for possible modification of duties or other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or specific continuance of existing customs or excise treatment unless it is included, specifically or by reference, in the annexed list or unless it is subsequently included in a supplementary public list. Except where otherwise indicated in the list, only duties imposed under the paragraphs of the Tariff Act of 1930 specified in the list with regard to articles described therein will be considered for a possible decrease, but additional or separate duties or taxes on such articles imposed under any other provisions of law may be bound against increase as an assurance that the concession under the listed paragraph or section will not be nullified.

In the event that an article which as of August 15, 1956, was regarded as classifiable under a description included in the list is excluded therefrom by judicial decision or otherwise prior to the conclusion of the trade-agreement negotiations, the list will nevertheless be considered as including such article.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, as amended, and paragraph 5 of Executive Order 10082 of October 5, 1949, information and views as to any aspect of the proposal, including the list of articles, announced in this notice may be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in accordance with the announcement of this date issued by that Committee. Persons interested in exports to Cuba may present their views regarding any tariff or other concessions that might be requested of the Government of Cuba. Any other matters appropriate to be considered in connection with the negotiations proposed above may also be presented.

Public hearings in connection with the "peril point" investigation of the United States Tariff Commission relating to the articles included in the annexed list, pursuant to section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, are the subject of an announcement of this date issued by that Commission.

By direction of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements this 8th day of October, 1956.

CARL D. CORSE
Chairman
Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements

LIST OF ARTICLES IMPORTED INTO THE UNITED STATES PROPOSED FOR CONSIDERATION IN TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Par.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed together with more than 35 per centum of wrapper tobacco, all the foregoing, stemmed or unstemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Filler tobacco not specially provided for (except cigarette leaf tobacco), stemmed or unstemmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Scrap tobacco.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Trade Agreement Negotiations with Cuba under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Submission of Information to the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Closing date for filing applications to be heard and the submission of briefs November 8, 1956. Public hearings open November 14, 1956.
The Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements has issued on this day a notice of intention to participate in trade-agreement negotiations with the Government of Cuba under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Annexed to the notice of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements is a list of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible concessions in the negotiations. The Committee for Reciprocity Information here by gives notice that all applications for oral presentation of views in regard to the proposed negotiations shall be submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information not later than 12:00 noon, November 8, 1956. The application must indicate the product or products on which the individual or groups desire to be heard and an estimate of the time required for oral presentation. All persons who make application to be heard shall also submit to the Committee their views in writing in regard to the foregoing proposal not later than 12:00 noon, November 8, 1956. Such communications shall be addressed to “Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington 25, D.C.” Fifteen copies of written statements, either typed, printed, or duplicated shall be submitted, of which one copy shall be sworn to.

Written statements submitted to the Committee, except information and business data proffered in confidence, shall be open to inspection by interested persons. Information and business data proffered in confidence shall be submitted on separate pages clearly marked For Official Use Only of Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Public hearings will be held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, at which oral statements will be heard. The first hearing will be at 2:00 p.m. on November 14, 1956, in the Hearing Room in the Tariff Commission Building, 8th and E Streets, N.W., Washington 25, D.C. Witnesses who make application to be heard will be advised regarding the time and place of their individual appearances. Appearances at hearings before the committee may be made only by or on behalf of those persons who have filed written statements and who have within the time prescribed made written application for oral presentation of views. Statements made at the public hearings shall be under oath.

The United States Tariff Commission has today announced public hearings on the import items appearing in the list annexed to the notice of intention to negotiate to run concurrently with the hearings of the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Oral testimony and written information submitted to the Tariff Commission will be made available to and will be considered by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements. Consequently, those whose interests relate only to import products included in the foregoing list, and who appear before the Tariff Commission, need not, but may if they wish, appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Persons interested in exports may present their views regarding any tariff or other concessions that might be requested of the Government of Cuba. Any other matters appropriate to be considered in connection with the proposed negotiations may also be presented.

Copies of the list attached to the notice of intention to negotiate may be obtained from the Committee for Reciprocity Information at the address designated above and may be inspected at the field offices of the Department of Commerce.

By direction of the Committee for Reciprocity Information this 8th day of October, 1956.

Edward Yardley,
Secretary,
Committee for Reciprocity Information

President Decides Not To Reopen Escape-Clause Action on Watches

White House press release dated October 5

The President has concurred with the U.S. Tariff Commission’s recent finding that no formal investigation should be instituted at this time to determine whether the tariff should be reduced on imports of watches. The President found, with the Tariff Commission, that there is not sufficient reason at this time to reopen the escape-clause action which resulted 2 years ago in an increase in the duty on imports of watches. The President’s decision means that the increased rate of duty established in July 1954 as the result of escape-clause action will continue to apply without reduction or other modification.

The President’s action was taken after various departments and agencies of the executive branch had been consulted. The Tariff Commission’s
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study was made pursuant to Executive Order 10401, which requires periodic review of affirmative actions taken under the escape clause. This was the Tariff Commission’s first such periodic review of the 1954 watch tariff increase. The Commission’s report was submitted to the President on July 25, 1956.

Current Treaty Actions

MULTILATERAL

Agriculture

Aviation
Protocol amending articles 48 (a), 49 (e), and 61 of the convention on international civil aviation (TIAS 1591) by providing that sessions of the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization shall be held not less than once in 3 years instead of annually. Done at Montreal June 14, 1954. Ratifications deposited: Laos, June 4, 1956; New Zealand, June 8, 1956; Japan, June 21, 1956; Venezuela, July 6, 1956; Thailand, July 18, 1956; Argentina, September 21, 1956.
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Recess Appointments
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Check List of Department of State Press Releases: October 8–14

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.
Press release issued prior to October 8 which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 527 of October 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>U. S. participation in Tangier conference (rewrite).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>Committee on defining aggression (rewrite).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*530</td>
<td>10/9</td>
<td>Negotiations with Mexico on standard broadcasting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>Texts of notes on German reunification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>Relaxation of Austrian controls over imports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>Strom appointed Ambassador to Cambodia (rewrite).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†534</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>Note to Soviets on 1954 plane case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*535</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>Hoover: “The Challenge to Engineering.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>Procurement agreement with Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*537</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>Educational exchange.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not printed.
† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.
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Secretary Dulles' News Conference of October 16

Press release 543 dated October 16

The following is the Department of State's release of Secretary Dulles' news conference of October 16.

Secretary Dulles: I have a statement to read, which will be mimeographed and available to you at the close of this conference.¹

Suez Situation

There has, I believe, been progress toward achieving a just and peaceful solution of the Suez crisis. The Security Council of the United Nations adopted unanimously six principles which ought to govern the solution. These are sound principles and if they are effectively implemented will accomplish what the principal users of the canal have sought. To me a most significant principle is that which says that the operation of the canal shall be insulated from the politics of any nation. That was in the proposals which we made in London last August and that principle was opposed by the Soviet Union at that time. Also the Security Council specifically said that there should be no discrimination, overt or covert.

While the second part of the French-U. K. resolution was vetoed, nevertheless the fact that it had the affirmative votes of 9 of the 11 members of the Council gives it substantial moral support. We can hope that relations with Egypt will, in fact, develop along the lines therein outlined.

It may be recalled that after the voting took place on the French-U. K. resolution I stated that "it is understood that the Council remains seized of this matter, and that the Secretary-General may continue to encourage interchanges between the Governments of Egypt, France, and the United Kingdom, a procedure which has already yielded positive results." This statement was made at the request of a number of the members of the Council, and it met no objection from any member. It can, I think, be assumed that the Secretary-General will, in fact, continue to encourage exchanges of views and that the Governments of Egypt, France, and the United Kingdom intend to pursue this path.

There are many difficulties still in the way. No one can say with certainty that there will be a peaceful solution in accordance with the principles of justice and international law, as called for by article 1 of the charter of the United Nations. Nevertheless, each difficulty overcome means one less difficulty remaining to be overcome, and we can thus take satisfaction from what occurred last week at the United Nations.²

Now, if you have any questions.

Press Conference Transcripts

Q. Mr. Secretary, I would like to raise at the beginning of this press conference the question of transcripts of the press conferences, particularly after the occasion of the last press conference. Can we be assured from now on that what is put out by the Department is a direct quote under the heading "transcript"—that it will in fact be a verbatim transcript, as is the case with the President's press conferences?

A. No, I am sorry to say you cannot be so assured. I must reserve the right, in case I make a blunder inadvertently which does damage to international relations, to correct those blunders. I do not profess to speak with perfection extemporaneously, and the important thing from my standpoint and from the standpoint of my job is not to damage the international relations of the United States by seeming to say what I do not intend. Sometimes my words convey a meaning I do not intend to convey, and, if that happens, I must reserve the right to correct them so they

¹The following four paragraphs were also released separately as press release 542 dated Oct. 16.

²For background, see Bulletin of Oct. 22, 1956, p. 611.
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reflect what I intend. That means that those who carry the exact transcript can say what they want, a "corrected transcript." But I cannot be put in the position of jeopardizing the foreign relations of the United States by being held literally to what I say extemporaneously, and, if that is the only condition on which I have to have a press conference, then we have to reconsider the concept of these press conferences.

Q. I don't think that anyone here would wish to cut down on the number of press conferences because we all appreciate the fact that you have held more press conferences than any other member of the Cabinet. We also realize, I am sure, that the point you make is well taken but we accept it. My only point is that it seems to a good many of us where a transcript is used it should in fact be that and, if it is going to be a corrected transcript, it should not be put out as a verbatim transcript.

A. I figure it is up to the people who carry it to call it a "transcript" or "corrected transcript." To my mind that doesn't make any difference. The main thing is that I am speaking not only to the press but I am speaking to the world at these press conferences. While I realize that it is far more interesting and exciting to the press if I make blunders in expressing myself, the first interest is not interest in excitement but it is to report to the world accurately what I think about these questions. If that requires me to make a slight modification in order that my words as reported shall reflect my meaning, I must reserve the right to do it. If not, we will have to alter the character of the press conferences.

Q. Can we have some assurance that, when you do correct the transcript in order to give your exact meaning, we will be so informed so that we will know and be in a position to report that fact?

A. Well, of course, you know that, if you are told first what I said and then the slight modifications necessary to convey my meaning, the only result of that is accentuating and magnifying the significance of the change.

Q. But most of us, I think, could remember what you said and then compare it also with the transcript.

A. If you remember it, and thus can compare it, you don't need further guidance.

Q. The reason I bring it up—at the White House, when a change is made, it is so labeled, and I wondered why you couldn't adopt the same procedure.

A. Let me say this, a good many of the changes I make are changes due to typographical mistakes. Sometimes the stenographers—who are extremely talented and able persons—perhaps because I do not pronounce distinctly, make a mistake. I do not blame the person making the transcript. I blame myself. Do you want me to call attention to the fact that there is a typographical mistake, a name has been misspelled, or that a sentence which I intended to end with a period is carried on with a comma? Those are the types of things generally I correct.

Q. Mr. Secretary, since this seems to me more of a discussion rather than a question-and-answer period, I would like to say that I too have had the feeling many of us are disturbed by the tendency to change the record of a conference and if the changes could be made in such a way as to indicate, either by the title of the transcript or some other designation, that it isn't precisely what is given in a given press conference, I think it would help to give us a feeling of greater accuracy in reporting. We make our first report out of the news conference without waiting for the transcript. If it comes out and you, as you say, have blundered in a substantive way—that is, if it is a point of substance rather than a typographical error, we are put in the position of making an erroneous report as compared to the later account of what has happened. If we could make the distinction clear, we would be very happy.

A. I have been holding these press conferences now pretty continuously for nearly 4 years, and I think there has only been one occasion, 2 weeks ago, when any issue was raised about this. I think in the main I have been able to express myself with sufficient accuracy so no alterations were required except what you might call of a minor linguistic character, to break up sentences so as to make them more intelligible and in some cases, as I say, where stenographic mistakes have been made. During this period I think I have tried to be informative with no evasion. I seldom said "no comment," although I have at times. I have tried to make these press conferences a success from the standpoint of really informing the press and the world
what we stand for. If there is greater interest in catching me up on a statement inadvertently made, where I have inadvertently connected two thoughts because my mind jumped ahead of what I intended—if that is the purpose of these press conferences, then I don’t think they serve a good purpose from the standpoint of the national interest. They may serve—from the standpoint of having an interesting time in the press, about how Dulles had bungled, about how Dulles corrected his transcript, and how Dulles cannot express himself correctly—if that is the purpose of press conferences. I do not believe it is the purpose of press conferences to do that kind of thing. I believe you all honestly want to know what U.S. policy is and what our thinking is about some of these problems. As far as the initial reporting goes, you are free to report that as you understand it as long as you don’t put it in quotation marks. If you want to put it in quotation marks, where it becomes in effect a state document, then I must reserve the right to be sure it accurately expresses the policy of the United States.

H-Bomb Tests

Q. What do you believe the effect will be abroad of Mr. Stevenson’s latest proposal on the H-bomb tests?

A. Well, we have for a long time been studying this whole question of the H-bomb and the possibility of having effective controls, and that has been a preoccupation of this administration for several years, ever since the big thermonuclear bombs have been developed. And we have been in contact with the British Government in particular, which is the only other friendly government which has these bombs. I believe that, if there is an effective way to control and limit the use of these bombs, we will find it. So far we have not found it, and I doubt very much if those who are not fully conversant with the details of the problem, which have to remain to some extent confidential, are in the best position to find it. As far as the will and the desire is concerned, I know that President Eisenhower has it.

Reports to Congress on Travel

Q. Mr. Secretary, President Eisenhower says he believes travel by Members of Congress should be accounted for “by voucher and exactly.” You have in your possession many such vouchers. Did you prepare reports at once for proper committee chairmen of Congress showing as nearly as possible how much each individual spent in the last fiscal year?

A. I think that the chairmen of the congressional committees have this information and—

Q. No, sir, they do not.

A. They do not have it?

Q. No, sir, there is no indication by individuals from your Department.

A. Well, certainly, the chairmen of the committees are entitled to get, I think, in that matter anything they want to have.

Q. They don’t want it though.

A. They don’t want it?

Q. No, sir. (Laughter) In fact, I believe Congressman Cannon of the House Appropriations Committee told you just a year ago or last January not to send up such a report which was in the process of being prepared.

A. You know these funds were made available by Congress for congressional purposes. We are in a sense an agent in the matter and not a principal, and it is a rule of law and a practice that the agent does what the principal wants. Now we have no—

Q. Are you happy as an agent under this arrangement?

A. I see myself no particular reason why the information should not be made public as there was made public information about the use of the Panama ships. But, as I say, we handle the funds pursuant to congressional action under congressional directive, and I do not think that in that capacity we can properly do with the funds or accounting for the funds what the principal who gives us the money may not want.

Q. Sir, I believe you act as a voluntary agent in this matter for Congress. You could cease being a voluntary agent.

A. I don’t know that I am a voluntary agent. I am the beneficiary, or I am the person to whom the funds are appropriated, I believe.

Q. Sir, I was thinking of counterpart funds, which are not—
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A. Oh, you are talking about counterpart funds.

Q. Yes, sir.

A. I thought you were talking about the other types of funds which are in my so-called confidential account.

Q. Both, really.

A. Yes. I am not informed, I am sorry to say, about the question of the use of the counterpart funds.

Troop Movements Into Jordan

Q. Mr. Secretary, though I know we are not directly involved, would the United States consider it wise for Iraqi troops to occupy Jordan and if from that there would arise in that country internal unrest as part of the election campaign of October 21?

A. I would rather not express any opinion on the merits of the case because it is an extremely delicate and complicated question. The situation is covered to a very considerable extent by a series of documents: There are the Israeli-Arab armistice agreements; there is the security treaty between the Arab countries, which includes Iraq and Jordan; there is the security treaty between Great Britain and Jordan; and there is the Baghdad Pact, which includes Great Britain and Iraq.

Now in that maze of treaty relationships it is extremely difficult for a country like the United States, which is not a party to them and thus not as intimately acquainted with the legal and practical aspects of those matters, to express an opinion. We have been kept informed, but only generally informed, as to the thinking of some of the parties at least in that situation. But we have not attempted to play any decisive role in the matter, nor would I want to express an opinion here as to the merits, which, in a way, are somewhat obscure and perhaps somewhat fluctuating.

Q. Mr. Secretary, among the information that we have, do we have any which says that there might be a delay in the movement of Iraqi troops into Jordan?

A. We do have information that indicates that there will be such a delay. Our information is confirmatory of press reports which I think have appeared this morning. It looks as though those reports were accurate.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in case of an outbreak of fighting there in the sense of Israel attacking Jordan, would our declaration of April 9 of this year continue to hold—that is, that we would come to the aid of the country aggressed against within constitutional processes?

A. Yes, we said that we would give aid. I believe the President's statement—there was a statement the President made from I think Augusta last April in which he said that within constitutional means we would assist and that we would give aid to any victim of aggression. That holds.

Suez Canal Users Association

Q. Mr. Secretary, what is now to happen to the Suez Canal Users Association? Does this decision intend American flagships pay it the canal toll?

A. The Scua, so-called, Suez Canal Users Association, is being developed through conferences which are being held almost daily in London. I would say that that development of Scua has been somewhat slowed down I think by the fact that this whole problem has been before the Security Council. The use of Scua has been under consideration by the Security Council, and nobody has known quite what would emerge out of the Security Council proceedings. Now that those proceedings are suspended, at least for the time being, I think that the movement will go ahead. As far as the payment of dues is concerned, that is a matter I think where our position has been made pretty clear from the beginning and where we adhere to the proposition that we put forth from the beginning; namely, that we believe that the organization should be set up to act as agent for the ships, that it should collect the dues from them as their agent and be prepared to pay an appropriate share of those dues over to Egypt in order to recompense Egypt for its contribution to the passage through the canal. That was expressed by Sir Anthony Eden in his speech describing the purposes of the Users Association and in my press conference which was held the next day, and we hope and believe that the matter will develop along those lines.

It is quite an intricate affair. It is complicated by the fact that the status of the Universal Suez Canal Company is not entirely clear. Some countries consider that it has been effectively nationalized; others consider that it has not been—that it still has rights under the concession itself to go on collecting dues. And that has created a certain complication and has led to certain delays as the British and French policy in that respect has been evolved. But I hope and believe that we will be able to make more rapid progress now, particularly after the British and French Ministers get back.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what is the technical situation or the legal situation in this country with respect to American shipping companies operating under the American flag? Have you caused any sort of rule or regulation to be issued which would compel them to pay their fees to the Users Association, or did you have such authority?

A. Well, so far, the shipping of Britain, France, and the United States has been carrying on precisely as it carried on prior to the attempted nationalization of the Suez Canal Company. Now they have followed in the past divergent practices. The British and the French have paid into an account of the Suez Canal Company at London and Paris; the American ships have been in the habit of paying, you might say, “on the barrel head” as they go through the canal. And in all cases, in the cases of those three countries, or the ships with those flags, we have been carrying on as before. The British and the French have not shifted to require their ships to pay into SCA or have we. And we are trying to work out a common procedure in that matter, but, so far, the payments are being made by the three countries, and, indeed, by other countries, precisely as they were made before.

Now the practical result of that is that about half of the dues are being paid in effective currency to the Egyptian authorities at the canal itself, and about half are being paid into accounts abroad in the name of the old Suez Canal Company.

Israel Shipping

Q. Mr. Secretary, among the six principles agreed upon by Egypt and the Western powers and approved by the Security Council was the principle of free passage without any discrimination. Did the Western powers seek and did they receive any assurances from Egypt that this principle would be respected concerning the Israeli shipping through the canal?

A. We received no such explicit assurances from Egypt. It was generally understood that the principle did cover all shipping, including that of Israel. I see that it is reported in the papers this morning that Mr. Mikoyan, at least on behalf of the Soviet Union, has expressed that was his understanding of the resolution, as it was ours. But we did not seek and receive any explicit assurances of Egypt in that respect. But we do believe that it in effect constituted a reaffirmation by the Security Council of the 1951 decision.

Q. Mr. Secretary, dispatches this morning report that Syria is moving heavy equipment into Jordan. Do we have any way of knowing whether this is Soviet equipment that the Syrians are moving into Jordan?

A. I don’t think that we do. It could be Soviet equipment; I think equally it could be British or French equipment which had been delivered to Syria at a considerably earlier stage.

---


Q. Are we at all disturbed by this Syrian move, sir?

A. Well, we can't, of course, complain over the fact that countries which have mutual security pacts help each other in terms of equipment and so forth, because we do the same ourselves with the countries with whom we have security pacts. A good deal depends upon what the real purposes and intent are. If it is purely defensive, then we cannot complain because we ourselves have said—I have made that clear in answer to an earlier question—that, if there were an aggression, we ourselves would assist the victims of aggression. Of course, the trouble is that aggression is not always easy to define and arms that are given in advance for defensive purposes may perhaps be used for other purposes. So we don't feel really in a position to judge whether that is a justifiable and helpful move or whether it has dangerous implications.

Q. Mr. Secretary, are Syrian troops going with the equipment?

A. Not so far as we know.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there is a report out of Moscow that the Soviets will not veto a new Japanese request for admission to the United Nations. Does the United States have any plans this year to again sponsor Japanese admission to the United Nations?

A. We have continuously supported and continue to support and will go on supporting the admission of Japan to the United Nations. I don't know from the technical standpoint whether the proposal in the Security Council would be made by the United States or by certain countries jointly. That I am just not familiar with. But you can be sure that anything feasible that we can do to promote that we shall do.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what stand does the United States take regarding the recent reprisal raids of Israeli forces against Jordan?

A. We believe that it indicates a deterioration of the situation and a failure of the efforts which were launched by the Secretary-General earlier this year. I think he has the same feeling. We greatly regret the fact that these rather large-scale operations are going on, and we believe that they are not consistent, really, with what Mr. Hammarskjold felt were the assurances he obtained earlier this year.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the Users Association, when do you expect it will be set up as a going operation? Is it a matter of days or weeks?

A. Well, I would hate to put an actual date on it. A good deal has already been done. They have created their executive committee, they have made provision for opening a bank account, they are in contact with various persons, one of whom they hope will be available to act as administrator of the operation, and, considering the fact that 15 countries are involved and the fact that the matter was not pressed during the Security Council proceedings, I think good progress has been made.

As I say, there are very considerable complications in working out this question of dues, not merely in terms of what are the policies of the member nations and what would, for example, be the "appropriate share," which I think were Sir Anthony Eden's words, that should go to Egypt. That is a delicate and difficult subject. But also you have the problem of relations with the old Suez Canal Company and the fact that there might in some cases be a risk of double liability. That involves a very complicated legal problem, and the working out of these things does necessarily involve painstaking procedures. It calls for an agreement among a number of countries which have somewhat different viewpoints perhaps, and therefore I would not want to put an exact date on it. But I do believe that fairly rapid progress will be made now that the Foreign Ministers, particularly of Great Britain and France, have concluded their work at the Security Council and have gone home. I think that they will concentrate on the matter perhaps over the next few days and I hope will make further and perhaps definitive progress in this respect.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do these comments of yours on the Users Association mean that the United States does not accept the decision or the judgment of the Council on the point—that part was vetoed and failed to pass the Council?

A. I am not quite sure that I understand your question. The vetoed portion of the United Kingdom-French resolution called upon Egypt to cooperate with the Users Association. We still
hope, and have no ground to abandon the hope, that there will still be that cooperation, and despite the fact that the resolution was vetoed we believe that it outlines the correct procedure and we intend to proceed along those lines.

Q. Didn't Dr. Fawzi \(^6\) say if he were a member of the Council that he would vote against it?

A. I don't think he singled out that particular paragraph to vote against. He said he would vote against the second portion of the resolution as a whole. He perhaps indicated that he didn't like that particular feature of it, but, on the other hand, there were indications, perhaps not formally given, which led us to believe it is not beyond the realm of possibility that there could be developed practical cooperation with the Users Association.

"Insulating the Canal From Politics"

Q. Mr. Secretary, in the statement you read you used the phrase from the six great principles about “insulating the canal from the politics of any nation,” which I believe is the phrase you originated at the London conference earlier. Could you tell us now what you believe that to encompass, what is the meaning of that phrase in practical terms?

A. Well, I believe that there should be a practical operating arrangement of the canal which insures, insofar as any such insurance is possible, that there could not be an effort by any nation—and Egypt is perhaps the most likely nation at the moment—to use the canal for political purposes. Now every nation—and Egypt is no exception—has policies which from time to time make it want to favor some country or perhaps to put pressure to bear upon some country. Now the essential thing is that the canal should not be an instrument of that kind of policy.

Now, as far as any open intervention with the operation of the canal is concerned, of course, we can never stop, as long as the canal goes through Egyptian territory, as it does, the fact that Egypt could by the use of force prevent certain vessels from going through the canal. But that overt action would be so in defiance of the treaty of 1888, so apparent to all the world, that there are very considerable sanctions, moral and perhaps practical sanctions, United Nations sanctions, against that kind of overt violation.

Now, the problem, as we see it and as I described it in London and elsewhere, is the danger of what I call covert violations. That word “covert” is used, you will notice, in the six principles, the danger that in various ways the ships of certain countries, let us say, against which Egypt wants to exert pressure may fail to get pilots in time, might get unqualified pilots, might be put at the end of the traffic line that goes through the canal. Now I think that there should be sufficient participation, such a close contact with the practical, day-by-day operations of the canal, that nothing of that sort could go on without being promptly detected and brought to light.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I don't want to press this beyond a reasonable point at this time, but do you see now whether this kind of guaranty or this kind of insulation from political pressure could be achieved by a supervisory board of some sort as well as by an operational board?

A. Well, words have so many different meanings that it is awfully hard to express our ideas in words without danger of misinterpretation. The word “supervisory” is a word which has a whole gamut of meaning. If you were actually supervising an operation you may be right there on that spot watching it and, indeed, directing it. So that I do not attach any magic to the word “supervision” as against other words that have been used, like “participation” and so forth. I think the practical problem is to have enough of an international contact with the day-to-day workings of the canal so that there could not go on the type of covert preferences or discriminations to which I refer.

Now, as I have said many times, while we put forward in London in August in the U.S. proposal one idea of how to accomplish that by something we called a Suez Canal Board, we also made clear at that time, and have made amply clear since then, and I made it clear again last week at New York, that we do not think that is the only way in which you can accomplish those results. One can think of a score or more of practical methods which would accomplish the same result. I think the practical goal is quite clear, and I have tried to express it, namely, that while we have, I think, adequate sanctions against what might be called overt interference, there needs to be also some way to detect and prevent at its incipiency covert preferences or discriminations. I believe that there are many ways in which that could be

*Mahmud Fawzi, Egyptian Foreign Minister.
Correspondence Between President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Bulganin Concerning Nuclear Tests

White House press release dated October 21

THE PRESIDENT TO PREMIER BULGANIN

October 21, 1956

Dear Mr. Chairman: I have the letter which your Embassy handed me through Secretary Dulles on October nineteenth. I regret to find that this letter departs from accepted international practice in a number of respects.

First, the sending of your note in the midst of a national election campaign of which you take cognizance, expressing your support of the opinions of "certain prominent public figures in the United States" constitutes an interference by a foreign nation in our internal affairs of a kind which, if indulged in by an Ambassador, would lead to his being declared persona non grata in accordance with long-established custom.

Second, having delivered a lengthy communication in the Russian language, you have published it before it could be carefully translated and delivered to me. Because of this and of the necessity of placing the facts accurately before the public, I am compelled to release this reply immediately.

Third, your statement with respect to the Secretary of State is not only unwarranted, but is personally offensive to me.

Fourth, you seem to impugn my own sincerity.

However, I am not instructing the Department of State to return your letter to your Embassy. That is not because I am tolerant of these departures from accepted international practice, but because I still entertain the hope that direct communications between us may serve the cause of peace.

You and I have exchanged a number of letters since our meeting in Geneva on the reduction of armaments and related matters in our effort to make progress toward the goal of peace. I hope that that practice may be resumed in accordance with accepted standards.

The United States has for a long time been intensively examining, evaluating and planning dependable means of stopping the arms race and reducing and controlling armaments. These explorations include the constant examination and evaluation of nuclear tests. To be effective, and not simply a mirage, all these plans require systems of inspection and control, both of which your Government has steadfastly refused to accept. Even my "Open Skies" proposal of mutual aerial inspection, suggested as a first step, you rejected.

However, though disappointed, we are not discouraged. We will continue unrelenting in our efforts to attain these goals. We will close no doors which might open a secure way to serve humanity.

We shall entertain and seriously evaluate all proposals from any source which seem to have merit, and we shall constantly seek for ourselves formulations which might dependably remove the atomic menace.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

PREMIER BULGANIN TO THE PRESIDENT

THE KREMLIN,
Moscow,
October 17, 1956.

Dear Mr. President: In this letter I should like to broach a subject to which—for readily understandable reasons—a great deal of attention is being paid, especially recently, in the United States of America and elsewhere.

I have in mind the question of atomic weapons, and in particular the testing of this weapon.

We have more than once had the opportunity to exchange views on this subject, both during my personal meeting with you in Geneva last year as well as in the subsequent correspondence. However, since it has not as yet been possible to reach agreement on the question of atomic weapons, it would be desirable to try again to evaluate the existing possibilities for progress toward reaching agreement on the prohibition of atomic weapons.

It is precisely for this reason that I am addressing this letter to you.

We realize, of course, that an election campaign is being conducted in the United States in the course of which the discussion of various questions of international significance, among them the question of disarmament, acquires the form of a polemic. However, we cannot fail to note the fact that in a number of cases, in speeches by persons in an official capacity, there has been obvious distortion of the policy of the Soviet Union concerning the above-mentioned questions. Unfortunately, this applies particularly to the statements by Mr. Dulles, who does not hesitate to make direct attacks against the Soviet Union and its peace-loving foreign policy.

I have already had the opportunity to call your attention to the importance which is attached by the Soviet Government to the problem of disarmament and to the search for ways of achieving agreement on this problem. Therefore you will understand our desire to have complete clarity, in considering the problem of disarmament, as to the positions taken by our Governments concerning the problem of disarmament, and in particular the atomic question.

I think, Mr. President, that you will agree that the problem of atomic weapons remains one of the most urgent international problems.

I need not speak at length of the fact that the Soviet Government has been and is in favor of an unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons, inasmuch as the present situation, with its ever-increasing race in the production of these weapons, is inconsistent with the aim of further easing international tension and freeing nations from the fear of atomic war. It is well known that, even in the United States of America, there is increasing anxiety as to the possible consequences of the present race in atomic armaments.

I can only express regret at the fact that the United States Government still does not consider it possible to cooperate in the efforts of many other nations, efforts which are directed toward the prohibition of atomic weapons and toward the conclusion of a pertinent international agreement to this end. But let us assume that for a certain period of time no agreement on the prohibition of atomic weapons will be achieved. Does this mean that no effort should be undertaken to find various partial solutions for this question, solutions which would facilitate future agreement on total exclusion of atomic weapons from the national armament, with the provision that atomic energy should be used only for peaceful purposes? I think that such efforts should be continued, and their results depend to a great extent on the position of the United States and the USSR.

Until the necessary agreement on the prohibition of atomic weapons is attained, it would, in our opinion, be desirable to reach agreement at this time on at least the first step toward the solution of the problem of atomic weapons—the prohibition of testing atomic and hydrogen weapons, as proposed in my message to you of September 11, 1956.²

I think you will also agree that, in the event that an agreement is reached on this question, no serious problem will arise in connection with the supervision of the implementation of such an agreement, since any explosion of an atomic or hydrogen bomb cannot, in the present state of scientific knowledge, be produced without being recorded in other countries. Would not the best guarantee against the violation of such an agreement be the mere fact that secret testing of nuclear weapons is impossible and that consequently a government undertaking the solemn obligation to stop making tests could not violate it without exposing itself to the entire world as the violator of an international agreement?

We fully share the opinion recently expressed by certain prominent public figures in the United States concerning the necessity and the possibility of concluding an agreement on the matter of prohibiting atomic weapon tests and concerning the positive influence which this would have on the entire international situation.

I cannot conceal a certain degree of surprise on my part, Mr. President, concerning the doubts expressed by you as to whether the Soviet Union is really willing to discontinue testing its atomic and hydrogen weapons. There is decidedly no basis for such doubts. I must say the same thing regarding your statement that discontinuance of testing the atomic weapon by the United States would be "a unilateral American act." Such a step on the part of the United States cannot in any way be unilateral, since the Soviet Union itself proposes that coordinated action be undertaken by the nations, with Soviet participation.

We have also noted your statement to the effect that the question of prohibiting the testing of atomic weapons can be decided only by concluding an agreement on the program of disarmament as a whole. It would, of course, be well if such an agreement on disarmament could be reached in the very near future. But it is a well-known fact that such an agreement is not within sight at present. This is attested by the fact that the United States, as well as certain other participants in negotiations on disarmament, renounces its own proposals as soon as the Soviet Union accepts these proposals. This was the very thing that happened, for example, with the proposals concerning the question of establishing a limit on the size of the armed forces of the five great powers.

Since this is the situation, it is our deep conviction that the solution of the problem of testing atomic weapons should not be made contingent on an agreement concerning the problem of disarmament as a whole.

As far as the Soviet Government is concerned, it is prepared to conclude an agreement with the United States of America immediately for discontinuing atomic weapon tests. We proceed, of course, on the basis of the assump-

²Not printed here. For text, see White House press release dated Sept. 14.
tion that other states having the atomic weapon at their disposal will likewise adhere to such an agreement.

It goes without saying that the Soviet Government will, as always, continue to contribute toward the achievement of an agreement on other problems of disarmament, not to mention the fact that it has, as you know, recently undertaken a unilateral reduction of its armed forces by 1,840,000 men without waiting for such an agreement.

I shall be grateful, Mr. President, for whatever considerations you may consider it possible to express in connection with the foregoing.

With sincere respect,

N. Bulganin

Reports of Unrest in Poland

Statement by President Eisenhower

White House (Denver, Colo.) press release dated October 20

Numerous reports have been emanating from Poland which indicate ferment and unrest. These are accompanied by stories of Soviet troop movements. I am closely in touch with Secretary Dulles in an effort to ascertain the facts.

Naturally, all friends of the Polish people recognize and sympathize with their traditional yearning for liberty and independence.

President's Determination Concerning Aid to Yugoslavia

White House press release dated October 16

The President on October 16 sent the following findings and report to the Congress, as required by section 143 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. The President’s findings and report were contained in identical letters to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. President (Dear Mr. Speaker): Section 143 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provides for a suspension of assistance to Yugoslavia as therein specified unless I find and report to the Congress with my reasons therefor: “(1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this Act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union, (2) that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3) that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this Act.”

After careful study and examination of all the relevant facts available to me, I hereby find and report to the Congress affirmatively with respect to the three matters above mentioned.

My reasons therefor are the following:

1. The policy of assisting Yugoslavia was begun by this Government in 1949. That policy was not based upon approval of, or affinity with, the internal policies of the Government of Yugoslavia. It was undertaken because, despite such internal policies, it was then deemed in the interests of the United States to support the independence of Yugoslavia against a major effort by the Soviet Union to dominate that country. The balance of available evidence leads me to find that Yugoslavia remains independent of control by the Soviet Union and desires to continue to be independent; that it is still subject to efforts by the Soviet Union to compromise that independence; and that some assistance from the United States continues to be required and is desired by the Government of Yugoslavia to assure the maintenance of its independence.

I am aware of the fact that the designs of the Soviet Union against Yugoslavia are more subtle than heretofore, and that perhaps those designs are not adequately appreciated, or defended against, by Yugoslavia. Nevertheless, there remain the basic factors, i.e., the independence of Yugoslavia; the dedication of Yugoslavia to its independence; and the Soviet endangering of that independence.

2. My finding that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for Communist conquest of the world is based upon the fact that the ideology and doctrine of the Yugoslav Communist Party appear to adhere to the concept that each nation should determine for itself which kind of a society it wishes and that there should be no interference by one nation in the internal affairs of another.

3. My reason for finding that it is in the interests of the national security of the United States to continue to furnish at least limited assistance to Yugoslavia is that otherwise, in my opinion, there is a danger that Yugoslavia will be unable to maintain its independence. I believe, moreover, that the United States policies inaugurated in 1949 to
enable Yugoslavia to maintain its independence remain valid.

This determination on my part meets the statutory requirement in Section 143 regarding the utilization of the public funds allotted to Yugoslavia under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and under prior mutual security legislation. Its primary immediate effect will be to clear the way for conversations with appropriate Yugoslav officials to examine the various possibilities for bilateral cooperation in the economic field thus made feasible under our laws.

In the military field, the various departments of the government have, since the enactment of Section 143 in July of this year, at my direction, followed a policy of permitting only small, routine and long-planned deliveries of equipment. I intend that this attitude, which implies the non-delivery of jet planes and other items of heavy equipment, shall be maintained until the situation can be more accurately appraised during the days to come. I believe, however, that economic aid for the people of Yugoslavia, primarily in the form of foodstuffs, may now prudently and wisely be proceeded with.

In any case, I shall not consider that my action herewith definitely settles the various questions pertaining to United States–Yugoslav relations. These problems will, on the contrary, remain under my constant review, and I have, in addition, directed that those officers who conduct our day-to-day relations with Yugoslavia vigilantly apply the very helpful criteria established by the Congress in Section 143 to ensure that the decision which I have now made remains justified in future circumstances. I have made it clear, furthermore, that my determination is not, even in economic matters, to be taken as a continuing directive necessitating the obligation or expenditure of the funds available for Yugoslavia, regardless of circumstances, but is one which restores discretion in this area to me and my subordinates to take such actions as accord with the applicable national policy relating to Yugoslavia and serve the national interest. Such an approach will, I am sure, serve the foreign policy interests of our country and, at the same time, afford adequate protection against the unwise expenditure of public funds.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

Visit of Election Observers From U.S.S.R. and Rumania

Press release 548 dated October 20

The Department of State announced on September 28 that invitations had been extended to the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania to send representatives to the United States to view at first hand the free electoral processes in this country. The U.S.S.R. and Rumania have informed the United States that they will send observers in reply to this invitation. The Governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary have declined.

Arrangements have been completed for the first half of the itinerary of the U.S.S.R. observers. The second half of the itinerary is to be arranged after the observers have arrived in Washington to correspond with the request of the visitors and as the developments of the political campaign indicate.

The U.S.S.R. has informed the Government of the United States that its observers will be L. N. Solovev, Deputy of the Supreme Soviet; V. L. Kudryavtsev, journalist and member of the editorial board of Izvestia; and M. I. Rubinstein, Doctor of Economic Sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. The Department of State has made arrangements with the Governmental Affairs Institute to handle the details of the visits. Richard M. Scammon of the Institute and an interpreter will travel with the U.S.S.R. observers during their stay in the United States.

The U.S.S.R. observers will arrive at Idlewild, New York, on October 22 and will continue to Washington the same day. The party will be in Washington October 22 and 23. While in Washington they will receive a briefing at the Governmental Affairs Institute on American politics and elections. They will also visit the Republican National Headquarters, the Democratic National Committee, the Volunteers for Stevenson-Kefauver Headquarters, and the Citizens for Eisenhower local office.

On October 23 the party will leave for Louisville, Ky., and will stay there until October 25. During their visit in Kentucky, at the request of

2 For text of Soviet reply, see ibid., Oct. 15, 1956, p. 582.
the Department of State, Mark Ethridge, vice president and publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, will arrange for them to witness the developments in the campaign in that State.

On October 25 the party will return to New York, where they will hear President Eisenhower's speech at Madison Square Garden. On October 26 the party will leave for Los Angeles, Calif.

While in Los Angeles, at the request of the Department of State, the Los Angeles Council on World Affairs, of which Walter Coombs is Executive Director, will arrange for the party to witness campaign developments in the area. On October 27 the party will hear the speech of the Democratic candidate for President, Adlai Stevenson, at Gilmore Field.

The further itinerary for the visit of the U.S.S.R. observers and the itinerary of the Rumanian observers will be issued later.

Journalists From NATO Countries To Observe U.S. Elections

The Department of State announced on October 15 (press release 539) that a group of 12 journalists from 7 member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, and Norway—arrived in New York on October 14 to spend a month in the United States devoted primarily to studying the American political scene. They have been invited to visit this country under the International Educational Exchange Program of the Department of State. The visiting newspapermen will observe party organization methods, campaign procedures, and election-day practices. They will also be given opportunities to study recent developments in the industrial, agricultural, and military fields. The Governmental Affairs Institute is cooperating with the Department in planning their itinerary and arranging their activities.

The group arrived in Washington on October 15. Their time in the Capital will be spent in discussions with officers of the Departments of State and Defense, attendance at press conferences, and exchanges of views with officials at both the Republican and Democratic National Committee Headquarters. A reception will be given in their honor by Deputy Under Secretary Robert Murphy.

The journalists will leave for Norfolk, Va., on October 18 to visit SACLANT [Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic] Headquarters, where they will have an opportunity to observe various aspects of the Nato base's facilities and unique training program. From Norfolk they will go to Los Angeles, Calif., where they will stay 3 days. Plans have been made for them to visit aircraft factories, industrial plants, the University of California at Los Angeles, and Hollywood.

The itinerary includes several days in Portland, Ore. There the World Affairs Council in cooperation with both major political parties has planned activities for the group, including opportunities to hear campaign speeches by candidates and, through side trips, to observe life in small American communities and on farms.

The visitors will leave Portland on November 3 for St. Louis, Mo., where they will stay until November 7. On election day they will visit the headquarters of the two parties in addition to several polling places and in the evening will visit the newsroom of one of the leading St. Louis dailies to watch the tabulation boards and television sets as the returns are reported.

Returning to New York on November 7, the group will visit the headquarters of the National Association of Manufacturers, offices of labor organizations, the New York Times, and the United Nations. Visits to some of the city's housing projects are also planned. The journalists will leave for their homelands on November 13.

Construction of Nuclear-Powered Merchant Vessel

White House press release dated October 15

Statement by President Eisenhower

I have today directed the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Commerce to proceed as rapidly as possible with the design and construction of the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, in accordance with provisions of Public Law 848 [84th Congress].

This is a project in which I long have had a deep interest. When I advanced the idea of a nuclear-powered merchant vessel in April of 1955, I stated that the ship "will demonstrate to people everywhere this peacetime use of atomic energy, harnessed for the improvement of human living."

We have had a nuclear-powered warship since
the launching of the submarine *Nautilus* in January 1954. Merchant ship propulsion, however, is as yet unrealized—although it is one of the most promising applications of nuclear energy. Atomic merchant ships will be able to operate on longer runs at higher sustained speeds. They will be able to carry more cargo on long voyages than conventional ships because of the saving in fuel space. They will need less time in port, since they will operate for long periods without refueling.

This new vessel will be a floating laboratory, providing indispensable information for the further application of atomic energy in the field of ocean transportation. The reactor itself will be a definite step forward in nuclear propulsion. I am confident that the ship will be the forerunner of atomic merchant and passenger fleets which one day will unite the nations of the world in peaceful trade.

I should like to emphasize that the ship's reactor design will not be secret. The reactor will be built on an unclassified basis. It will be possible for engineers not only of our own country but of other nations to view the nuclear power plant and see at first hand this demonstration of the great promise of atomic energy for human betterment.

Attached to this statement is a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission which contains a description of the ship.

The Atomic Energy Commission will furnish the reactor and be responsible for its installation. The Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, will be responsible for the design and construction of the ship.

**Letter From Secretary of Commerce Weeks and AEC Chairman Strauss, October 15**

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Responsive to your letters of July 30, 1956, we are gratified to be able to report to you that meetings between the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, and the Atomic Energy Commission have taken place and agreement in principle has been reached on the characteristics of a nuclear powered merchant ship as provided in H.R. 6243, an Act to amend Title VII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 [Public Law 848].

The agreement provides that the Atomic En-

---

*Not printed here.*

**Shipping Liaison Committee**

Press release 547 dated October 19

The Department of State announced on October 19 the formation of a Shipping Liaison Committee to afford ready means for interchange of information between the Department and U.S. shipping interests concerning the use of the Suez Canal by vessels of U.S. ownership.

The committee will be composed of appropriate officials of the Department of State, of the Maritime Administration, and of those segments of the steamship industry normally using the Suez Canal. Chairman of the committee will be Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

This committee is intended to afford opportunity to the shipping industry to present its views regarding Suez directly to the appropriate officers of the Department and permit the Department to keep the industry as fully informed as practicable on developments in the problem. To this end it is expected that invitations to serve on the committee will be extended to individuals representing the following three segments of the U.S. shipping industry regularly using Suez: (1) dry-cargo liner companies, (2) the occasional tramp steamers, and (3) the tanker fleets.
Berlin, Symbol of Free-World Determination

Following are translations of two addresses made in German by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy at Berlin, the first at the cornerstone-laying ceremonies for the new Conference Hall on October 3 and the second before the Ernst Reuter Gesellschaft at the Free University on October 4, together with a series of messages read at the Conference Hall ceremonies.

CONFERENCE HALL ADDRESS, OCTOBER 3

There are times and occasions when a symbolic act is clothed with importance and stands out in the perspective of history. The occasion for which we are gathered here today, in the laying of the cornerstone for this Conference Hall, is one of those moments. It will be remembered long after we, perhaps, have been forgotten.

Today in Free Berlin we are laying the cornerstone for a splendid building in the construction of which the citizens of Berlin and my countrymen have jointly participated. I should like to pay special thanks to Mr. Hugh Stubbins, the American Institute of Architects, and their German associates for the design of this impressive modern building which is a symbol of cooperation between our peoples and of our hopes for the future.

Consider the significance of these three buildings—the Memorial Library, the Free University, and now the Conference Hall—built as they are in this great city only part of which is free, an island of Western civilization, surrounded on all sides by a tyranny that denies freedom of thought or expression or action to millions of human beings. That the people of the United States and the people of Berlin have worked together to build a Free University, a public library, and a Conference Hall is characteristic of values that they have shared in the past, which they cherish today, and which they are determined to maintain in the future. Freedom of thought, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly are cornerstones not only of these buildings but also of the principles on which our respective societies are based.

The whole world knows of the “spirit of Berlin,” the determination to remain free in the face of relentless pressures and subtle forces working to destroy that liberty. You and we know how the strength that has kept us free has sprung from our heritage, from the fight, from the determination, from the sacrifices that were made by our forebears because they prized liberty and because they valued the dignity of man.

German Devotion to Education

It was in 1809 that some scholars driven from Halle because of its incorporation into the Kingdom of Westphalia came to Berlin to seek the opportunity to establish a university. Wilhelm von Humboldt gave them assistance and encouragement, and one of the great universities of the modern world came to birth. A patriotic German woman wrote at the time that the “new university has been conceived in the midst of defeat, wretchedness, and terror.” Somehow, even after the exhaustions of defeat, and in the face of crushing exactions, the government of the day found means to endow the new university. Soon the youth of Germany were flocking to Berlin to listen to the voices of courage and wisdom that were heard there.

It was in 1809 that Fichte, speaking in the city overwhelmed by the troubles of the period, said: "The struggle of arms is over; we must begin that of principles, manner, and character." Certainly that was one of the symbolic moments of history, like the one in which I have confidence we are participating today. The greatness to which the university grew and the quality of the intellectual
life that centered in Berlin for the ensuing 100 years need no attestation. The scholarly life and the teaching of men like Wilhelm von Humboldt, Fichte, Leopold von Ranke, Helmholz, Moenssen, and many others left its mark throughout the civilized world.

This devotion to education and learning was not confined to a great university. It was the vital force that ran through German society. It could not have existed without the dedication of an entire people. If the Volkschulen and the German schoolmaster had not been possessed of this dedication, there could not have been the rebirth on the ashes of war of the great Germany of the 19th century.

This building which we are dedicating today represents in many ways the spirit of Berlin. Dark as the future seemed in 1806, the problems which had to be faced of course were not of the magnitude nor the brutality of the ones that you have overcome in the last 11 years. The small Berlin of that day, a city of just over 100,000 population, also was an island surrounded by hostile forces, but it did not face the appalling problems of the great city of over 4,000,000 people which was shattered in the last war. The physical destruction of a great industrial and transportation center such as modern Berlin and the continuous occupation of part of a city for over 11 years by a tyrannous force, the barriers thrown up to prevent its access not only to the sources of its industrial strength but even to the neighboring truck farms that supply it with produce represented problems of a magnitude and scale with which no people have previously had to deal.

The story of the people of Berlin's fight to preserve their city and their identity in the 11 years since the end of the war is known wherever men prize freedom and independence. The year 1945 found this great metropolitan city so badly damaged that many thought it could never be rebuilt. It was the people of Berlin, their fierce desire to be free, their determination to retain their identity that made it possible. In Berlin in 1945 the network of facilities necessary to a modern city had been destroyed or were out of use; its transportation system, its power plants, its water supply had been devastated. With nothing but their hands and stout hearts and their courageous determination, the people of Berlin grimly and immediately began the vast work of reconstruction.

And then came the blockade of 1948 and 1949. It was in those 11 months that a solid unity was forged between the peoples of Berlin and the United States. We in the free world came to know that a battlefront vital to our own well-being was the one that was being contested in this beleaguered city, exposed to this cruel test after all its wartime suffering. The people of the free world and people of Berlin knew that we shared a common cause, a battle to keep alive the civilization that we cherished.

Again, on June 17, 1953, we had a reaffirmation of the identity of spirit and strength that is shared by those of us who have had this greatest of privileges of freedom. On that day, cut off from aid and assistance, the spirit of a people who would be free and maintain their national identity was manifested. It was a day that will not be forgotten as long as liberty and independence are alive in our world.

And so it is today, 11 years after the end of the war, that I am honored to represent my Government at the dedication of the building that stands as a symbol to the courage and the soul of a city and a living symbol of the bond that ties our great and free peoples together.

The Role of Benjamin Franklin

How appropriate it is that this building which represents this bond should be identified with Benjamin Franklin! Not simply because that great hero-philosopher of the American Revolution, whose ever-seeking, ever-curious mind of the Enlightenment had brought him to Hanover to talk to Freiherr von Muenchhausen and to become a member of the Royal Academy of Sciences and visit the University of Göttingen, but because the range of his interests, his delight in learning, and the unfettered qualities of his mind had so much in common with the spirit of the great scholars and leaders of thought in the Germany of that day.

It was Immanuel Kant who said, "No man must be the means for the ends of another, but must be an end in himself, all the time." Surely the great philosopher would be pleased to know that an inscription that will be in this building will quote Franklin's words: "God grant that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface, and say, 'This is my coun-
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try.' It is doubtful if anyone could better represent the qualities which you, the people of Berlin, and we of the United States share and cherish. No one could be less "a man made by a stencil"—Schablomenmensch.

Franklin's wisdom was of invaluable service to the young nation which he represented for so many years in London and Paris. The years of his public life paralleled the years in which the Colonies were developing their unity and coming into existence as a country. He represented the best of those years of enlightenment of the 18th century, and it has been written of him that he shared "its healthy, clarifying scepticism; its passion for freedom and its humane sympathies; its preoccupation with the world that is evident to the senses; its profound faith in common sense, in the efficacy of reason for the solution of human problems and the advancement of human welfare."

What could be more fitting than that his name should be honored in the construction of this Conference Hall representing as it does the joint effort of the Federal Republic of Germany, the City of Berlin, and the people of the United States?

Here, in the renaissance of a great city, the cooperation of the Federal Republic, the City of Berlin, and the United States has built these three great new buildings: the Memorial Library, the Free University, and the Conference Hall. They represent a living force, free expression, free association, a common recognition by our peoples of the identity of free men. This is the Berlin that is the window of the free world, standing as an active, vital, living representation of its intellectual and spiritual values. It is here at this outpost of freedom that a beacon of light proclaims the identity in soul and body of the great society that takes its strength from its faith in God.

In the past 11 years the people of Berlin have repeatedly demonstrated their will to retain their religious, their intellectual, their political, and their economic freedom—their will to be in the great community of the free. The free world cannot continue its existence without this determination. It is like a chain: Its strength is that of its weakest link. The people of the United States have been able to work with their Berlin friends in their dark hours. We, like them, are determined to maintain our freedom at any price; working together we have strengthened each other. May the years of the future demonstrate increasingly our success, in this and in other joint endeavors, to build a world in which our successors may live as free men and women under God!

MESSAGES READ AT CORNERSTONE CEREMONY

President Eisenhower to Ralph Walker

TO CHAIRMAN, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN FOUNDATION, RALPH WALKER: On the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the Congress Hall in Berlin, I wish to greet the people of Berlin and express my sincere hope that this building will well serve the high purposes for which it was designed.

This cooperative effort of the German and American people is not only a symbol but an instrument to serve the cause of liberty and those basic human values which we are committed to preserve.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Secretary Dulles to Ralph Walker

DEAR MR. WALKER: I was delighted to learn that the cornerstone-laying ceremony for the Berlin Kongresshalle will be held October 3 under the auspices of the Foundation you have so ably headed since your appointment as Chairman on October 14, 1955.

I regret that it is not possible for me to participate in the ceremony with you, but the Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. Robert Murphy, will be there to express the good wishes of all of us. For my part, I would like to take this occasion, which marks the completion of the important preliminary stages in the construction of the building, to express appreciation of the time and effort you have devoted to the success of this project at every stage of its development.

This building, dedicated to Benjamin Franklin, who typifies the spirit of freedom and humanitarianism which binds together the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, is unusual not only in design but in the part it is intended to play in the divided city of Berlin. I am sure that the Hall will do much to carry out our hope of attracting to the city groups of intellectual leaders and of stimulating there an increasing exchange of ideas through free assembly and debate, thereby furthering the cause of human freedom.

You and your associates in this enterprise will be able to feel a sense of great pride because of the
significant personal contribution you have made to this end.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Ambassador Conant to Deputy Under Secretary Murphy

Dear Bob: Will you please extend to those present at the cornerstone-laying ceremony my congratulations and say how much I regret that illness prevents my being present. I had intended to say at this ceremony a few words of introduction for yourself. This privilege I am deprived of, but, of course, it is quite unnecessary to introduce in Berlin a man who played such an important part in the heroic stand of the free world against tyranny during the Berlin blockade. Not only because of your present position and the many important positions which you have previously held, but primarily because of your work in and for Berlin, I am sure that all will welcome you in Berlin with enthusiasm.

Will you please express my appreciation, both personal and official, to all those who have labored together to make the Conference Hall a reality—and I think I may call it a reality although I know that only the cornerstone is being laid. I should like particularly to express my appreciation of the work of Mr. Walker for his part in the effort and to congratulate Mr. Stubbin's for his interesting plan. I should like to thank the Berlin authorities and all those Americans who worked with them. Above all, words of praise should go to Mrs. Eleanor Dulles for her unstinting labor. I am sure all will agree when I say we owe it primarily to Mrs. Dulles that we are able to lay this cornerstone today.

Again with regrets at my absence,

Sincerely,

JAMES B. CONANT.

FREE UNIVERSITY ADDRESS, OCTOBER 4

Yesterday I had the privilege of participating in the cornerstone laying of the Conference Hall in the Tiergarten, and I said how especially fitting I felt it was for that building to be associated with the memory of Benjamin Franklin, as a repre-

sentative of that great period of enlightenment from which have emerged so many of the intellectual and spiritual values which we share.

Today we are gathered to honor the memory of one of Berlin's great citizens, Mayor Ernst Reuter. When we recall the courage with which our ancestors fought to bring about the existence of our respective countries, we are reminded of Ernst Reuter and his spirit and will—his ability to overcome discouragement. It was my privilege to observe him closely in those hard years. He never wavered, he never despaired. He was an inspiration to all of us. This man, who suffered in countless ways, who was exiled by tyranny, and who returned to a city completely in ruins to start its rebuilding under the most adverse circumstances that ever faced a great people, symbolizes the indomitable spirit of the people of this great city and their faith in freedom.

There are many bonds between the people of the United States and the people of Germany. Our American faith in the future of a free, independent, and united Germany is the stronger because of men like Ernst Reuter.

Yesterday, speaking at the cornerstone laying of the Conference Hall, I referred to those days in Berlin's history, 150 years ago, when the outlook for the present and future was dark and men suffered from despair and discouragement. One hundred and fifty years ago Berlin itself was occupied, Germany was divided and weak. But history, the enlarged reflection of human life, is like human life itself, surprising and unpredictable. What greater surprise has it held than the rebirth of vitality and force that took place here in Berlin during the 19th century? The small Berlin of some 100,000 people that in 1806 was an occupied city, the capital of a small state whose territory was being apportioned by others, was a hundred years later to become the capital of a great country, one of the three or four largest cities in the world, an intellectual center, and the hub of a vast industrial system.

If we think of the years between 1806 and 1871, we become aware of the faith, the will, and the perseverance that went into the slow progress of building a unified country. For us one lesson of these years was the success that was achieved when a unified German state became a reality. This was the success that crowned the efforts of a people determined to be free and united. But there is another lesson to be gained and remembered from
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this half a century of hope and effort, and this lesson is most important: Men cannot be denied their freedom—men cannot be denied their national identity when spiritual strength and determination exist together.

We in our country share this knowledge with you. We went through a period of 25 years from 1763 to 1788 when we were struggling to become a nation. These were years of frequent discouragement, even during our Revolutionary War years of bitter dark despair. There was more than one time when only the faith of our ancestors and their will to be a united, free people kept their effort alive.

Germany, like the United States, knows well what these years of discouragement can be—we have both been through them and have known that the strength of faith and will is in the end irresistible. Today we and you share this faith and will. We know that, no matter how great the sacrifices and how trying the effort may be, the alliance of free men will prevail and the day will come when a united, independent, and free Germany will take its rightful place among the family of nations.

Policy of Collective Security

In the past 11 years since the end of the war, we in the free world have been faced with a threat to our existence. And in answer to this threat we have seen an evolution of policy among the free nations of the world which our children and their children may well record as one of the most significant developments of history.

This period has been marked by a rapidly increasing awareness among the free nations of the world of an identity of interests. We in the free world have been faced with a threat to our very existence, a danger that unless we could rapidly coordinate our resources and strength we would lose our independence and freedom.

In this 11-year period a combination of old-fashioned Russian expansionism and aggressive communism has by intimidation, by threat of force, and by violence reduced the once independent countries of Eastern Europe to the status of unhappy satellites. It led the massive insurrection in Greece; it has kept Eastern Germany captive; it attempted to subjugate all of Berlin; Asiatic countries have suffered Communist-inspired internal aggression; Norway, Denmark, Turkey, and especially the Federal Republic of Germany were subjected both to blandishments and threats as they joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and in Korea there was war.

The continuation of this series of maneuvers throughout the postwar years has made it harshly clear to most of the nations of the free world that they were in constant danger of Soviet Communist domination. They recognized that their individual security could not be maintained unless a system of collective security was built.

We in the United States have recognized that because of our position and because of our strength we have had a special responsibility in building with our friends this collective security system. Our allies and the United States developed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the Anzus Pact with Australia and New Zealand, and the Rio Pact with our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. In all, the United States has collective security treaties with some 42 nations.

This policy of the free nations based on the principle of collective security has been successful. It contemplates the creation of European unity. It has stopped the expansion of the Soviet Union. Favorable conditions have been established which have culminated in the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany in Nato and the restoration of sovereignty to Japan, both of these latter achieved over the adamant opposition of the Soviet Union.

The threat to our way of life has not been eliminated. But we do not permit that threat to stultify our thinking or paralyze our actions. President Eisenhower has said that the policies of our country must be shaped "not for a moment but an age of danger," and this is true for all of the free world.

We share common interests and common values. We believe in a code of morality and are not impressed by primitive materialism. The concept of preventive war is not acceptable to the United States or its allies. Unless the Communists force war upon us, we must rely upon our common strategic policies to maintain our security.

We are engaged in perhaps the most complex task that any group of nations working together has ever undertaken. We must maintain our unity and simultaneously change the nature of an adversary to induce him over a period of time to abandon expansionist policies and participate reason-
ably and responsibly in world affairs, and we are determined to achieve this objective without resort to war.

The free nations cannot tolerate indefinitely the concept of a divided and precarious world community in which peace rests only on the fear engendered by nuclear stalemate. We of the Atlantic Community must especially summon all of our resources of material power and spiritual energy in the unremitting endeavor to achieve a situation in which the existence of diverse systems and ideologies becomes possible without sacrifice of fundamental principles or values, and in which the peace will be assured through firm and endorsable guaranties against unilateral and aggressive military action by any state or group of states.

It is true that we are stronger than we have ever been before. Never has the world seen an alliance of so many different countries representing so many cultures. Yet we are faced by a vast hostile bloc, intent on dominating the world. Our world, with its vital interdependence, no longer enjoys absolute bulwarks of time and space. This is the time for wise leadership and steady nerves, for clarity of purpose and economy of means, for unswerving determination and flexibility in procedure.

We in the United States propose to maintain our own strength. We are at the center of the alliances of the free world, and there is no substitute for strength at the center. The pattern of collective security that has been built in the postwar years will be maintained and strengthened. We must see that the area of freedom expands and that nations that now stand uncommitted realize that their identity is with the free world.

Secretary Dulles has said: 3

It is not enough to prove that despotism is bad. It is equally necessary to go on—and on—proving that freedom is good. . . .

That is the great mission to which the free nations are dedicated. If we can continue to show freedom as a dynamic liberalizing force, then we need not fear the results of the peaceful competition which the Soviet rulers profess to offer. More than that, we can hope that the forces now at work within the Soviet Union and within the captive countries will require that those who rule shall increasingly conform to principles of freedom.

Shift in Soviet Tactics

Since the death of Stalin, and especially since the spring of 1955, the Communist bloc has shown a marked change in its foreign conduct. It has lessened its emphasis on force and violence, closing out military and subversive operations in Korea, Indochina, Malaya, and the Philippines. It has sought to achieve more normal relations, especially with its neighbors, and it has ended its occupation of Austria. It has turned increasingly to conventional diplomatic relations, exchanging state visits, extending economic credits, selling arms openly rather than clandestinely, more than doubling its cultural exchange program.

In particular, it has paid new attention to cultivating government-to-government relations. Scarcely a country in the world has not been the recipient of some amiable Soviet gesture. In short, it has tried to create a new image of the U.S.S.R. in the eyes of world opinion, an image of a respectable, peaceable, reasonable, well-meaning country, a country that is strong but need not be feared.

This shift in the Soviet approach may have been under consideration in Stalin's time, but his death certainly accelerated it. Stalin's passing permitted the Soviet rulers to make a fresh assessment of the world situation. In making this assessment, they appear to have reached four conclusions:

1. Nuclear war, especially during a period in which Soviet capabilities are inferior to those of the West, was unacceptable.

2. Stalin's tactics by and large had reached a point of diminishing returns, and their further employment might lead to unnecessary risks.

3. The enormous cost of modern weapons systems, including air defense, intensified domestic economic problems and retarded internal development.

4. Despite the political problems inherent in solving the succession to Stalin and the economic problems involved in rapid industrialization, the Soviet Union felt itself under no compulsion to seek a final settlement with the free world.

In terms of the direction to be taken by Soviet policy, these conclusions appeared to point toward the avoidance of extremes. At one extreme, it was dangerous to pursue a course of action that might lead to general war. At the other extreme, it was unnecessary in view of Soviet strength, including thermonuclear successes, to face up to a real settlement of issues with the free world. Thus, the remaining alternative was "peaceful co-
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existence.” This concept is not, however, a passive one. The past 18 months—one of the most dynamic periods in the history of Soviet diplomacy—testify that the Soviet rulers regard “coexistence” as an activist policy with new opportunities for furthering the Soviet’s international objectives.

The very novelty of some rather recent Soviet actions has attracted attention and in some areas abroad has excited hopes that the Soviet Union is in the process of embarking on a new course. Certainly the changes that have taken place cannot be dismissed out of hand. They require careful evaluation and constant watching.

Elements in U.S.S.R. That Have Not Changed

It is also of the greatest importance that we keep our attention vigilantly on the elements that have not changed in the U.S.S.R. today.

First of all, the Soviet Union remains a dictatorship. Stalin’s power has been collectivized, with Khrushchev holding a disproportionate share, but the substitution of an executive committee for a single boss still leaves unaltered the dictatorial nature of the system. The denunciation of the so-called cult of personality has yet to be matched by the introduction of checks and balances against the emergence of another despot. The power of decision—the ability to direct the mighty resources of the Soviet Union in any desired direction—continues to be the exclusive and absolute right of the few, unchecked by law, institution, or ethic.

Secondly, the Soviet Union remains wedded to a hostile ideology. To be sure, the Soviet rulers have been giving fresh accent to the theme of peaceful coexistence, but they have made no effort to disguise its meaning. “The fact that we support peaceful coexistence,” Khrushchev told the 20th Party Congress, “does not mean that one can relax in the struggle against bourgeois ideology.” In India he was both frank and colorful: “We tell the gentlemen who are expecting the Soviet Union to change its political program: ‘Wait for the pigs to fly.’”

Third, the Soviet Union remains a formidable military machine. It is not necessary to recite the details of the constant development of Soviet military capabilities on the ground, in the air, and under the sea. Soviet forces are no longer almost exclusively designed for massive land battles on the Eurasian Continent. Special emphasis has been placed on the development of nuclear weapons. We know that the Soviet guided missile program is well advanced. Moscow’s well-advertised reduction in manpower has not been paralleled by any letup in its development and production of the most modern weapons.

Fourth, the Soviet Union continues to press the development of heavy industry. Economic power, rather than popular welfare, remains the overriding goal. The post-Stalin regime has sought to improve conditions in neglected areas of the economy, especially agriculture, but it has retained the traditional framework of top priority for heavy industry.

To sum up then, we find that, despite the variety of changes that have taken place on the Soviet scene, the main elements that make the Soviet Union a threat to our security remain unaltered. In meeting this new situation, we shall, as President Eisenhower has said, employ dynamic and flexible means, not merely to counter Soviet tactics but to advance our own objectives.

Fundamental Principles of U.S. Policy

There are continuing and fundamental principles of United States foreign policy on which all Americans are agreed regardless of political party. These fundamental principles are well known to you in Berlin. They are: to maintain the strength and unity of the free world and further develop the institutions which express that strength and unity; and to continue our opposition to arbitrary and despotic rule until the point has been reached, as we are firmly convinced it will be, where the leaders of the Soviet finally realize that their analysis of the world situation, in particular of your own German situation, has been wrong and must be abandoned.

The United States believes that strengthening the Atlantic Community remains of the greatest importance. This can be done in part by developing means of closer European cooperation and by the strengthening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

European cooperation has progressed since the war. The development of hostile Soviet-bloc power since 1945 has intensified the awareness of common interests, common needs, and a common destiny by those nations of the West which have come to feel themselves bound together into a community by their history and heritage.

The sense of community was sharpened by ex-
experiences deriving from World War II and its aftermath. Quite apart from the Soviet threat, the nations of Europe had reached a point, after 1945, beyond which their further well-being and even existence could be assured only through close cooperative political and economic actions and no longer through exclusively national policies and measures. Out of this necessity, there have developed a variety of cooperative international organizations linking the nations of the area and directed toward the solution of common problems. Some of these—the Council of Europe, the OEEC, the Coal and Steel Community—have made significant progress toward European integration. And recently we have seen important support for two other significant steps toward European integration in the serious consideration that has been given to the Euratom program and to the “common market.”

President Eisenhower said in February of 1955:

I cannot overemphasize the importance to the security of the free world of a greater economic, industrial, and social connection and, indeed, finally, some greater political connection between the nations of free Europe.

Importance of NATO

The other factor fundamental to strengthening the Atlantic Community is continued progress toward a more effective North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This will remain a key element of top priority in our planning. The political functions of Nato should be appropriately broadened. As long as the main elements of Soviet policy remain as they are today, the military strength of Nato must be maintained and developed. We in the United States are determined to spare no effort to reach this goal. We have made in the past and will continue to make in the future an extraordinary contribution to the success of our collective defense effort.

I wish to emphasize the importance of Nato as a mutual defense effort, an effort which necessitates an appropriate contribution from each Nato partner according to resources and geographic position. The aim of these individual contributions is a balanced and flexible defense force capable of action in all military situations. This is as true for our own United States military planning as it is for Nato itself. Given the different histories and institutions of the United States and other Nato members, the Nato organization has been a tremendously convenient vehicle to help us carry out our desire to help other members in the mutual defense effort, and it is hard to imagine how we could render as effective assistance without it. As you know, the basic principle of Nato is the unity which stems from the mutual understanding and voluntary cooperation of its members; when we have acted together, we have been successful, but when members have acted contrary to this spirit of cooperation, the entire organization suffers.

I have pointed out that it is a major foreign-policy objective of the U.S. to continue our opposition to arbitrary and despotic rule. In relation to those nations once free members of the European community that have lost their freedom, we have repeatedly made it clear that we will never accept their enslavement and that we shall undertake no agreements which confirm or sanction the status quo. Secretary Dulles said last year:

We shall not seek to cure these injustices by ourselves invoking force. But we can and will constantly keep these injustices at the forefront of human consciousness and thus bring into play the force of world opinion which, working steadily, will have its way. For no nation, however powerful, wishes to incur, on a steadily mounting basis, the moral condemnation of the world.

What the world needs to know at this juncture is that our Nation remains steadfast to its historic ideals and follows its traditional course of sharing the spiritual, intellectual, and material fruits of our free society, in helping the captives to become free and helping the free to remain free.

You will recall that Winston Churchill in one of the war’s memorable phrases, described a certain point in World War II as “not the end, nor yet the beginning of the end, but the end of the beginning.” The more we learn of the ferment now loose in the Soviet Union and its satellite empire, the more it seems to me that we may be at such a point in the relations between the free world and the Soviet bloc.

Inherent Contradictions of Communism

There is much evidence that the Soviet leaders have decided, for a time at least, to put less stress on violence in foreign affairs and to permit some tolerance internally. Our own policies perhaps have had some influence in promoting this worthwhile progress. It is too early to say that there is anything irreversible in their decisions to date, and the power elements in the Soviet system still exist largely unchecked by institutional safe-

guards or the force of legitimate public opinion. However, we are beginning to deal for the first time with a mature Soviet society, and the Soviet leaders are finally having to face up to the inherent contradictions of communism:

—How to rear a new class of scientists, managers, and officials free enough to make further progress and slave enough to accept the shabby dogma of a 19th-century formula for despotism.

—How to manage the conflicting claims of empire, with less reliance on coercion, with continued restriction of consumption, and with the increasing devotion of resources to heavy industry and military technology.

—How to maintain dependable Communist movements in the underdeveloped states and at the same time pose as wishing to help those states strengthen their independence and make a success of their moderate non-Communist governments.

These and other contradictions inherent in their system, including the perhaps yet-to-be-fatal flaw involved in their lack of an accepted and orderly system of succession in their leadership, bind and restrict Soviet choices of action. For our part, one essential condition must be met. The Soviet leaders must be deprived of victories. The free world must be resolute and skillful in preventing further Soviet conquests by force or by trickery. Only in this way will they be induced to advance further toward a responsible participation in international affairs. Our posture of firmness and strength must convince them that they cannot revert in safety to their methods of violence. And our political posture must be such as to persuade them that they must come to terms with the world of the 20th century, terms to satisfy reasonable requirements of security, peace, and justice for all peoples. The maintenance of this politically-military posture is the task of all of us.

We in the United States believe that these objectives are realistic and are obtainable. We believe that the fulfillment of this task is possible. We are convinced that, if it is fulfilled and the Germans in the East and the West maintain their determination to be a free and united people, we can bring about a gradual evolution in the attitude of Soviet leadership and a revision in their position toward the reunification of a free Germany.

**Arbitral Commission on Property, Rights, and Interests in Germany**

The Department of State announced on October 19 (press release 546) the appointment of Albert I. Edelman of New York City as the United States member of the Arbitral Commission on Property, Rights, and Interests in Germany. This Commission was established pursuant to chapter five of and the annex to the Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising out of the War and the Occupation, as amended by schedule IV of the Protocol on the Termination of the Occupation Regime signed at Paris on October 23, 1954. The tribunal, which is composed of members appointed by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, has jurisdiction in all disputes envisaged under article 7 of chapter 5 and article 12 of chapter 10 of the settlement convention. The Commission meets at Coblenz, Germany.

**Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy**

**84th Congress, 2d Session**
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1 For text, see S. Executives Q and R, 82d Cong., 2d sess.

2 For text, see London and Paris Agreements, September–October 1954, Department of State publication 5659, p. 86.
Claim Against U.S.S.R. in 1954 Plane Attack

Press release 534 dated October 12

The U.S. Ambassador at Moscow on October 12 delivered to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs a note presenting a formal international diplomatic claim for damages against the Soviet Government for losses resulting from the destruction in the airspace over the international waters of the Sea of Japan on September 4, 1954, of a United States Navy P2V-type aircraft, commonly known as a Neptune type, by military aircraft of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There was one victim of the attack, and nine survivors. The claim totals $1,355,650.52.

The U.S. Government protested the incident to the Soviet Government on September 6, 1954, reserving at the time all rights to claim damages for loss of property and lives from the illegal attack by Soviet aircraft. The incident was brought to the attention of the Security Council of the United Nations and discussed by the Council on September 10, 1954.1

TEXT OF U.S. NOTE OF OCTOBER 12

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to transmit, upon the instruction of my Government, the following communication from my Government to your Government:

The Government of the United States of America makes reference again to the destruction in the air space over the international waters of the Sea of Japan on September 4, 1954 of a United States Navy P2V-type aircraft, commonly known as a Neptune type, by military aircraft of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Because the United States Government believed, and believes, that the repetition of such incidents might endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it brought the incident to the attention of the Security Council of the United Nations, which discussed the incident and its implications on September 10, 1954. As it stated in its note to the Soviet Government, number 202 of September 6, 1954, the United States Government also reserved all rights to claim damages for loss of property and lives and for other circumstances resulting from the illegal attack by Soviet aircraft.

A careful study and review of all the available evidence with respect to the incident confirms the essential correctness of the statements made by the United States Government and compels the United States Government to deny the version of the facts of the incident and reject the claims of justification for the attack advanced by the Soviet Government. The United States Government in this connection has given careful consideration to the statements of fact regarding the incident made by the Soviet Government’s representative in the Security Council on September 10, 1954 and in the Soviet Government’s latest note on this subject, number 74/OSA, received by the American Embassy at Moscow on September 8, 1954.2

The purpose of the present communication is to prefer against the Soviet Government a formal international diplomatic claim for damages as set forth below.

I.

The United States Government is prepared to prove by evidence in an appropriate forum, and it charges, the following:

1. By virtue of the Security Treaty between the United States of America and Japan signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951, as well as by virtue of its rights under international law, the United States Government on, and from time to time prior to, September 4, 1954, dispatched military aircraft from the territory of Japan over adjacent international air space including the international air space over the Sea of Japan. These facts were undoubtedly well known at all relevant times to the Soviet Government.

2. Shortly before two o’clock in the afternoon of September 4, 1954, a P2V Neptune-type patrol aircraft, bearing number 128357, of the United States Navy Air Arm departed from its base at Atsugi, Japan, under orders from

---

1 Bulletin of Sept. 13, 1954, p. 364. The note, dated Sept. 6, was released at Washington on Sept. 5.
2 For statement by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., see ibid., Sept. 20, 1954, p. 417.
3 Not printed here.
appropriate United States Navy authorities to conduct a routine patrol mission in the international air space over the Sea of Japan upon a course from Niigata, Japan. The mission was entirely peaceable in character, and it was directed, and it was conducted, under the authorization of the Security Treaty with Japan and in the exercise of the United States Government’s rights under international law.

Upon its departure the Neptune-type aircraft had on board a crew of ten persons, all members of the United States Navy and all nationals of the United States.

The crew, officers and enlisted men, were competent by education, training, and skill to perform the various tasks relevant to the flight, particularly aerial navigation and pilotage. The Neptune aircraft and the equipment thereon were at all times during the flight in efficient and good working order.

The aircraft in the course of its flight attained, and at all times relevant to the present claim maintained, except as recited below, an altitude of about 8,000 feet, and it maintained a normal cruising speed of approximately 180 knots. At no time did the aircraft leave, after departing from Japanese territorial air space, the international air space of the Sea of Japan. As it approached closer to the land mass at the northern end of the Sea of Japan, the crew made repeated and careful navigational checks, confirmed by visual observation on the part of the crew and facilitated by the fact that weather and visibility in the area were good, to insure that they were flying, and would continue to fly, exclusively in the international air space well over the universally acknowledged high seas of the Sea of Japan.

At 5:58 o’clock in the afternoon, while the airplane was flying on a course of 090 degrees magnetic, over the high seas of the Sea of Japan, its position was approximately 41 degrees 51 minutes north and 132 degrees 47 minutes east. At 6:07 o’clock in the afternoon, the course was changed to 067 degrees magnetic. The ground speed of the aircraft at the time continued at approximately 180 knots and its altitude was approximately 8,000 feet.

The course of 067 degrees had been continued for approximately five minutes, when, without prior signal or warning, Soviet fighter aircraft of the MiG type, at least two in number, came up behind the Neptune aircraft, approaching it in an offensive, hostile firing position, with the glaring sun behind the fighters, and then, having determined that this was a United States Neptune, still without any prior warning opened fire upon the Neptune several seconds after 6:12 o’clock shooting numerous rounds of ammunition at it from the rear in a manner calculated to effect the Neptune’s immediate destruction. The pilot of the Neptune, perceiving that he was under hostile attack from the rear, although not seeing nor having seen the attacker or other Soviet aircraft, turned sharply to the right and went simultaneously into a steep dive at a rate of descent of approximately 2,000 to 3,000 feet per minute, attempting to fly farther and farther away from the Soviet land mass and seeking the protective cover of a cloud bank approximately ten miles farther away; but to no avail. The attacking Soviet aircraft, unrelenting, resumed the hostile attitude, from above and to the rear right of the Neptune; as the Neptune was descending, one of the Soviet aircraft approached from the rear right and from that rear position resumed hostile firing against the Neptune at 6:15 o’clock. The Neptune, continuing its steep dive in its attempt to reach the cloud bank above described, made evasive maneuvers to the right and left, carrying it farther still from the Soviet land mass. At the second firing pass by the Soviet aircraft, the pilot of the Neptune intensified evasive maneuvers directed toward reaching the cloud bank shelter. But the Soviet fighters, still unrelenting, resumed firing positions to the rear of the Neptune, now at an altitude of approximately 3,000 feet from the surface of the sea, and reopened firing attack and this time succeeded in hitting the left wing of the Neptune causing it visible, multiple injuries. Only then did the attacking Soviet MiG aircraft disengage and climb back to higher altitude westward.

The Neptune’s left wing was set on fire in consequence of this final attack. The fire continued to spread quickly through the wing to the fuselage, and when the Neptune had reached an altitude of 400 feet over water and the protection of the cloud bank, the pilot determined that it was necessary to abandon the aircraft in the interest of the safety of the crew. The Neptune thereafter was landed on the sea and came to a complete stop within 50 to 75 yards after the initial impact.

The United States Government has determined that the point of the first attack by the Soviet fighter aircraft, above described, was over the high seas to the southeast of Cape Ostrovnoi, in the neighborhood of 42 degrees 22 minutes north and 134 degrees 11 minutes east, or further to the south and east of that position, that is, not closer to Soviet territory than approximately 33 to 40 nautical miles; that the point of the second attack by the Soviet fighter aircraft was slightly further to the east, but in the same area although, as indicated above, at lower altitude; that the point of the third attack was at the edge of the cloud bank, approximately 10 miles to the east of the position of the first attack, and in the neighborhood of 42 degrees 22 minutes north and 134 degrees 24 minutes east, and even farther from Soviet territory than the earlier attacks.

Of the ten members of the crew on board the Neptune aircraft, nine succeeded in making their way out of the aircraft to the surface of the sea and entered a survival raft which had been carried aboard. Such was the deadliness of the damage inflicted by the Soviet aircraft however that one member of the crew, Ensign Roger H. Reid, was trapped in the fuselage which sank as the crew members were leaving it and while he was attempting to put out an additional survival life raft.

The nine surviving crew members in their survival raft remained afloat in the area in which they had been shot down. No attempt whatever was made by any authority of the Soviet Government at rescue of the survivors. As the result of an emergency radio message sent from the Neptune aircraft upon the Soviet attack, rescue aircraft of the United States Government from Japan and Korea discovered the survivors shortly before dawn on September 5, 1954, at 42 degrees 39 minutes north and 134 degrees 20 minutes east, and the survivors were duly
rescued and returned to Japan. All were in a state of
shock resulting from the incident and their exposure, and
one suffered physical injuries resulting directly from
the unlawful action of the Soviet aircraft. In spite of a
diligent and careful search by aircraft and surface ves-
sels, the body of Ensign Roger H. Reid could not be found.

3. The United States Government concludes from its
investigation that the two Soviet MIG-type attacking
aircraft were dispatched by responsible Soviet ground
authorities and their pilots were then and continuously
thereafter under the control, and performed the actions
of approach and firing upon the explicit direction, of re-
sponsible Soviet ground authorities.

4. The United States Government must conclude from
its consideration of all the evidence and all the surround-
ing circumstances that the acts of interception of the
Neptune aircraft, attack upon it and its destruction, were
deliberate and calculated on the part of responsible Soviet
Government authorities; that each of these acts was
committed with full knowledge on the part of such au-
thorities that the Neptune aircraft was then lawfully
flying in the international air space over the Sea of Japan;
and that these acts were directed and committed with the
preconceived intention of accomplishing both the destruc-
tion of the aircraft and the death or injury of the crew.

II.

The Soviet Government in its various notes to the
United States Government on this incident has given a
version of the facts which has by now taken on the char-
acter of a stereotype. The United States Government
finds as a result of its investigation that the Soviet Gov-
ernment's version contains material misstatements of fact.
These misstatements were repeated and additional ones
were made by the Soviet representative in the Security
Council on September 10, 1954 in the course of the dis-
cussion of this incident in the Security Council.

Of these material misstatements of fact the most sig-
nificant are the following:

1. The Soviet Government states and has reiterated
that the Neptune aircraft at 18 hours 12 minutes local
time on September 4, 1954 "violated the state frontier of
the USSR in the region of Cape Ostronu to the east of
the Port of Nakhodka." At no time, in any of its notes or
in the statements made by the Soviet representative in
the Security Council, has the Soviet Government stated
any position in coordinates of latitude and longitude at
which any known or claimed frontier of the Soviet Gover-
ment in this area was crossed by the Neptune aircraft in
the course of its flight. The United States Government
categorically denies any such crossing at any time during
the flight and reiterates that the Neptune aircraft at all
times stayed within the international air space over the
Sea of Japan.

2. The Soviet Government states that two Soviet fight-
ers approached the American airplane "for the purpose
of showing it that it was within the limits of the frontiers
of the Soviet Union and of proposing that it immediately
leave the air space of the USSR." This statement the
United States Government categorically denies. At no
time did the attacking Soviet aircraft or any other air-
craft make any approach to the Neptune aircraft in flight
in any attitude consistent with any peaceable purpose,
conveying any signal or attempting to communicate any
such message whatsoever; on the contrary, the Soviet
fighter aircraft approached the Neptune aircraft from
behind and made their presence known only by firing from
hostile firing positions calculated to effect the immediate
destruction of the Neptune aircraft and without any prior
warning whatsoever. The United States Government
notes again that this stereotype Soviet allegation, made in
the Soviet versions of other incidents of similar illegality,
is not supported by any allegations as to the means or
methods by which the Soviet fighter aircraft are claimed
to have undertaken to convey the alleged message.

3. The Soviet Government further states that the
American airplane "opened fire on the Soviet airplanes"
when the latter approached for the above-mentioned pur-
pose. This statement the United States Government cate-
gorically denies. The only firing by any member of the
crew of the Neptune aircraft took place while the Neptune
was in its sharp descent and seeking disengagement, when
one of the attacking Soviet fighters, having already fired
on the Neptune aircraft for the purpose of destroying it,
appeared again in continuation of the hostile attacks and
one of the Neptune crew, in self-defense and in a vain
attempt to ward off a repetition of the previous hostile
attack, sent fire in the direction of the oncoming attacker,
which simultaneously fired at the Neptune. As was
pointed out in the Security Council discussion, and as the
Soviet Government is well aware, an allegation that a
patrol aircraft of the Neptune type initiated hostile firing
at a fighter-aircraft of the MIG type is senseless.

4. The Soviet Government states that the Soviet air-
planes "were obliged to open answering fire". This the
United States Government categorically denies. At the
time of the attack the Neptune aircraft was following an
easterly course which, if continued, would place it pro-
gressively farther and farther away from the Soviet-held
land mass. The MIG-type Soviet aircraft, moreover,
could easily place itself out of range of the Neptune's
armament when the crew member fired in vain self-defense,
and this must have been obvious. Had the Soviet pilots
been instructed or had they intended to convey any signals
to the Neptune aircraft, they could easily with their speed
and maneuverability disengage the Neptune aircraft and
remain out of range of its guns and still observe it and
communicate any signal. They were not "obliged" to fire at
the Neptune.

5. The Soviet Government states that after the opening
of answering fire upon it the American airplane "withdrew
in the direction of the sea" and that Soviet authorities
have no further information of the fate of the Neptune
aircraft. As the facts above recited show, the attacking
Soviet fighters did not disengage until the obviously mor-
tally wounded Neptune aircraft had reached an altitude
so low above the surface of the sea as to make further
attack by fighter aircraft risky as well as unnecessary,
and was approaching the protective cover of a low lying
cloud layer approximately ten miles to the right of the
Neptune at the point of first attack. These facts were
known to the Soviet pilots and undoubtedly were com-
communicated to the competent higher Soviet authorities.
The United States Government notes that having wrong-
fully accomplished the destruction of the Neptune ac-

craft the responsible Soviet authorities made no attempt
to mitigate their wrong by attempting to effect any rescue
of the survivors even though, contrary to fact, the Soviet
Government asserts that the Soviet action against the
Neptune aircraft took place within Soviet territorial air

space.

III.

The United States Government concludes, and it charges,
that the foregoing actions of the pilots of the Soviet
aircraft and of the competent Soviet authorities made the
Soviet Government guilty of deliberate violations of inter-
national law on account of which it has become liable to
the United States Government for damages and other
amends. The United States Government has dealt in
other communications to the Soviet Government with al-
legations by the Soviet Government of versions of fact and
implications of law similar to those contained in the
Soviet Government's notes regarding the present incident.
Particular reference is made to the United States Gov-
ernment's note of October 9, 1954 1 concerning the case of
the United States B-50 aircraft shot down by Soviet
aircraft over the Sea of Japan on July 29, 1953. In regard
to the present incident, however, the United States Gov-
ernment desires specifically to state:

1. To the extent that the Soviet Government claims a
violation of any Soviet frontier, the United States
Government again declares that the limit of the territory
of the Soviet Government in the area in which the present
incident occurred extends no farther than three nautical
miles from the mean low water mark of the Soviet-held
land mass, following the sinuosities of the coast and

the sinuosities of each of the Soviet-held islands. The United
States Government prefers, however, to challenge the
Soviet Government's territorial claims in this regard only
in the channels of peaceful diplomatic negotiation and
judicial determination. The present incident occurred in
international air space well outside any territorial air
space officially claimed by the Soviet Government at any
time so far as is known. But the United States Government
reasserts that in its opinion there is no obligation
under international law to recognize any Soviet claims
to territorial waters or air space in excess of three miles

from the Soviet coast.

2. The Soviet Government, in its note of September 8,
1954, has made statements questioning the conduct by
United States military aircraft of patrol flights over the
Sea of Japan. The United States Government reiterates
that any peaceable flights conducted by United States
military aircraft in international air space have the un-
questionable sanction of international law and that par-

ticularly the flight of the Neptune aircraft in the inter-
national air space over the Sea of Japan recited above

was so sanctioned. In addition, as the United States
Government has stated, apart from their general interna-
tional law sanction, peaceable flights in this area by
United States military aircraft, and the flight of the

Neptune in the present case, were and are specifically
sanctioned and envisaged by the Security Treaty of
September 8, 1951 between the United States of America
and Japan. The Government of Japan has, at all relevant
times, been, and it is, a sovereign government having
littoral rights along the Sea of Japan and in the air
space above it.

3. Any shooting by the crew of the Neptune aircraft at
the attacking MIG-type aircraft in the circumstances de-
scribed above was lawful in the exercise of the right of
self-defense. In the circumstances described above, had
the purpose of the Soviet fighter aircraft been to commu-

nicate signals or warnings, it was the duty of their pilots
and of their ground controllers to engage in no hostile
approach or fire as a method of communication or to engage
in any hostile maneuver or attitude in flight.

IV.

The United States has suffered the following items of
damage in direct consequence of the foregoing illegal acts
and violations of duty and international legal obligations,
for which the Soviet Government is liable, and the United
States Government demands that the Soviet Government
pay the following sums on account thereof:

1. Loss of the United States Navy P2V-5 aircraft, Ne-
ptune type, No. 125357, and the equipment thereon, amount-
ing in total to $939,183.00.

2. Damages to the United States by the willful and un-
lawful conduct of the Soviet Government, amounting in
total to $316,467.52.

3. Damages to the next of kin, nationals of the United
States, for the death of crew member Ensign Roger H.
Reid, amounting to $50,000.00.

4. Injuries to the nine surviving members of the crew,
amounting to $50,000.00.

Total ........................................... $1,355,650.52

The United States Government has not included in its
demand for damages, specified above, any sum on account
of items of intangible injury deliberately and intentionally
caus ed to the United States Government and to the Amer-
ican people by the wrongful actions of the Soviet Gov-
ernment in this case. In this regard the United States Gov-
ernment has determined to defer to a future date the for-
mulation of the kind and measure of redress or other
action which the Soviet Government should take which
would be appropriate in international law and practice
to confirm the illegality of the actions directed by the
Soviet Government against the United States Govern-
ment and against the American people.

The United States Government calls upon the Soviet
Government to make its detailed answers to the allega-
tions and demands made in this communication. Should
the Soviet Government in its answer acknowledge its in-
debtedness to the United States on account of the fore-
going and agree to pay the damages suffered, the United
States Government is prepared, if requested, to present
detailed evidence in support of its calculations of damages
suffered and alleged.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my high-
est consideration.

Department of State Bulletin
President Orders Investigations on Effects of Fig and Date Imports

IMPORTS OF FIGS AND FIG PASTE

White House press release dated October 2

The President on October 2 directed the U. S. Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation into the effects of imports of dried figs and fig paste on the Federal Fig Marketing Order Program and on the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic figs. The President's action was taken in response to a recommendation by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Commission's investigation will be made pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

President's Letter to Edgar B. Brossard, Chairman of Tariff Commission

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that there is reason to believe that dates are practically certain to be imported into the United States during the 1956-57 crop year under such conditions and in such quantities as to render ineffective the Federal Fig Marketing Order Program and to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic figs.

The Tariff Commission is therefore directed to make an immediate investigation under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, to determine if there is a need for import restrictions for dried figs and fig paste. The Commission's findings should be completed as promptly as practicable.

A copy of the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture is enclosed.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

IMPORTS OF DATES

White House press release dated October 2

The President on October 2 directed the U. S. Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation into the effects of imports of dates on the Federal Date Marketing Order Program, on the Department of Agriculture's program for the diversion of dates to new uses, and on the amount of domestic dates processed in the United States. The President's action was taken in response to a recommendation by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Commission's investigation will be made pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

President Approves Report on Imports of Dried Figs

White House press release dated October 12

The President on October 12 approved the U. S. Tariff Commission's fourth periodic report on the 1952 escape-clause action with respect to dried figs. The Commission reported on August 30, 1956, that it does not appear that conditions have so changed as to warrant the institution of a new formal investigation on imports of dried figs.

On August 30, 1952, the tariff on imports of dried figs was increased pursuant to an escape-clause action. The Tariff Commission's fourth periodic report to the President on subsequent developments in the dried figs trade was made in accordance with Executive Order 10401.

Copies of the report may be obtained from the U. S. Tariff Commission, Washington 25, D. C.

October 29, 1956
World Bank Loan To Aid
Development of Southern Italy

The World Bank announced on October 11 that it has made a loan equivalent to $74,628,000 to the Cassa per il Mezzogiorno for the agricultural and industrial development of southern Italy. The bank has now lent a total of nearly $165 million for Italy’s program to raise the standard of living in the area comprising the Italian mainland south of Rome and the islands of Sicily and Sardinia. Previous loans of $10 million each were made in 1951 and 1953 and one of $70 million in 1955.

The Bank of America is participating in the loan, without the World Bank’s guaranty, to the extent of $500,000 of the first maturity, which falls due September 1, 1959.

The Cassa per il Mezzogiorno is the governmental agency established in 1950 to administer a 12-year program for the development of southern Italy. The program will cost the equivalent of $2 billion, and after 6 years of existence the Cassa has reached the halfway mark and has approved projects that will absorb more than half its resources.

Eugene R. Black, President, who signed the loan documents on behalf of the World Bank, pointed out that this fourth loan was the best evidence of the bank’s continued interest in and support for the work of the Cassa.

Industrial Projects. The 10 industrial projects for which the equivalent of $23,963,000 has been allocated from the bank’s loan will cost a total of more than $50 million. The bank funds will be re-lent to the concerns carrying out the projects. There are two cement factories and two glass factories, a vegetable canning plant, an automobile assembly plant, a plant for the construction of buses and truck bodies, a fertilizer factory, and plants for the production of hardboard and of polyethylene. They will provide some 3,000 new jobs and have a favorable effect on the balance of payments of about $9.6 million a year, as well as reducing the cost of internal transport.

Seven of the projects will be on the mainland, two will be in Sicily, and one in Sardinia. Three of the borrowers on the mainland are well-known northern industrial firms which will for the first time establish factories in the south. All three plants will be in the Naples area, where unemployment is high.

Electric Power Projects. While the Cassa does not itself finance power projects in its program, considerable expansion of power facilities is essential to the economic development of the Cassa area, and power companies in the south of Italy all have large investment programs planned for the next 10 years. The bank’s loan in 1955 included $30 million for power development and the Cassa will re-lend $25.2 million of the $74,628,000 loan to power companies to help to finance projects which will cost a total of about $42 million. They include three hydroelectric plants on the mainland—two in the neighborhood of Cassino between Rome and Naples, and one south of Salerno on the west coast—and a thermal plant at Augusta on the east coast of Sicily. The projects will increase installed capacity of the Cassa area by 217,000 kilowatts, or 14 percent, and the annual generation of power by 17 percent. All of the plants will be in operation in 1959 and some of them will be completed earlier.

The Cassa. After 6 years of operation, the Cassa has signed more than 55,000 contracts and paid out the equivalent of $760 million on work completed or in progress. Private interests, encouraged by the Cassa’s activities in the south, have added materially to this investment. So far the Cassa has completed 1,900 miles of canals and improved river beds and 750 miles of main and secondary canals; it has irrigated 114,000 acres, constructed 1,300 miles of new roads, and improved 5,600 miles of old ones; it has planted 67 million trees; and it has brought drinking water to 245 villages with 1,350,000 inhabitants.

Flumendosa Irrigation Project. The loan will provide $25 million of the equivalent of $85 million to be spent on the Cassa’s most ambitious single project, irrigation of up to 123,500 acres of the Campidano di Cagliari, a plain in southwestern Sardinia. Water for irrigation will come from the Flumendosa River and its tributaries, the Flumineddu and the Mulargia. The Flumendosa runs between mountains on the east coast of the island, and at present its waters flow wasted into the sea. The project will include the construction of dams on the three rivers to store the water and a series of tunnels and canals to take it from the reservoirs thus created and distribute it over the plain. It is estimated that, when the Flumendosa project has been completed, the value of farm production will increase by the equivalent of nearly $21 million annually and the total income of the region by $30 million.
Problems Facing the 11th Session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

Statement by Herbert V. Prochnow
Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs

When the Contracting Parties met in their 10th session last October, the head of the United States delegation, Ambassador Bonbright, remarked that economic conditions in the world continued to be favorable for further progress toward the freer, nondiscriminatory trade which we have jointly accepted as our objective in the general agreement. I believe that a similar observation may be made today. Again, we can be encouraged by gains made by many countries during the year in production and productivity, in volume of trade, and in the size of their monetary reserves. These gains have enabled a number of countries to dismantle more of their import restrictions and trade controls and to move nearer a system of nondiscrimination in trade and payments.

In looking at these favorable developments, however, we cannot disregard the economic problems that have arisen for certain countries represented here. In some cases the favorable trade conditions that had existed for them have become adverse and their monetary reserves have declined; in other cases the strengthening of their balance of payments has proved to be a slow process demanding—and fortunately bringing forth—steadfastness and patience. There has also been observable during the past year a problem of a more general nature, namely, the emergence of inflationary pressures in many parts of the world.

I believe that all of us here recognize that, if these pressures are not prudently and effectively dealt with, they can injure not only the economic health of the individual countries in which they originate but also the economic health of many other countries throughout the world. It is encouraging to note the early recognition which many governments have shown of the dangers of inflationary developments and of the importance of dealing with them.

This 11th session of the Contracting Parties convenes only a few months after the conclusion of another round of general tariff negotiations. The results of those negotiations have confirmed the role of the general agreement as a most effective instrument for the orderly reduction of unnecessary barriers to international trade.

The progress that has been made in the reduction and removal of such barriers since the creation of the general agreement is a source of hope and encouragement. The United States has played its part in making certain that this progress was maintained and that tariff gains would be protected.

It is, of course, obvious that the restoration of world production facilities since the end of World War II has increased the competition for markets and the demands for protection from affected industries. It would be idle to pretend that governments can or should in every instance resist these pressures. The path of progress is

1 Made at the opening of the 11th session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, Switzerland, on Oct. 11 (press release 541 dated Oct. 15). Mr. Prochnow is chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 11th session.


never an uninterrupted one. One must always expect some backsteps, some adjustments in a policy aimed at the elimination of unnecessary trade barriers. What counts most is the long-term trend, and it is here, I think, that many governments adhering to this agreement may be commended for the generally forward movement of their international trade policies since 1947.

**U.S. Steps To Reduce Trade Barriers**

Since 1948, when the general agreement entered into force, the United States Trade Agreements Act has been renewed six times. Its renewal in 1955 by a bipartisan majority of the Congress for a period of 3 years reflected the extent to which the principle of reciprocal tariff reductions as a means of expanding world trade has been accepted as an integral part of United States foreign economic policy. Relatively few of the thousands of United States concessions representing hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of trade have been withdrawn or modified. I trust it is not immodest to say that the successive renewals of the Trade Agreements Act by the United States and its willingness to participate in five tariff negotiations under the general agreement have made a significant contribution to the achievements for which the general agreement is best known.

During the last year, my Government has continued to demonstrate its attachment to the principles embodied in the general agreement. On August 2 the Customs Simplification Act of 1956 was signed by the President. Section 2 of the act makes export value the method of valuation to be used generally. This represents a change desired by foreign traders everywhere—a change from the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930—and it should encourage the expansion of mutually advantageous trade between the United States and the rest of the world. In this measure, which had been preceded by the customs simplification laws of 1953 and 1954 and by the abolition of the requirement for the certification of consular invoices in 1955, the United States was acting in accordance with the principles of the general agreement having to do with the necessity for simplifying customs formalities.

The continuing awareness of the United States of the necessity for simplifying customs procedures whenever possible is also manifest in the study of the problems of classification in the United States tariff structure now being made by the United States Tariff Commission pursuant to the Customs Simplification Act of 1954.

Also during the past year the United States Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the Samples Convention, which was drafted by the Contracting Parties. This action by the Senate offered further evidence of the basic United States policy that international cooperative action should be employed wherever possible to facilitate the movement of goods between nations. The draft legislation necessary for the implementation of the Samples Convention is in preparation.

It is because of its concern for the effectiveness of the general agreement that my Government hopes that those Contracting Parties which have not yet accepted the protocols amending the substantive provisions of the general agreement will soon find themselves in a position to do so. These protocols have been open for acceptance since March of 1955. They reflect the experience of governments under the general agreement and their careful assessment of the international trade picture in the calculable future. They have been accepted by some of the Contracting Parties, including the United States. We urge that they be accepted by others so that they may enter into force at an early date. In accepting these amendments Contracting Parties will be demonstrating their awareness that the general agreement, if it is to continue to be an effective instrument, must reflect the significant changes in the international trade situation that have occurred since the general agreement was drafted in 1947.

**Balance-of-Payments Question**

Because of the substantial improvement in the world trade and payments situation today as compared with that which prevailed only a few years ago, the United States believes that the Contracting Parties should direct their attention to making more effective the provisions of the agreement which make possible the multilateral consideration of import restrictions maintained for balance-of-payments reasons. Significant changes have taken

---

place in the balance of payments and reserves of individual countries, in the stability of their currencies, and in the domestic factors affecting the forces of supply and demand. Foreign trade and exchange regulations have undergone numerous modifications, and old patterns of trade have continued to be modified both by administrative action and by alterations in fundamental economic conditions. In some cases import controls have been intensified; in other cases they have been relaxed.

It is my Government's view that an invitation should be extended by the Contracting Parties to those governments which apply restrictions under article XII to consult regarding those restrictions in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4 (b) of that article. The United States delegation will have detailed comments to make on this particular matter during the session. I should like, however, to stress the importance attached by my Government to this proposal. As was mentioned earlier, the Contracting Parties have every reason to be proud of the progress that has been made in the dismantling of unnecessary tariff barriers under the auspices of the agreement and in the settlement of problems within the context of the agreement. Progress has also been made with regard to the reduction and removal of quantitative restrictions on imports. The United States proposal for consultations under article XII is designed to accelerate the progress with respect to quantitative restrictions.

My Government believes that the experience of the Contracting Parties over the past 8 years demonstrates the utility of a multilateral, systematic, and careful examination of import controls. Such examinations make possible the fullest understanding of the basis for those controls, their scope, their effect on the trade of other Contracting Parties, and the possibilities of their relaxation and eventual elimination.

Certainly all of us are aware of the extent to which the proverb that "nothing is so permanent as the temporary" applies to import restrictions. They have a tendency to harden, and governments are no different from domestic industries in eventually taking them for granted. There is an opportunity here which my Government believes the Contracting Parties should seize at this session. A demonstrated awareness by the Contracting Parties of the task that must be faced and of a willingness to face it at this session can not help but enhance the usefulness of the agreement to all its participants.

GATT and the Common Market

During the 11th session the Contracting Parties will be called upon to consider their role in relation to the six-country initiative directed toward the creation of a common market. In this connection they will also wish to consider their role with respect to the possible development of the European free trade area which is now being studied by the OEEC.

My Government believes that the Contracting Parties to the general agreement should keep themselves fully informed of developments with respect to both the six-country common market and the possible European free trade area. Certainly, in projects of such magnitude, having widespread international commercial repercussions, the Contracting Parties have a role to play. Consideration should be given by the Contracting Parties at this session to arrangements which would facilitate consultation and cooperation by them with the governments and other institutions concerned with these undertakings. This is particularly true in view of the provisions of article XXIV of the agreement and the fact that countries participating in these endeavors to promote economic integration are also adherents to the agreement.

During the 11th session the Contracting Parties will also be called upon to consider the application of Switzerland for accession to the general agreement. The United States Government welcomes the application by Switzerland and is prepared to consider this request sympathetically. My Government would be prepared to support an arrangement which would permit Switzerland to associate itself with the general agreement on a provisional basis, pending an ultimate solution to the problem presented for the general agreement by the Swiss agricultural controls.

The Contracting Parties will also be called upon to consider the proposal of Brazil with respect to the revision of its tariff. The United States delegation is aware of the important considerations which have prompted the Government of Brazil to revise its tariff and is sympathetic to the desire of all economically underdeveloped countries to coordinate their international trade policies with the legitimate economic needs and aspirations of
their populations. The United States delegation will give its most earnest attention to the proposal of Brazil in the hope that a constructive solution to this problem may be developed at this session.

During this session the Contracting Parties will have the opportunity to consider the report of the Intersessional Committee on the training program which they approved on an experimental basis at the 10th session. My Government believes that this program should continue to be supported by the Contracting Parties. The report by the Executive Secretary to the Intersessional Committee describing the operation of the program is a most encouraging one and rightly indicates the great promise which it holds for the future.

I have touched only briefly on some of the steps taken by my Government in the trade field in the past year and on some of the major problems which need to be considered by the Contracting Parties at the present session. The agenda before us is a long and substantial one and continues to reflect the importance which governments attach to the agreement and their desire to make it work as effectively as possible. I am confident that this session will prove a constructive and fruitful one in furthering the objectives we share as partners in the general agreement.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Contracting Parties to GATT

The U.S. delegation to the 11th session of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which opened at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 11, is as follows:

Chairman
Herbert V. Prochnow, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs

Vice Chairman
Carl D. Corse, Chief, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State

Congressional Adviser
Representative Thomas R. Curtis, Missouri

Advisers
Louis Boochever, American Embassy, Luxembourg
Richard DeFelice, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture

Ethel Dietrich, U.S. Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations, Paris
Phil S. Eckert, Foreign Agricultural Service, Bonn
Morris Fields, Chief, Commercial Policy and United Nations Division, Department of the Treasury
Moritimer Goldstein, Office of International Finance and Development, Department of State
Walter Hollis, Office of the Assistant Legal Adviser for Economic Affairs, Department of State
Eugene Kaplan, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce
Virgilia McClung, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State
Bernard Norwood, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State
Albert Pappano, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Department of State
Vernon L. Phelps, American Embassy, Bonn
Albert Powers, Office of Economic Affairs, Department of Commerce
Joe A. Robinson, U.S. Consulate General and Resident Delegate for International Organizations, Geneva
John Stewart, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture

Secretary of Delegation
Henry J. Sabatini, U.S. Consulate General and Resident Delegate for International Organizations, Geneva

World Eucalyptus Conference

The Department of State announced on October 16 (press release 544) that the U.S. Government would be represented by the following delegation at the World Eucalyptus Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), to be held at Rome October 17–29, 1956:

Woodbridge Metcalf, chairman, Berkeley, Calif.
Willard F. Bond, United States Operations Mission, Libya
W. Raymond Ogg, Foreign Agricultural Service, Rome
Walter W. Sohl, American Embassy, Rome

This project is a further step in FAO's endeavor to promote interest in quick-yielding eucalypts, following the Eucalyptus Study Tour held in Australia in 1952. The central theme of this conference is "Eucalypts in World Forestry." The objectives are to bring about an exchange of views among the foresters best acquainted with eucalypts, with particular emphasis on plantations outside their natural habitat; to summarize recommended practices in all phases of establishment, management, and utilization; to analyze research needs; and to propose methods of coordinating future research and action programs in the introduction of eucalypts in suitable regions throughout the world.
Beginning on October 24, the delegates will be taken on a study tour arranged by the Italian Forest Service. They will visit points of interest in the vicinity of Bari, Foggia, Caserta, Naples, and Catania in Sicily.

All FAO member governments have been invited to participate in the conference.

**ECE Timber Committee**

The Department of State announced on October 18 (press release 545) that Walter M. Leuthold, Chairman of the Board of the Deer Park Pine Industries, Inc., Deer Park, Wash., has been designated the U.S. delegate to the 14th session of the Timber Committee of the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe to be held at Geneva, October 22–25, 1956.

The Timber Committee is one of the principal subsidiary organs established by the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe. The Economic Commission for Europe and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations work together on timber questions; in the ECE Timber Committee importers and exporters regularly review the timber situation.

At the 14th session, delegates will present statements concerning the development of consumption, production, and trade in 1956, together with prospects for 1957, in the categories of sawn softwood, sawn hardwood, and small-sized roundwood. Other items of interest will be reports of the Joint FAO-ECE Committee on Forest Working Techniques and Training of Forest Workers; the Joint FAO-ECE Working Party on Forest and Forest Products Statistics; and the Working Party on the Standardization of General Conditions of Sale for Timber.

**Data on Atomic Radiation Transmitted to U.N Committee**

U.S./U.N. press release 2463 dated October 3

A nine-volume record of 250,000 worldwide fallout samples analyzed by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission as part of its monitoring program was transmitted to the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation on October 3 by the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Four of the volumes detail the day-by-day results of samples collected at monitoring stations across the United States. The five others, each representing a region, give identical data for the 62 localities abroad where daily samples are collected. Single bound volumes of the fallout data from each country in which a sampling station is located will be made available to scientists of that country upon request at the U.S. Embassy or Consulate in the area.

The main purpose of the Atomic Energy Commission’s worldwide monitoring network is to gather data on the distribution of fission products resulting from nuclear test detonations. Sampling is done by exposing a 1 foot square sheet of gummed film on a stand 3 feet above the ground for a period of 24 hours. The exposed film is then mailed to the Commission’s Health and Safety Laboratory in New York City, where it isashed and the radioactive content measured. The nine volumes transmitted to the United Nations present the data from each sample in terms of: Beta activity (expressed in millicuries per square mile), accumulated strontium (expressed in millicuries per square mile), and infinity gamma dose (expressed in millirads, the unit for measuring the dose of ionizing radiation to the tissue). The analyses indicate that the average gamma dose from fallout is 3 percent of that naturally delivered from cosmic rays and radioactive materials normally present in the soil.

The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation was established by the General Assembly at its 10th session on the initiative of the United States. The committee was established in the belief that the widest distribution should be given to all available scientific data on the effects upon man and his environment of radiation, including radiation levels and radioactive fallout.

The United States also forwarded two new reports on the analysis of materials for strontium 90, potentially the most hazardous of the fission products which compose airborne dust or fallout, to the United Nations Committee. Entitled, “Project Sunshine Bulletin No. 12, University of Chicago, The Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies” and “Summary of Analytical Results from the HASL Strontium Program to June 1956, Health and Safety Laboratory, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,” these reports detailed the analysis of approximately 5,900 samples of soil, milk, air, rain, tapwater, urine, human and animal
bone, canned fish, and vegetation for possible strontium content.

The bulk of the data in these volumes and reports covers the years 1952 through September 1955 and has served as the basis for previous summary reports on the subject. One of these, "Radioactive Fallout Through September 1955" by Eisenbud and Harley, was transmitted to the United Nations by the United States Mission in August of this year. Similar reports appeared in the journal *Science* in 1953, 1955, and 1956. In its recent report on "The Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation," the National Academy of Sciences also drew heavily on this material.

**Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography**

**General Assembly**


Questions Relating to Economic Development. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. A/3192, September 18, 1956. 9 pp. mimeo.


**Security Council**


**Economic and Social Council**


Advisory Services in the Field of Human Rights. Provisional observations by UNESCO on the implementation of resolution 926 (X) of the United Nations General Assembly concerning advisory services in the field of human rights. E/2894/Add. 1, June 13, 1956. 9 pp. mimeo.
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International plant protection convention. Done at Rome December 6, 1951. Entered into force April 3, 1952.¹
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Postal Services


War
Geneva convention relative to treatment of prisoners of war;
Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded and sick in armed forces in the field;
Geneva convention for amelioration of condition of wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea;
Ratification deposited: Argentina, September 18, 1956.
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Brazil

¹ Not in force for the United States.
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DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Consular Offices
The Department of State announced on October 15 (press release 538) that the American Consulate at Melbourne, Australia, will be redesignated as a Consulate General effective November 1. Consul General Gerald Warner is the principal officer at Melbourne.

This action has been taken because of Australia’s increasing importance in its contacts with the United States. The office is moving to new quarters before the expected influx of visitors to Melbourne for the Olympic Games, November 22 to December 8.

Recess Appointments
President Eisenhower on October 15 appointed James W. Riddleberger as Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs (press release 540).

Designations
Walter N. Walmsley as Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, effective October 8.
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I recall being here almost exactly 4 years ago. A few days afterward I was Secretary of State-designate, and ever since then I have been quite busy. I am glad, however, to have found it possible to return here to Dallas and to join your World Affairs Council as it celebrates its fifth anniversary.

When I was here before, we talked about some of the problems ahead of us. I suggest that we do the same tonight, looking first at the significance of some broad principles. These are not partisan principles. Indeed, they are largely the outgrowth of nonpartisan consultations between the Executive and the Congress.

Then I shall speak of the Suez Canal problem. It is an unfinished drama of suspense which illustrates the kind of effort, often called “waging peace,” which will be required, day in and day out, for many years, in many matters, as we seek a just and durable peace.

**Maintaining Military Power**

Let me speak first of our military strength. That we must have. For moral strength alone is not enough. If we were relatively feeble in relation to the vast military power possessed by unscrupulous men, then we would not be the master of our own destiny.

But, while it is simple to decide to be militarily strong, it is difficult to decide in what way to be strong. There are many ways—air, army, navy—conventional and atomic weapons—defense and offense. We cannot be equally strong in all ways and at all times and at all places without assuming an intolerable load.

Fortunately, it is not necessary for the United States alone to possess all of the military power needed to balance that of the Soviet bloc. We have allies, and they contribute to the common defense. But we do have one special responsibility. We alone have the economic and financial strength and the “know-how” to prevent the world from being dominated by the atomic and nuclear weapons which the Soviet Union is feverishly developing. We must possess a capacity to retaliate on a scale which is sufficient to deter aggression. We must have that capacity, not in the expectation of having to use it but because if we have that capacity we shall probably **never** have to use it.

But there may be local aggressions, so-called “nibblings,” not initially involving the most potent weapons. We and our allies should, between us, have the capacity to deal with these without our action producing a general nuclear war. Furthermore, it would be reckless to risk everything on one form of armament, because no one can forecast with certainty the requirements of a future war.

Thus, we and our allies, in addition to having great nuclear power, should have conventional forces which can help to defend the free world. The combined free-world military strength must be sufficiently balanced, sufficiently flexible, and so deployed that it can deter or defeat both big and little aggressions.

Of course, peace which rests upon the deterrent effect of military power is not an ideal peace. There ought to be a controlled limitation of armament. To achieve that is perhaps the most difficult of all tasks of peace. But if the difficulties are great, so also is the necessity to overcome those

---

1 Made before the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Dallas, Tex., on Oct. 27 (press release 560).
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difficulties. Let our action reflect faith that what needs to be done can be done.

**Strengthening Collective Security**

I turn now to a second major area of concern. That is the maintaining and strengthening of our collective-security arrangements.

The United States now has collective-security associations with 42 other nations. The principal charters are the Rio Pact of the American Republics, the North Atlantic Treaty, and the Southeast Asia Treaty.

All of these arrangements, in their present form, are the product of a sense of danger born of the aggressive and violent foreign policies of power-hungry dictators—firstly Hitler and then the Soviet and Chinese Communist rulers.

But now that sense of danger is somewhat dissipated. The Soviet Union has continued intensively its efforts to develop military supremacy. But it has also sought—at least until this week—to appear more peace-loving. In consequence, rightly or wrongly, it became widely felt that there was less danger of general war. The cement of fear is not so strong to hold us together as it was to bring us together.

That is not logical, because the basic danger persists—vast military power in the hands of a dictatorship unrestrained by moral principles. We should, therefore, hold fast that which has made us more safe. But we cannot get away from the fact that, as people feel less endangered, they tend to draw apart—unless they find a basis for unity which transcends that sense of danger.

That is perhaps most readily achieved in the case of the Organization of American States. That association has a rich and venerable background. It is designed not merely to repel external aggression but to solve controversies among the American nations themselves. At the recent Panama meeting it was agreed that more emphasis should be put upon economic and cultural relations. This concept is being actively developed.

We face the same problem in relation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Its members are now studying how to develop its nonmilitary aspects. Senator Walter George is acting for the United States in relation to this matter and bringing his great experience and talents to bear upon it.

In the case of our Pacific and Asian associations the problem is somewhat different because the Chinese Communists keep fear alive. They continue to threaten the Republics of Korea and Vietnam with military force. They periodically threaten to take Taiwan (Formosa) by force. They have occupied portions of Burma with armed force.

In the Far East danger is still apparent, although even there the Chinese Communists occasionally seek to woo with blandishments. So, even there we cannot rely on the cement of fear alone. To find sounder ties will be one of the tasks of the Foreign Ministers of the SEATO countries when they meet next spring.

We do not, of course, forget the United Nations. It was designed to provide collective security for all and increased economic and social fellowship. The United Nations has performed and is performing a great service in these respects. But it still falls short of what it could be. The strengthening of the United Nations is another vital phase of the collective effort to build peace and justice in the world.

**Newly Independent Nations**

A third major area of concern relates to the nearly 700 million people who, in 18 new nations, have achieved full independence since World War II. These new nations are distinctive in many respects. But they are alike in being imbued with national patriotism that won them their freedom. Also they are all inspired by a vision of progress toward well-being.

Some of these newly independent nations realize that their independence can best be assured through such collective-security arrangements as we have described. We are proud to be associated with these nations and are determined to justify their confidence.

Other newly independent nations prefer not to adhere to collective-security pacts. We acknowledge, of course, their freedom of choice.

We have a deep interest in the independence of all of these new nations and stand ready to contribute, from our store of skills and resources, to help them achieve a solid economic foundation for their freedom.

This is a challenging problem for the free world. For, in the long run, political independence and economic well-being are interdependent. Much has been done, and is being done, to meet the problem. But it is on a piecemeal basis. The search for adequate and dependable processes is still unfinished business.
Surely it is within the capability of the free world to assure that no people dedicated to freedom have to choose between Communist servitude and economic destitution.

Captive Nations

Another intensive concern of our foreign policy is in relation to the captive nations of the world. We had looked upon World War II as a war of liberation. The Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Declaration committed all the Allies to restore sovereign rights and self-government to those who had been forcibly deprived of them and to recognize the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they would live. Unhappily, those pledges have been violated, and in Eastern Europe one form of conquest was merely replaced by another.

But the spirit of patriotism, and the longing of individuals for freedom of thought and of conscience and the right to mold their own lives, are forces which erode and finally break the iron bonds of servitude.

Today we see dramatic evidence of this truth. The Polish people now loosen the Soviet grip upon the land they love. And the heroic people of Hungary challenge the murderous fire of Red Army tanks. These patriots value liberty more than life itself. And all who peacefully enjoy liberty have a solemn duty to seek, by all truly helpful means, that those who now die for freedom will not have died in vain. It is in this spirit that the United States and others have today acted to bring the situation in Hungary to the United Nations Security Council.

The weakness of Soviet imperialism is being made manifest. Its weakness is not military weakness nor lack of material power. It is weak because it seeks to sustain an unnatural tyranny by suppressing human aspirations which cannot indefinitely be suppressed and by concealing truths which cannot indefinitely be hidden.

Imperialist dictatorships often present a formidable exterior. For a time they may seem to be hard, glittering, and irresistible. But in reality they turn out to be “like unto whitened sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men’s bones, and of all uncleanness.” They have vulnerabilities not easily seen.

Our Nation has from its beginning stimulated political independence and human liberty throughout the world. Lincoln said of our Declaration of Independence that it gave “liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time.” During the period when our Nation was founded, the tides of despotism were running high. But our free society and its good fruits became known throughout the world and helped to inspire the subject peoples of that day to demand, and to get, the opportunity to mold their own destinies.

Today our Nation continues its historic role. The captive peoples should never have reason to doubt that they have in us a sincere and dedicated friend who shares their aspirations. They must know that they can draw upon our abundance to tide themselves over the period of economic adjustment which is inevitable as they re dedicate their productive efforts to the service of their own people, rather than of exploiting masters. Nor do we condition economic ties between us upon the adoption by these countries of any particular form of society.

And let me make this clear, beyond a possibility of doubt: The United States has no ulterior purpose in desiring the independence of the satellite countries. Our unadulterated wish is that these peoples, from whom so much of our own national life derives, should have sovereignty restored to them and that they should have governments of their own free choosing. We do not look upon these nations as potential military allies. We see them as friends and as part of a new and friendly and no longer divided Europe. We are confident that their independence, if promptly accorded, will contribute immensely to stabilize peace throughout all of Europe, West and East.

Peoples of U.S.S.R.

Let me add a word about future relations with the peoples who compose the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. They, too, can have hope. The spread of education and industrial development create growing demands for greater intellectual and spiritual freedom, for greater personal security through the protection of law, and for greater enjoyment of the good things of life. And there has been some response to those demands.

There is ground to believe that that trend will prove to be an irreversible trend. It may bring the day when the people of the United States can have, with the people of Russia, the relations of fellowship which they would like and when the
Governments of our countries can deal with each other as friends.

Suez Canal Controversy

I have spoken in terms of the general. But also there is the particular. A world which vitally reflects human passions and imperfections will constantly produce particular situations which endanger the peace or good relations between nations. History records a long succession of such situations; there are several now, and there will be more to come. I shall speak briefly of one—the Suez Canal controversy. I pick that because it is of great immediate importance and because it illustrates the ever-present task of "waging peace."

The Suez Canal is the world's most important manmade waterway. It is made international by treaty. Since it was opened 90 years ago, it has been operated by the Universal Suez Canal Company. On July 26, 1956, the Egyptian Government, for national purposes, seized that company and took over the canal operations.

The Foreign Ministers of France, Great Britain, and the United States quickly met to consider what should be done. Some people thought that force should at once be employed to restore the situation that Egypt had disturbed. But our three Governments agreed to call together, in conference, the 24 nations most directly involved, including Egypt.

That was "Peace Effort No. 1."

The conference was held in London in August. Only two of those invited, including Egypt, failed to attend. At that conference 18 nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, Australasia, and America, representing over 90 percent of the canal traffic, formulated a proposal to assure efficient and dependable operation, maintenance, and development of the canal as called for by the Convention of 1888.

This London conference was "Peace Effort No. 2."

Then the 18 nations which had agreed to the proposal I mention sent a 5-nation mission to Cairo, headed by Prime Minister Menzies of Australia, to lay their suggestion before President Nasser.

That mission to Cairo was "Peace Effort No. 3."

When President Nasser rejected the proposal, the 18 nations met again at London in September. There they formulated a plan to create a cooperative association to represent the interest of the canal users. It was hoped that the association might develop, on a provisional, practical, operating basis, an acceptable measure of cooperation with the Egyptian canal authorities.

This September conference was "Peace Effort No. 4."

While the Users Association was in process of organization, the United Kingdom and France brought the Suez problem to the United Nations Security Council. After being in session for 9 days, the Council adopted six principles which should govern the Suez solution. These six principles were substantially those which had been adopted by the 18 user nations when they met in London last August.

France and the United Kingdom also proposed measures to advance the implementation of these principles. That portion of the resolution received 9 of 11 votes, but it failed of adoption because of a Soviet Union veto.

That Security Council proceeding was "Peace Effort No. 5."

While the formal proceedings of the Security Council were taking place, informal and private exchanges of views were being held by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France, and Egypt, under the auspices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

These private and informal talks were "Peace Effort No. 6."

It is now hoped that further exchanges of views will be resumed between the three Governments mentioned. These meetings, if they occur, would constitute "Peace Effort No. 7."

I trust that this recital has not been tedious. I can assure you that the efforts themselves, while they have been exacting, have not been tedious for the many people from many lands who have thus sought to secure a peaceful and just settlement of the situation resulting from the seizure, by the Egyptian Government, of an instrumentality of vital international significance.

Under the international conditions which prevailed prior to the adoption of the United Nations Charter, we would almost surely have had war before now. The future is still obscure. But 3 months have been devoted to almost continuous efforts to bring about a settlement by agreement. Peace has been waged with intensity and imagination. The next stage, which may be decisive, depends primarily on the three Governments most
directly involved—France, the United Kingdom, and Egypt—with the Secretary-General of the United Nations playing an important role.

It seemed to us from the beginning that any solution should take account of two basic facts. One is that an international waterway like the Suez Canal, which has always had an international status, cannot properly be made an instrumentality of any government's national policies so that equal passage may depend on that government's favor. That does not require Egypt to forgo the rights which are normal to it as the sovereign nation through whose territory this international waterway passes. It does mean that Egypt should not be in a position to exercise such arbitrary power, open or devious, over the operations of this international waterway that the nations dependent on the canal will in effect be living under an economic "sword of Damocles." That would be an intolerable state of affairs. It would be inconsistent with the United Nations Charter requirement that these situations must be dealt with in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

The second basic proposition is that economic interdependence between Europe, Asia, and Africa, such as is served so indispensably by the Suez Canal, cannot be made truly secure by coercion and force.

If implementation of these two principles is sought in good spirit, there can be a negotiated conclusion.

I cannot predict the outcome. The situation is grave. There are complicating and disturbing factors unrelated to the canal itself. But if the Governments most directly concerned—those of Britain, France, and Egypt—with help from the United Nations, do come to agree, they will have written an inspiring new chapter in the age-long struggle to find a just and durable peace. They will deserve the praise which world opinion and history will surely bestow upon them.

Maintaining the Peace

What we have said about the Suez Canal problem perhaps makes clear that none of the general policies which have been outlined during the first portion of my talk can be translated into reality without encountering and overcoming a multiplicity of specific obstacles.

We all know the obstacles which men face and surmount, in time of war, to secure victory. It seems not to be realized that it is necessary to make comparable efforts, in time of peace, to preserve peace. Peace will never be won so long as men reserve for war their finest effort. Peace has to be waged, just as war has to be waged, and men and nations have to work intensively and sacrificially to overcome the threats to peace and justice.

I see no reason why that should not be done. Surely peace is a goal which deserves to be sought with the same dedication that would be devoted in war to winning victory. Today it is the more important because we now live in a world where, if war comes, there may be no victors.

I am confident that the mood I describe is that of our people and of our political leaders, without regard to party. If that mood be matched by the people and leaders of other lands, then we can see the future as one which, despite its vast perplexities, beckons us hopefully to great tasks of creation.

Increased Tensions in Middle East

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

White House press release dated October 28

During the last several days I have received disturbing reports from the Middle East. These included information that Israel was making a heavy mobilization of its armed forces. These reports became so well authenticated that yesterday morning, after a meeting with the Secretary of State, I sent a personal message to the Prime Minister of Israel expressing my grave concern and renewing a previous recommendation that no forcible initiative be taken which would endanger the peace.

I have just received additional reports which indicate that the Israeli mobilization has continued and has become almost complete, with consequent stoppage of many civil activities. The gravity of the situation is such that I am dispatching a further urgent message to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion.

I have given instructions that these developments be discussed with the United Kingdom and
France, which joined with the United States in the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950, with respect to the maintenance of peace in the Middle East.

While we have not heard of such large-scale mobilization in countries neighboring Israel which would warrant such Israeli mobilization, I have also directed that my concern over the present situation be communicated to other Middle East states, urgently requesting that they refrain from any action which could lead to hostilities.

The Security Council of the United Nations now has before it various aspects of the maintenance of peace in the Middle East. I earnestly hope that none of the nations involved will take any action that will hinder the Council in its efforts to achieve a peaceful solution.

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING AMERICANS IN MIDDLE EASTERN COUNTRIES

Press release 563 dated October 28

The President in his statement today drew attention to increased tensions in the Middle East and indicated steps which this Government is taking to ameliorate the situation and prevent hostilities in that area.

The United States earnestly hopes that a high order of statesmanship will be shown by the governments involved, and that the peace will not be violated. As a matter of prudence, however, measures are being instituted to reduce the numbers of Americans, particularly dependents, in several of the Middle Eastern countries. While it is not contemplated that a full-scale evacuation will take place, persons who are not performing essential functions will be asked to depart until conditions improve.

The Department of State urges American citizens planning to visit countries in the Middle East to defer such plans until the situation is clearer.

In announcing these measures, the Department emphasizes their precautionary nature and is confident that the governments of the several countries will, in any circumstances which might arise, afford full protection to American lives and property in accordance with their responsibility under international law.

U.S. Concern for Hungarian People

Following are texts of statements by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles concerning developments in Hungary, together with an account of a conversation between Deputy Under Secretary Murphy and the First Secretary of the Hungarian Legation.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

White House press release dated October 25

The United States considers the development in Hungary as being a renewed expression of the intense desire for freedom long held by the Hungarian people. The demands reportedly made by the students and the working people clearly fall within the framework of those human rights to which all are entitled, which are affirmed in the charter of the United Nations, and which are specifically guaranteed to the Hungarian people by the treaty of peace to which the Governments of Hungary and of the Allied and Associated Powers, including the Soviet Union and the United States, are parties.

The United States deplores the intervention of Soviet military forces which, under the treaty of peace, should have been withdrawn and the presence of which in Hungary, as is now demonstrated, is not to protect Hungary against armed aggression from without but rather to continue an occupation of Hungary by the forces of an alien government for its own purposes.

The heart of America goes out to the people of Hungary.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES

Press release 562 dated October 28

The Government of the United States is actively concerned with the suffering caused the Hungarian people by the street fighting and military operations in Hungary. It has been in constant touch with the American Red Cross authorities. The American Red Cross has offered assistance through the International Red Cross in Geneva, Switzerland, and this Government has offered to extend assistance to alleviate suffering on the part of the Hungarian people. It will continue to
pursue this matter vigorously. It is understood that the Red Cross societies of 30 countries have made offers of assistance.

CONVERSATION BETWEEN MR. MURPHY AND MR. ZÁDOR

On October 27 Lincoln White, Acting Chief of the News Division, made the following statement to correspondents.

At the request of the Department of State, the First Secretary of the Hungarian Legation, Tibor Zádor, was asked to come in to see Deputy Under Secretary Murphy today. Mr. Murphy told him that, since our Legation is cut off from contact with Washington, we are eager to get information about conditions in Hungary. Mr. Zádor said that he had been in communication with his Legation in London, which has radio communications with Budapest. He said that the Legation in London had confirmed that the new government had been established.

Mr. Murphy cited reports of fighting and the intervention by Soviet military forces, and Mr. Zádor said this was true and referred to a “riot” in Budapest. He had no information about the

2 Later the same day Mr. White read to correspondents the following message which had been transmitted to the Department on behalf of the U.S. Legation in Budapest by the Hungarian Foreign Ministry: “This short clear [not coded] message sent through facilities of Hungarian Foreign Ministry. Situation report 1400 hours 27th all communications have been closed down 5th a.m., Thursday [Oct. 25]. We have understood however that Washing- ton was kept abreast on broad outline of situation here from news report and certain other sources. No incident in Legation area since massive demonstration 1700 hours 25th. Szeghely apartment area saw heavy firing Thursday morning with considerable damage to apartments. Most American personnel spent night 25th in the basement of the apartment house and were evacuated to the Legation shortly before noon of the next day.

“U.S. citizens Mr. and Mrs. Chrysler [Bernard Kreshler], Mr. and Mrs. Mathys and Mr. Wolf departed for Vienna with convoy of other nationals 26th. Four U.S. citizens of the Garst Group [representatives of the Garst and provinces. He said the fighting started after student demonstrations. The students had demanded certain changes, which, he said, had been made. He said that the students were justified in these demands but that “Fascists” had taken advantage of the situation. Mr. Murphy asked whether the workers had made the same demands. Mr. Zádor said that they had.

Mr. Murphy asked whether Hungary welcomed the intervention by Soviet forces, citing reports of the number of Hungarians who had been killed by these forces. The First Secretary said that this was quite legal under the Warsaw Pact.

Mr. Zádor was told by Mr. Murphy that we had been in touch with the American Red Cross and that 15 national Red Cross societies, including that of the United States, had made offers of assistance through the International Red Cross but that the League at Geneva had not been able to contact the Hungarian Government. Mr. Murphy stressed that we were very much interested in the humanitarian aspects of the situation and hoped that something could be done to alleviate the suffering of the Hungarian people.

Mr. Murphy closed the conversation by lodging a firm protest about the fact that our diplomatic representative in Hungary is completely cut off from communications with his Government.

Thomas Hybrid Corn Co., Coon Rapids, Iowa] still in Margit Island Hotel. All American personnel and dependents unharmed as of 1400 hours 27th. Also Mrs. Diana Hgirtaaf of Norway who would appreciate notification family through Norwegian Embassy.

“Government radio has announced that groups of three or more persons will be fired on and that all individuals are confined to houses after 1000 hours 27th. Legation personnel have been advised by Hungarian Foreign Office that while curfew does not apply to diplomatic personnel they would advise that streets were unsafe and should not be used by any member foreign mission.”

The reference to “5th a.m.” in the second sentence of the message presumably means “5 p. m.,” since the Department had received a communication sent by the Legation the afternoon of the 25th. Asked about the phrase “certain other sources” in the third sentence, Mr. White told correspondents that news reports had been the only source of information since the cutting off of communications.
Communist Imperialism in the Satellite World

Remarks by President Eisenhower:

Here we commemorate the establishment of an organization created to further a great American purpose. For individual freedom, rooted in human dignity and in human responsibility, is a theme that runs through the whole story of American labor. And, certainly, it is significant that the First Continental Congress met in Philadelphia’s Carpenters’ Hall in 1774 and, in that same hall, the Constitutional Convention assembled 13 years later.

Freedom is not restricted to the fundamental rights of which we so often speak, including freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly. Your forebears in the labor movement recognized that the industrial revolution had created new problems, requiring a new approach by worker and employer alike—an approach that stressed the equal dignity, the equal responsibility of labor and management.

Consequently, your Brotherhood stands for: freedom to organize, freedom to bargain, freedom to strike. Above all, freedom to vote with complete independence—that was one of the first resolutions, I am told, your Brotherhood called for 75 years ago. In standing for those things, you help extend the boundaries of human freedom and amplify our concept of them.

Others, men like Marx and Lenin, saw in a far different light and setting the new problems created by the industrial revolution. And they came up with a completely different answer, substituting for free labor and free management the omnipotent state.

The industrialized world is now divided between those who follow the philosophy of freedom and those whose lives are regimented under the philosophy of communism.

Unrest in the Satellite World

I should like to talk to you briefly on the fruits of communistic imperialism, now daily becoming evident in the satellite world. Let us take one country as an example.

The Poles, as a people, have known freedom. For that matter, in the persons of Kosciuszko, and Pulaski, and countless others, they were builders of American freedom. And, by the hundreds of thousands, they helped build industrial America and the free labor movement.

But, for 17 years now, they have been victims of two tyrannies in succession. Neither tolerated freedom. And the Polish people rebelled against both, for the love of freedom was and is the strongest mark of the Polish character.

A people like the Poles who have once known freedom cannot be forever deprived of their national independence and of their personal liberty. That truth applies to every people in Eastern Europe who have enjoyed independence and freedom.

For a time, that truth may be obscured. Tyranny can, for a while, effectively present a false facade of material accomplishment. But that illusion is no substitute for the freedom that men and women cherish from raising their children in family loyalty—choosing their jobs or their friends and associates—practicing their religious faith without fear. Eventually, as in the satellites today, the cost proves greater to a once proud and independent...
people than the value of the monuments or factories—or prisons—that have been erected.

In those lands, the fruits of imperialism are discontent, unrest, riots in one place and demonstrations in another, until the tyranny exercised over them either dissolves or is expelled.

The day of liberation may be postponed where armed forces for a time make protest suicidal. But all history testifies that the memory of freedom is not erased by the fear of guns and the love of freedom is more enduring than the power of tyrants. But it is necessary that the inspiration of freedom and the benefits enjoyed by those who possess it are known to those oppressed.

The Allies of the United States

We, as a nation—in that light—have a job to do, a mission as the champion of human freedom. This is it:

First—So to conduct ourselves in all our international relations that we never compromise the fundamental principle that all peoples who have proved themselves capable of self-government have a right to an independent government of their own, full, free choice.

Second—So to help those freedom-loving peoples who need and want and can profitably use our aid that they may advance in their ability for self-support and may add strength to the security and peace of the free world.

Third—So to manage our commerce with other nations that we are joined with them in a genuine partnership of trade, fostering a spiral of mutually shared prosperity and abundance that will be proof against all propaganda and subversion.

Fourth—So to exemplify at home the opportunities, the rewards for work well done—all the good things of a free system—that the world will recognize in human freedom; the sure road to human good.

Working in this manner, we shall expand the areas in which free men, free governments can flourish. We shall help shrink the areas in which human beings can be exploited and their governments subverted.

In this mission, none should play a more important role than free American labor. Your wholehearted support is assurance of success; your indifference, a guaranty of failure.

More than that, you can most persuasively proclaim this mission to the world. And the world will listen. For you speak with an authentic voice, whose accent reflects all the working places of America.

Proof That Marx Was Wrong

Above all, in the struggle between the cause of freedom and the cause of communism, you are the living proof that Marx was wrong. Free American labor has prospered in every index of life—in pocketbook and in schooling, in leisure for recreation and culture, in dignity and in spirit:

Not by engaging in a class war;
Not by abandoning to government freedoms and responsibilities;
Not by surrendering any right or duty of free men for the pottage of state guarantees;
But by joining in voluntary association to bargain and to negotiate;
By recognizing that the prosperity of agriculture and industry and labor are inseparably joined;
By demonstrating in factory and union meeting and community that American citizenship, with its freedoms and its obligations, is based on a spiritual faith in the equal dignity and equal rights of all men and women.

Therefore, as an American citizen and as President of the United States, I am proud and happy I can be here this evening to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. On its record, the Brotherhood has proved itself a worthy representative of free American labor, a dynamic builder of the free American system.

Honduran Government Recognized

Press release 561 dated October 27

The United States Embassy at Tegucigalpa, Honduras, on October 27 informed the Foreign Minister of Honduras, Esteban Mendoza, that the United States Government has recognized the new Government of Honduras.
U.S. Policies and Actions in the Development and Testing of Nuclear Weapons

Following are the texts of a statement by President Eisenhower and two related memoranda which were released to the press by the White House on October 23.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

I have concluded it to be in the public interest to place before you, the American people—and before the world—a full and explicit review of your Government's policies and actions with respect to the development and testing of nuclear weapons, as these affect our national defense, our efforts toward world disarmament, and our quest of a secure and just peace for all nations.

In this cause of world peace, one truth must never be lost from sight. It is this: the critical issue is not a matter of testing nuclear weapons—but of preventing their use in nuclear war. America has repeatedly stated its readiness, indeed its anxiety, to put all nuclear weapons permanently aside—to stop all tests of such weapons—to devote some of our huge expenditures for armament to the greater cause of mankind's welfare—to do all these things whenever, and as soon as, one basic requirement is met. This requirement is that we, as a nation, and all peoples, know safety from attack.

In this spirit and in this awareness, we as a nation have two tasks. First: we must—and do—seek assiduously to evolve agreements with other nations that will promote trust and understanding among all peoples. Second: at the same time, and until that international trust is firmly secured, we must—and do—make sure that the quality and quantity of our military weapons command such respect as to dissuade any other nation from the temptation of aggression.

Thus do we develop weapons, not to wage war, but to prevent war.

Only in the clear light of this greater truth can we properly examine the lesser matter of the testing of our nuclear weapons.

On this specific matter, I last week directed the appropriate Departments and Agencies of your Government to submit to me summaries of all relevant facts in their respective areas of responsibility. This record covers the span of the past 11 years—since the first atomic explosion which occurred in a test in New Mexico. It may be pertinent to note that my direct personal concern with these matters extends almost uninterrupted over these same 11 years—in my successive capacities as Chief of Staff of the Army, Advisor to the Secretary of Defense, Supreme Commander Allied Powers Europe, and, since 1953, as your President and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces.

This record of your Government's policies and actions—insofar as it does not prejudice national security—is herewith made public. It encompasses facts in the several areas of national defense, scientific development, and diplomatic conduct.

This record reflects, clearly and consistently, the persistent, peaceful purposes of our nation.

II.

I deem it proper, in this summary statement, to take note of the most salient points of fact in the accompanying record.

One. Your Government has been unremitting in its efforts to ease the burden of armaments for all the world. to establish effective international control of the testing and use of all nuclear weapons and to promote international use of atomic energy for the needs and purposes of peace. The manifest evidences of this extend from the beginning of this Administration to the present: (a) my appeal to these specific purposes as early as my address of April 18, 1953; (b) the offer of "Atoms for Peace" in December of the same year; (c) the
appointment of a Special Assistant for Disarmament, with Cabinet rank, to develop and coordinate our efforts toward disarmament; (d) my offer at the Meeting of the Heads of State at Geneva, in July of 1955, for immediate exchange of military blueprints between the United States and the Soviet Union, and mutual air inspection by the "open skies" formula; (e) acceptance of the Soviet proposal for ground-control teams if combined with air inspection; (f) the approval this week of the Statute to govern the International Atomic Energy Agency with 81 nations participating in its peaceful purpose; and (g) our continuing, constructive participation in the work of the U.N. Disarmament Commission.

Facts such as these have given substance and validity to my statement before the United Nations General Assembly on December 8, 1953:

The United States pledges before you—and therefore before the world—its determination to solve the fearful atomic dilemma—to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

Two. The indispensable principle upon which we have insisted has been the securing of effective safeguards and controls in any program of disarmament. Our readiness to begin disarmament under such safeguards has been affirmed repeatedly during the past three and one-half years. At the Geneva Meeting of Foreign Ministers last autumn, it was specifically reaffirmed by the Secretary of State, with particular reference to nuclear weapons and their testing.

There is only one reason why no safe agreement has been effected to date: the refusal of the Soviet Union to accept any dependable system of mutual safeguards. In the past two years alone, the Soviet Union has rejected no less than 14 American proposals on disarmament and control of nuclear weapons.

Three. In the light of these facts, your Government has kept enlarging its stockpile of nuclear weapons, and has continued its development and testing of the most advanced nuclear weapons. The power of these weapons to deter aggression and to guard world peace could be lost if we failed to hold our superiority in these weapons. And the importance of our strength in this particular weapons-field is sharply accentuated by the unavoidable fact of our numerical inferiority to Communist manpower.

Four. The continuance of the present rate of H-bomb testing—by the most sober and responsible scientific judgment—does not imperil the health of humanity. On the amount of radioactive fallout, including strontium 90, resulting from tests, the most authoritative judgment is that of the independent National Academy of Sciences. It reported last June, following a study by 150 scientists of the first rank, that the radiation exposure from all weapons tests to date—and from continuing tests at the same rate—is, and would be, only a small fraction of the exposure that individuals receive from natural sources and from medical X-rays during their lives.

Five. On the other hand, the continuance of this testing is having two important beneficial results.

(A) The most recent tests enable us to harness and discipline our weapons more precisely and effectively—drastically reducing their fallout and making them more easy to concentrate, if ever used, upon military objectives. Further progress along this line is confidently expected.

(B) And these same recent tests have helped us to develop—not primarily weapons for vaster destruction—but weapons for defense of our people against any possible enemy attack, as well as knowledge vital to our whole program of civil defense.

Six. There is radioactive fallout, including strontium 90, from the testing of all nuclear weapons, of whatever size. But the character of the weapon, as well as its size, determines the fallout. Such fallout cannot be avoided—as has been implied—by limiting tests to the smaller nuclear weapons. Such fallout of strontium 90 as does take place results from the process of atomic fission. Fission is the basic phenomenon of the smaller weapons. Thus, the idea that we can "stop sending this dangerous material into the air"—by concentrating upon small fission weapons—is based upon apparent unawareness of the facts.

Seven. With reference to the Soviet Union: its sympathy with the idea of stopping H-bomb tests is indisputable. This idea merely reflects the Soviet Union's repeated insistence, ever since discussion of the Baruch plan in 1946, that all plans for disarmament be based on simple voluntary agreements. Now, as always, this formula allows for no safeguards, no control, no inspection.

Eight. A simple agreement to stop H-bomb tests cannot be regarded as automatically self-en-
forcing on the unverified assumption that such tests can instantly and surely be detected. It is true that tests of very large weapons would probably be detected when they occur. We believe that we have detected practically all such tests to date. It is, however, impossible—in view of the vast Soviet land-mass that can screen possible future tests—to have positive assurance of such detection, except in the case of the largest weapons. Nor is it possible to state, immediately following the long-range detection of a test, its size and character.

Nine. If your Government were to suspend research and preparation for tests—as well as the tests themselves—and resume such preparation only upon knowledge that another nation had actually exploded another H-bomb, we could find our present commanding lead in nuclear weapons erased or even reversed. For the preparation for such a test may require up to two years.

Ten. If your Government were to suspend only its tests, while continuing precautionary research and preparation—if that were feasible—we could still suffer a serious military disadvantage. It requires a year or more to organize and effect such tests as those conducted at our proving ground in the Pacific Ocean.

III.

These facts dictate two conclusions.

First. We must continue—until properly safeguarded international agreements can be reached—to develop our strength in the most advanced weapons—for the sake of our own national safety, for the sake of all free nations, for the sake of peace itself.

Second. We must—and we shall—continue to strive ceaselessly to achieve, not the illusion, but the reality of world disarmament. Illusion, in this case, can assume either of two forms. It can mean a reliance upon agreements without safeguards. Or it can be the suggestion that simple suspension of our nuclear tests, without sure knowledge of the actions of others, signifies progress—rather than peril.

There is nothing in postwar history to justify the belief that we should—or that we could even dare—accept anything less than sound safeguards and controls for any disarmament arrangements.

I remain profoundly hopeful that—if we stay strong and steadfast—the reality of significant world disarmament will come to pass.

There is every reason to believe that—if there but be sincerely peaceful purpose on all sides—the nations of the world can achieve and agree upon a system of dependable controls governing disarmament.

We shall never cease striving to this end.

MEMORANDUM ON WEAPONS TESTS AND PEACEFUL USES OF THE ATOM

In response to a request by the President, the following statement has been prepared by the Executive Branch officials chiefly concerned. It covers:

I. The United States Program of Testing Atomic Weapons.

II. Fallout from Atomic Tests.

III. Long-Range Detection of the Detonation of Nuclear Weapons.

IV. International Atoms-for-Peace Program.

I. The United States Program of Testing Nuclear Weapons

1. Beginning with the first test in 1945, the United States has conducted 13 test series. With the exception of the first test, which was in time of war, each series was publicly announced before it was held.

2. Each of the series and every shot in each series was individually justified and evaluated as necessary for the advancement of our nuclear weapon technology or to gain important weapon effects information.

3. Of the shots in the several series, approximately 20 percent have been of high-yield thermonuclear designs and 80 percent of fission devices.

4. The first test—Trinity—in July 1945 demonstrated the feasibility of an atomic weapon.

5. In July 1946, 2 devices were fired at Operation Crossroads at Bikini Atoll for information as to the effects of atomic bursts on ships.

6. Subsequent tests took place as follows:

   Operation Sandstone during the spring of 1948.
   Operation Ranger in the winter of 1950–51.
   Operation Greenhouse in the spring of 1951.
   Operation Buster-Jangle in the fall of 1951.
   Operation Tumbler-Snapper in the spring of 1952.
   Operation Ivy in the fall of 1952.
   Operation Upshot-Knothole in the spring of 1953.
   Operation Castle in the spring of 1954.
   Operations Teapot and Whigam in the spring of 1955.
   Operation Redwing in the summer of 1956.
7. These tests were designed to fulfill, and have fulfilled, the following purposes:

(a) The development of successive designs using less material and therefore increasing the
    defensive strength of the United States in terms of the amount of material available.
(b) The development of designs of smaller configuration and lighter weight with the objective of
    providing weapons which can be more readily and effectively used.
(c) The development of high-yield thermonuclear weapons. This development has been of
    vital importance to our striking force and to its capability to deter aggression.
(d) In the more recent tests, the development of warheads for missiles designed to defend our
    populations and important installations against enemy attack. In the most recent tests, the de-
    velopment of weapons of high yield but low production of fission products. The successful at-
    tainment of this objective will make it possible for us to have weapons with greatly reduced radiologi-
    cal hazard (fallout).

8. A major effort in our test series has been to secure information for the protection of our civil
    population in the event of attack with nuclear weapons. This information has been dissemi-
    nated to our people through and by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

9. The time required to prepare for a test series depends upon a number of variables such as:

(a) The state of readiness of devices for test.
(b) Whether the tests are to be conducted at our Eniwetok Proving Grounds or within the Conti-
    nental limits of the United States (where only small devices can be accommodated).
(c) The number and complexity of the test devices and of the measurements and observations to
    be made.

The period required for preparation has varied from a minimum of months to the test of simpler,
small devices at the Nevada Test Site of the Commission to from 1 to 2 years for tests of larger yield
thermonuclear devices at the Eniwetok Proving Grounds.

II. Fallout From Atomic Tests

10. This phenomenon associated with atomic explosions has been known since Operation Trinity.
    It acquired a greatly increased importance with the advent of early thermonuclear weapons al-
    though the objectionable fallout of an atomic explosion, especially the component strontium 90,
    is the result of atomic fission, which is the specific reaction in existing small atomic weapons.

11. The Atomic Energy Commission has been continuously engaged in the study of the biological
    effect of radiation, both from the point of view of determining safety standards in its installa-
    tions and for those individuals and institutions to whom radioactive isotopes are supplied, and in
    connection with the testing operations of the Commission.

12. The Commission has made public all the pertinent information which it had collected on
    this subject, with due regard to national security. The National Academy of Sciences, the Nation's
    foremost independent scientific body, engaged in an independent study of the biological effects of
    atomic radiation, conducted by approximately 150 of the most distinguished authorities in their
    several fields. The results were publicly reported in June, 1956.

13. The report states that, except for accidents, the biological damage from peacetime activities,
    which include the testing of atomic weapons, has been "essentially negligible." For a fuller state-
    ment of the radiation exposure from all weapons tests to date and from future tests continued at
    the past testing rate, the entire report of the National Academy of Sciences should be
    examined.

14. As regards fallout of strontium 90 from weapons testing, Dr. Willard F. Libby of the
    Atomic Energy Commission has stated that the present rate of testing, if continued indefini-
    tely, would not produce a dangerous level of concentration of strontium 90 in the human body.
    Dr. Shields Warren, eminent radiologist, has stated that bone deposition of strontium 90 is well below
    the natural background level of radiation, and that to cause harmful effects the dose would have
    to be increased many times.

15. Mention might be made at this point of various speculations concerning the effect of
    atomic explosions upon the weather. The National Academy of Sciences also established a
    Committee on Meteorology which gave attention to this question and which concluded that there
    was no evidence to indicate that climate has been in any way altered by past atomic and
    thermonuclear explosions.
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extensive reports on the subject of fallout, including the most authoritative scientific data, in testimony before various committees of the Congress.

17. On the initiative of the United States, an international study of the subject was undertaken under the auspices of the United Nations. This study is now in progress.

III. The Long-Range Detection of the Detonation of Nuclear Weapons

18. A system for monitoring the occurrence of an explosion, attributable to an atomic source, was initiated by the Government in sufficient time to detect a Soviet nuclear explosion which occurred on the 29th of August, 1949, and which was announced by the President on September 23rd of that year.

19. Including that test and since that date, the organization concerned with this responsibility has detected 7 series of weapons tests within Soviet territory. These series have been announced by our Government as they occurred and were detected. Particular detonations which presented any unusual characteristics have been specifically identified at the time of detection.

20. No Soviet weapons tests series has been publicly announced by the Soviet Government in advance of its occurrence. No description of the effects of tests useful to a program for the protection of civil populations has been made available by the Soviets.

21. The United States long-range monitoring program employs a variety of systems which in the interest of national defense have not been described and, being intelligence operations, should remain classified.

22. While the system of long-range detection or monitoring is believed to be as effective as it can be made in the present state of scientific knowledge, it cannot insure the detection of every test irrespective of size, location, or type and composition of the weapon tested.

23. A determination as to size and nuclear character of detected weapons cannot be reached immediately upon detection, nor for several weeks and occasionally months thereafter. This is particularly true with respect to the larger, more complicated thermonuclear devices.

24. Our evaluation of nuclear weapons tests made by other countries has been dependent upon the calibration afforded by our own tests of weapons of known characteristics.

IV. The Program for the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (Atoms-for-Peace) and the Establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency

25. When the Administration of President Eisenhower took office, it inherited a disarmament stalemate and an atomic arms race, both of which stemmed largely from the repeated rejections by the U.S.S.R. of the Baruch proposals of 1946-47 for putting all atomic energy under international control.

26. As a result of the President’s consideration of this problem, the idea for the Atoms-for-Peace program was evolved and presented to the world in the speech on December 8, 1953, which the President made to the General Assembly of the United Nations. This speech pictured the holocaust of an atomic war, the blessings of an atomic peace, and proposed an international agency to which the powers possessing atomic materials would begin and continue to make contributions of such materials for peaceful uses.

27. Worldwide acclaim of President Eisenhower’s proposal made it difficult for the Soviets to succeed in their efforts to sabotage it as they had the Baruch plan.

28. During the protracted negotiations following the speech, the United States took a number of affirmative steps without awaiting establishment of the Agency.

(a) Upon recommendation of President Eisenhower, the Atomic Energy Act was rewritten by the Congress in 1954 in order to permit international cooperation, as a result of which agreements have been entered into with 37 nations, providing for the exchange of information on the peaceful uses of atomic energy to build research reactors and power reactors. Scores of students from friendly countries have been trained in technical schools set up by the Atomic Energy Commission. In addition, we have presented atomic energy libraries to 45 friendly nations.

(b) On June 11, 1955, President Eisenhower announced a proposal by our Government to share one-half the cost of research reactors to be built in friendly foreign nations. The purpose was to marshal world opinion in support of a demand that atomic science be used for the benefit of mankind.
(c) We initiated the largest scientific congress ever held (the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, Geneva, August, 1955) at which a very large amount of nonmilitary atomic information was exchanged.

(d) The President allocated in 1954, 1955, and 1956 a total of 40,200 kilograms of fissionable material for research and power reactors in the United States and abroad.

(e) The United States announced to the Colombo Plan nations in a meeting in Singapore in October 1955 that it would support an Asian Nuclear Research Center for the training of scientists and engineers in the Far East; plans have been formulated for this Research Center to be located in Manila.

(f) The Atomic Energy Commission is assisting in the establishment of a research and training center at the University of Puerto Rico where instruction and training in the nuclear sciences will be given in the Spanish language, thereby expanding the Commission's training program for the special benefit of students from Latin American countries.

(g) In conjunction with the Organization of American States, the Atomic Energy Commission has initiated a program of assistance to the Inter-American Institute of Agriculture Sciences at Turrialba, Costa Rica.

(h) The United States has announced plans for an Inter-American Symposium on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy to be held next May at the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island.

29. President Eisenhower's United Nations speech in the meantime has borne fruit:

(a) On the initiative of the United States, representatives of 12 nations—including the U.S.S.R.—met in Washington earlier this year and drafted the statute (charter) of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(b) Delegates from 81 nations began a conference on September 20 in New York to consider the statute (charter) ; agreement was reached today, October 23d.

MEMORANDUM ON DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

In response to a request by the President, the following chronology of principal actions and events relating to international negotiations concerned with disarmament, control of atomic energy and atomic weapons, and limitation of atomic weapons tests has been provided by the Executive Branch officials chiefly concerned.


2. On January 24, 1946, the General Assembly approved a resolution setting up an Atomic Energy Commission.

3. The U.S. representative to the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission, Bernard Baruch, presented on June 14, 1946, U.S. proposals for international control of atomic energy. He called for establishment of an International Atomic Development Authority which would own or manage all potentially dangerous activities in atomic energy. The U.S. declared its willingness, under effective control, to give up its atomic weapons monopoly, destroy or dispose of its atomic stocks, and turn over atomic secrets to an international atomic agency in which no nation would wield a veto. The agency would own or manage all potentially dangerous activities in atomic energy and control and license all atomic activities in that field. The U.S. proposal specifically provided that the Authority should be given the exclusive right to conduct research in the field of atomic explosives, and should foster beneficial uses of atomic energy.

4. On July 19, 1946, the U.S.S.R. proposed an alternative plan for a convention which would forbid "use of atomic weapons in any circumstances," prohibit production of atomic weapons, and provide for destruction of all atomic stocks within three months after ratification of the treaty. The U.S.S.R. insisted on retention of Security Council veto power over any control system. This proposal, in essence, remained the Soviet position through the succeeding years.

5. On December 30, 1946, the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission approved by a vote of 10 to 0 (with the U.S.S.R. abstaining) essential principles of the U.S. plan for control of atomic energy.

6. On June 11, 1947, the Soviets made proposals in the Atomic Energy Commission again calling for a convention outlawing production and use of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction. They called for a separate convention which
would provide for an “International Control Commission” with limited inspection rights, but subject to Security Council veto.


8. On May 17, 1948, the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission voted 9 to 2 to adjourn indefinitely on grounds that the Soviet position provided no useful basis for further commission discussions.

9. On November 4, 1948, the General Assembly adopted by a vote of 40–6 (the U.S.S.R. opposing) a Canadian resolution approving the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission majority plan (the U.S. proposal) as a basis for “establishing an effective system of international control of atomic energy.” The resolution created a committee of six to determine if there existed “any basis for agreement on international control of atomic energy.”

10. On September 23, 1949, President Truman announced the first atomic explosion in the U.S.S.R.

11. On October 24, 1949, the committee of six reported on fundamental differences between the U.S.S.R. and the Western powers with regard to control of atomic energy. The report concluded that the majority powers put world security above sovereignty, while the U.S.S.R. put its sovereignty first and insisted on unimpeded exercise thereof.

12. The United States on October 24, 1950, proposed that the work of the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission and the U.N. Commission on Conventional Armaments be more closely brought together and that this work be carried forward by “a new and consolidated disarmament commission.”

13. On November 7, 1951, the U.S., U.K. and France sponsored proposals in the U.N., providing for regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and armaments, including atomic weapons. The proposals provided for a progressive disclosure and verification of all armed forces and armaments, including atomic, and provided that the U.N. majority plan should continue to serve as a basis for control of atomic energy, unless a better or not less effective system could be devised.

14. On November 16, 1951, the U.S.S.R. rejected the tripartite proposal and submitted a counterproposal calling for a convention prohibiting atomic weapons.

15. On January 11, 1952, the General Assembly adopted a resolution creating the U.N. Disarmament Commission.

16. On January 12, 1952, the U.S.S.R. delegation submitted proposals which provided that prohibition of atomic weapons and “strict international control” of atomic weapons should come into effect simultaneously, but that the control organ not be entitled to interfere in the domestic affairs of any state.

17. On April 5, 1952, in the first meeting of the Disarmament Commission, the U.S. cosponsored the first of a series of working papers, including a “proposal for progressive and continuing disclosure and verification of all armed forces and armaments, including atomic.”


19. On November 1, 1952, the U.S. exploded the first hydrogen device at Bikini.

20. On April 8, 1953, the General Assembly noted the impasse in the Disarmament Commission deliberations and requested the Commission to continue its work and report back to the next General Assembly.

21. President Eisenhower in his speech of April 16, 1953, proposed “international control of atomic energy to promote its use for peaceful purposes only, and to insure the prohibition of atomic weapons” under “adequate safeguards, including a practical system of inspection under the United Nations.”

22. On August 21, 1953, the U.S.S.R. exploded a hydrogen device.

23. In the United Nations General Assembly on September 24, 1953, the Soviet Union reiterated their proposal for an unconditional prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and continued to call for such a prohibition without specifying the nature of controls.

24. The General Assembly on November 28, 1953, adopted by a vote of 54–0, with the Soviets abstaining, a resolution cosponsored by the U.S. which called for the establishment of a subcommittee of the Disarmament Commission “consisting of ‘representatives of the powers principally involved’ which should seek in private an acceptable solution.”

25. President Eisenhower addressing the United

710 Department of State Bulletin
Nations General Assembly on December 8, 1953, emphasized U.S. readiness to meet privately with other powers principally involved to seek an acceptable solution to the atomic armaments race and proposed that the governments concerned begin at that time and continue to make joint contributions from their stockpiles of normal uranium and fissionable materials to an international atomic energy agency, and that such agency find ways to assure that the contributed materials be devoted to peaceful purposes.

26. The U.S.S.R. on December 12, 1953, indicated a willingness to participate in discussions on the President's proposal but added the reservation that there should be a discussion of an unconditional obligation not to employ hydrogen, atomic or other weapons of mass destruction.

27. On April 2, 1954, Prime Minister Nehru proposed a “standsstill agreement” on tests of nuclear weapons.

28. On May 25, 1954, the U.S. introduced into the U.N. Disarmament Subcommittee a proposal for the establishment of international control organs to enforce a disarmament program.

29. On May 28, 1954, the World Peace Council (Communist) launched a demand for a cessation of tests together with a prohibition on the use of nuclear weapons.

30. The U.S. supported a French-U.K. proposal of June 11, 1954, in the Disarmament Subcommittee which called for a phased approach to disarmament through successive stages and for nuclear disarmament phased with reduction of conventional arms and forces. The proposal included a proviso that states would regard themselves as prohibited from using nuclear weapons except in accordance with the U.N. Charter.

31. In late June 1954, after consideration of the matter with his top officials, President Eisenhower adopted an interdepartmental recommendation that the United States should not at that time agree to a test moratorium, but that disarmament policy review should be continued and expedited.

32. After initial rejection of the Anglo-French proposal, the U.S.S.R., on September 30, 1954, announced at the U.N. General Assembly that it would accept that proposal as a basis for a draft international convention on disarmament.

33. On November 4, 1954, the General Assembly unanimously called for “further efforts . . . to reach agreement,” by the Disarmament Committee.

34. On November 23, 1954, the Communist World Peace Council proposed that the great powers reach “immediate agreement on the banning of all experimental explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs,” and combined this with a demand that governments undertake “never to use nuclear weapons whatever may be the pretext.”

35. On February 23, 1955, President Eisenhower at a news conference stated that the United States sees nothing to be gained by a separate ban on thermonuclear tests outside of a decent and proper disarmament.

36. In the resumed meetings of the U.N. Subcommittee the U.S. during March 1955 called attention to the difficulties that had arisen in “accounting fully for all past production of nuclear materials” which “raises doubt that presently foreseeable plans can completely guarantee the elimination of all nuclear weapons.”

37. On March 8, 1955, the U.S., U.K., France and Canada submitted a proposal to the U.N. Disarmament Subcommittee on the timing or phasing of a disarmament program; which was not accepted by the U.S.S.R.

38. On March 12, 1955, the U.S., U.K., France and Canada submitted to the U.N. Disarmament Commission Subcommittee a joint draft resolution for the U.N. General Assembly on the principles to govern reductions in armed forces and conventional armaments; which was not accepted by the U.S.S.R.

39. To undertake a complete review of disarmament problems and to develop an approach taking account of the growing technological problems that had arisen, the President on March 19, 1955, appointed Harold E. Stassen as Special Assistant to the President for Disarmament and directed that special studies of basic U.S. policy on the matter be made, utilizing men both in and out of Government.

40. On April 21, 1955, the U.S., U.K., France and Canada submitted to the U.N. Disarmament Commission Subcommittee a joint draft resolution for the U.N. General Assembly on the principles of disarmament controls; which was rejected by the U.S.S.R.

41. At the U.N. Subcommittee in London the Soviet Union, on May 10, 1955, recognized that “there are possibilities beyond the reach of international control for evading control and for organizing clandestine manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons.” The Soviet Union further recognized the danger of mounting nuclear stock-
piles and the necessity of guarding against surprise attack. The U.S.S.R. made a disarmament proposal which included, without provision of safeguards, as one of the first measures of its execution: “the reduction of arms and the prohibition of atomic weapons, States possessing atomic and hydrogen bombs shall pledge themselves to discontinue tests of these weapons.”

42. The first comprehensive report of the Special Assistant on Disarmament was presented to the President on May 26, 1955. This report stressed, among other things, the extreme importance of providing against surprise attack, the absolute necessity of effective inspection in any agreement, the role of an aerial component and of scientific instruments and photography in such a system.

43. The President, in June, 1955, considered and approved the conclusions of an interagency group, following a second review of the matter, to the effect that a moratorium on H-bomb testing would not be in the interest of the U.S. and should not be agreed to except as a part of a comprehensive safeguard disarmament agreement.

44. On June 22, 1955, the U.S. announced a proposal that the United Nations undertake to pool the world's knowledge about the effects of atomic radiation on human health, and later requested that this item be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly; subsequently a resolution to this effect was adopted.

45. On July 18, 1955, while the Summit Meeting at Geneva was proceeding the Soviet Union indicated that it was ready to participate in negotiations for the establishment of an international atomic energy agency.

46. President Eisenhower at the Geneva Meeting of heads of government on July 21, 1955, gave a comprehensive statement of the broad principles of U.S. policy and proposed that as a practical step the Soviet Union and United States, the two great countries which possess new and terrible weapons in quantities, agree immediately to an exchange of blueprints of their military establishments and to provide each other with facilities for aerial reconnaissance. The President stated that such a step would provide against the possibility of a great surprise attack and would be but a beginning toward a comprehensive and effective system of inspection and disarmament.

47. On the same day, Marshal Bulganin reiterated the Soviet proposal for establishment of control posts at large ports, at railway junctions, on main motor highways and airdromes, in order to prevent surprise attack.

48. The U.S. on August 30, 1955, presented an outline plan for the implementation of the President's proposal to the U.N. Subcommittee on Disarmament at the beginning of a series of meetings at the U.N. Headquarters in New York; which was rejected by the U.S.S.R.

49. Marshal Bulganin, in a letter to President Eisenhower on September 19, 1955, raised objections to the “open skies” proposal.

50. On October 7, 1955, the U.S. proposed an extension of President Eisenhower's plan of aerial inspection to cover other countries, thus applying to U.S. bases overseas; which was not accepted by the U.S.S.R.

51. President Eisenhower on October 11, 1955, in a letter to Marshal Bulganin encouraged further study by the Soviet Union of the Geneva proposal and stated United States willingness to accept the Soviet proposal for ground control teams, along with the President’s open skies proposal. The U.S.S.R. continued to reject the open skies proposal.

52. At the Foreign Ministers' Conference at Geneva on November 10, 1955, Mr. Molotov indicated willingness of the Soviet Union to consider the concept of aerial photography as one of the forms of control to be considered “at the concluding stage of the implementation of measures to reduce armaments and to prohibit atomic weapons.”

53. On November 11, 1955, at the Geneva Foreign Ministers’ Conference, Secretary Dulles stated that “if agreement can be reached to eliminate or limit nuclear weapons under proper safeguards, the United States would be prepared to agree to corresponding restrictions on the testing of such weapons.”

54. On November 29, 1955, Secretary Dulles stated at a press conference that the question of suspension of nuclear testing had been studied for a great many months, and that no formula had been found which would be both dependable and in the interest of the U.S. with regard to the protection of people and freedom in the world.

55. The United Nations General Assembly on December 16, 1955, adopted by a vote of 56-7, against Soviet opposition, a resolution cosponsored
by the United States which urged that the sub-
committee of the Disarmament Commission give
priority to (a) such confidence building measures
as the President’s open skies plan and the Bul-
ganin ground inspection plan, and (b) all such
measures of adequately safeguarded disarmament
as are now feasible.
56. Marshal Bulganin, in a letter to President
Eisenhower on February 1, 1956, again declined to
enter into an aerial inspection system.
57. On December 24, 1955, Pope Pius XII in a
Christmas broadcast declared that the three steps
of “renunciation of experimentation with atomic
weapons, renunciation of the use of such, and gen-
eral control of armaments” must be effected
together.
58. On January 25, 1956, Governor Stassen testi-
ying before the U.S. Senate Disarmament Sub-
committee reiterated U.S. policy and pointed out
that we do not have the technical facilities to de-
tect all test explosions.
59. On February 14, 1956, Khrushchev before the
20th CPSU Congress in Moscow stated “we are
willing to take certain partial steps—for example
to discontinue the thermonuclear weapon tests. . . .”
60. In a letter to Premier Bulganin of March 1,
1956, President Eisenhower answered questions re-
garding the “open skies” proposal, and added a
proposal for efforts to bring under control the
nuclear threat and reverse the trend toward a con-
stant increasing of nuclear weapons hanging over
the world. He stated the United States would be
prepared to work out, with other nations, suitable
and safeguarded arrangements so that future pro-
duction of fissionable materials anywhere in the
world would no longer be used to increase the
stockpiles of explosive weapons. The President
suggested that this might be combined with his
proposal of December 8, 1953, “to begin now and
continue to make joint contributions” from exist-
ing stockpiles of normal uranium of fissionable
materials to an international atomic agency. The
President stated that the ultimate hope of this
Government is that all production of fissionable
materials anywhere in the world will be devoted
exclusively to peaceful purposes.
61. On March 21, 1956, the U.S. presented to the
Subcommittee of the Disarmament Commission at
London a proposal for a demonstration test area
of open skies inspection in a strip of land 300
miles long and 100 miles wide in the U.S.S.R. and
in the U.S.; which was rejected by the U.S.S.R.
62. On March 21, 1956, the U.S. proposed to the
U.N. Disarmament Commission Subcommittee im-
mediate exchanges for a test period of technical
missions for purposes of preliminary study of
the methods of control and inspection; which was
not accepted by the U.S.S.R.
63. On March 22, 1956, the U.S. proposed to
the U.N. Subcommittee that, subject to certain
accompanying conditions and safeguards, the first
phase level of reduced armed forces and arma-
ments should be on a basis of measurement of
2.5 million men each for the U.S. and U.S.S.R.,
750,000 each for the U.K. and France.
64. On March 26, 1956, the U.S. proposed to the
U.N. Disarmament Commission Subcommittee,
as part of an air and ground inspection system, the
advance notification of planned movements of
armed units through international air or water or
over foreign soil; which was not accepted by the
U.S.S.R.
65. On March 27, 1956, the U.S.S.R. proposed at
the London meetings of the U.N. Disarmament
Subcommittee the discontinuance of further tests of
thermonuclear weapons as a measure indepen-
dent of attainment of agreement on general
disarmament.
66. At the London meetings of the Disarma-
ment Subcommittee, the U.S. delegation on April
3, 1956, put forward a working paper suggesting
a step-by-step plan for a first phase of a com-
prehensive disarmament program including limita-
tion on conventional armaments, provision against
surprise attack, including President Eisenhower’s
proposals for control of the nuclear threat, and
limitations on the testing of nuclear weapons as
part of a safeguarded disarmament program.
The paper included a proviso that “the testing of
nuclear weapons will be limited and monitored
in an agreed manner,” by an armaments regu-
lation council which the U.S. proposed should be
established. This proposal was not accepted by
the U.S.S.R.
67. On April 21, 1956, Mr. Stevenson urged that the
U.S. “give prompt and earnest consideration to
stopping further tests of the hydrogen bomb.”
68. On April 23, 1956, Governor Stassen at the
U.N. Disarmament Subcommittee in London
stated that the U.S. is prepared to agree to restric-
tions on the testing of nuclear weapons provided
there has been agreement on an effective limitation
of nuclear weapons under proper safeguards as a
part of the disarmament agreement, and provided
this agreement limiting nuclear weapons has been
satisfactorily carried out.

69. On April 24, 1956, Governor Stassen held a
discussion with Bulganin and Khrushchev in Lon-
don in which the necessity, method, and sincerity
of the “open skies” proposal and 2.5 million force
level were presented at length and debated.

70. On April 25, 1956, President Eisenhower
at his press conference stated that the United
States has no more interest in developing bigger
nuclear weapons, but is proceeding with testing to
find ways and means to limit the weapon, to make
it useful for air defense, to reduce fallout, and to
make it more a military weapon and less one of
mass destruction.

71. On May 4, 1956, the four Western powers,
in a joint declaration at end of Subcommittee
meetings, reiterated the necessity for a “strong”
control organization with inspection rights, in-
cluding aerial reconnaissance, operating from the
outset and developing in parallel with the disar-
mament measures.

72. On June 6, 1956, Marshal Bulganin in a let-
ter to the President announced the intention to cut
the armed forces of the Soviet Union by 1.2 million
men.

73. In the U.N. Disarmament Commission, the
U.S.S.R. supported a Yugoslav draft resolution
of July 10, 1956, which called for “such initial
disarmament measures as are now feasible and
such forms and degrees of control as are required
for these measures” and specified as one such meas-
ure “the cessation of experimental explosions of
nuclear weapons as well as other practicable mea-
sures in the field of nuclear armaments.”

74. On July 12, 1956, Mr. Gromyko of the
U.S.S.R. in the U.N. Disarmament Commission,
made a statement accepting the figure of 2.5 mil-
lion men for the armed forces of the U.S. and the
Soviets, but only as a first step, and without
accepting the accompanying conditions and safe-
guards.

75. On July 13, 1956, in the Disarmament
Commission, Ambassador Wadsworth stated that “in
the absence of agreement to eliminate or limit nu-
clear weapons under proper safeguards, continu-
ation of testing is essential for our national de-
fense and the security of the free world.”

76. On July 16, 1956, the U.S., U.K., France
and Canada proposed to the Disarmament Com-
mission the principles on which a sound disarma-
ment program could be based; which was rejected
by the U.S.S.R.

77. On July 16, 1956, the 12-nation U.N. Dis-
armament Commission adopted a resolution re-
calling the terms of the General Assembly resolu-
tion endorsing the open skies, and requested the
Subcommittee to continue its studies.

78. Also on July 16, 1956, U.S.S.R. Foreign
Affairs Minister Shepilov, before the Supreme
Soviet in Moscow, stated the “question of discon-
tinuing tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons
can be . . . settled independently” of disarma-
ment agreement.

79. President Eisenhower in a letter of August
4 to Premier Bulganin reaffirmed the proposals
of his March 1, 1956, letter and asked if progress
could not be made on the matter.

80. On August 26, 1956, the White House an-
nounced that the Soviets had exploded a nuclear
device two days earlier.

81. On August 31, 1956, the President an-
nounced that a second Soviet atomic explosion had
occurred on the previous day.

82. On September 3, 1956, the AEC announced
that a third explosion in the test series had taken
place on the preceding day.

83. On September 5, 1956, Mr. Stevenson, at the
American Legion Convention, restated his prop-
osal as “to halt further testing of large nuclear
devices, conditioned upon adherence by the other
powers to a similar policy.”

84. On September 10, 1956, the Soviets an-
nounced that a nuclear weapon test had occurred
that same day.

85. Marshal Bulganin in a letter to President
Eisenhower on September 11, 1956, rejected the
President’s proposal that further production of
fissionable material no longer be used to increase
the stockpiles of explosive weapons. He stated
that to prohibit the manufacture of nuclear weap-
ons without forbidding their use and without elim-
inating them from the armaments of nations
would “not in any measure solve the problem of
eliminating the threat of atomic war.” He also
stated that discontinuation of nuclear tests “does
not in itself require any international control
agreements”; that it was possible to “separate the
problem of ending tests of atomic and hydrogen
weapons from the general problem of disarma-
mament”; and that “an agreement among nations
concerning the termination” of such tests would be “the first important step toward the unconditional prohibition of these types of weapons.”

86. On October 6, 1956, President Eisenhower issued a statement that “the testing of atomic weapons to date has been, and continues, an indispensable part of our defense program”; and that “as part of a general disarmament program, the American Government, at the same time, has consistently affirmed and reaffirmed its readiness—indeed its strong will—to restrict and control both the testing and the use of nuclear weapons under specific and supervised international disarmament agreement.”

87. From October 8 through October 12, Italian aerial reconnaissance tests were conducted to demonstrate the effectiveness and value of the Eisenhower open skies proposal.

88. On October 17, 1956, Marshal Bulganin in a letter to President Eisenhower stated, “Until the necessary agreement on the prohibition of atomic weapons is attained, it would, in our opinion, be desirable to reach agreement at this time on at least the first step toward the solution of the problem of atomic weapons—the prohibition of testing atomic and hydrogen weapons. . . .” He also stated, “We fully share the opinion recently expressed by certain prominent public figures in the United States concerning the necessity and the possibility of concluding an agreement on the matter of prohibiting atomic weapon tests. . . .”

89. On October 21, 1956, President Eisenhower, in a letter to Marshal Bulganin, stated:

The United States has for a long time been intensively examining, evaluating and planning dependable means of stopping the arms race and reducing and controlling armaments. These explorations include the constant examination and evaluation of nuclear tests. To be effective, and not simply a mirage, all these plans require systems of inspection and control, both of which your Government has steadfastly refused to accept. Even my “Open Skies” proposal of mutual aerial inspection, suggested as a first step, you rejected.

However, though disappointed, we are not discouraged. We will continue unrelentingly in our efforts to attain these goals. We will close no doors which might open a secure way to serve humanity.

We shall entertain and seriously evaluate all proposals from any source which seem to have merit, and we shall constantly seek for ourselves formulations which might dependably remove the atomic menace.

90. Currently, interdepartmental preparations are going forward, under direction of the President, for further efforts to reach a sound agreement for a thoroughly inspected system which will improve the prospects of a durable peace. This work is in specific preparation for renewed consideration of the subject in the U.N. Disarmament Subcommittee and in the next session of the General Assembly.

**Italian Demonstration of Aerial Photography**

White House press release dated October 23

Following is a message from President Eisenhower to President Giovanni Gronchi of Italy.

October 22, 1956

I have followed with close attention the Italian Government’s demonstration last week of the practicability of using modern aircraft as sentinels of peace. The lessons to be learned from your government’s demonstration of aerial photography over the City of Rome and other Italian centers will be studied with keen interest by all governments interested in achieving a lasting peace.

I congratulate the Italian Government on this significant initiative directed toward the building of international confidence. It is a valuable contribution to public understanding of one essential element of a meaningful disarmament agreement.

Dwight D. Eisenhower
A Review of United States Foreign Policy

by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy

It is a great privilege to enjoy this opportunity to meet with the members of the Institute of International Affairs of Seattle this evening. At the time of my last visit here incident to the opening of the International Trade Fair Exposition I learned something of the interest of your community in matters relating to American foreign policy and I also obtained a good deal of inspiration from your knowledge of many of the problems on which the Department of State is constantly engaged. We in the Department of State want to keep in the closest possible touch with the thinking of representative groups such as yourselves in a world situation which is fraught not only with anxieties and problems but with constructive opportunities as well.

I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to the initiative shown by this community in the field of international relations. I refer to the International Trade Fair, which was begun in 1951 as a result of a trip to Japan of a group of Seattle businessmen. I think this has proved a significant contribution to the well-being of this area as well as to our relations with both Asian and Latin American nations. I know this has not been an easy task and that a number of people in this community have borne an extra-heavy burden in connection with it. Perhaps in the District of Columbia the future will see more support of a practical nature given to this demonstration of an affirmative interest in better relations with our friends abroad.

It should be recalled, of course, that the basic objective of U.S. foreign policy is the welfare and security of the American people. Everything that we do in the Department of State is intended to work to that end. I might add that, as you know, one of the major features of this policy effort is the system of collective security which has been painstakingly constructed. We have now security arrangements with 42 nations. This system of alliances is based on a forward strategy and incident to it we maintain bases in many parts of the world around an extended periphery.

I would like to stress that we view these alliances not as a design only for the selfish purposes of the United States but to serve the mutual needs of our country and the other countries involved. There is at times perhaps inevitably a tendency on the part of some of our friends abroad to believe that they are doing the United States a favor pure and simple in extending the facilities. This at times becomes the subject of aggressive bargaining in an effort to extract from the United States the maximum in the way of advantages. It is, of course, obvious that the foreign country where we might have base privileges gains a considerable advantage in the increased security and protection against aggression which the presence of our forces there offers.

If you will permit a personal reference, when I was Ambassador to Japan in 1952 right after the Japanese peace treaty came into effect, I initialed on behalf of the United States the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. I became acquainted at that time with Seattle's active interest in a problem which concerned the United States, Canada, and Japan. As you know, the international fisheries relations of our country are now in a period of great ferment and, we believe, of constructive growth. This evening, with your permission, I

1 Address made before the Institute of International Affairs at the University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., on Oct. 24 (press release 551 dated Oct. 23).
would like to deal briefly with some aspects of the fisheries problem, and then perhaps we could make what the French like to call a tour d’horizon of situations relating to our foreign policy in the Far East, the Middle East, and Europe.

International Fisheries Problem

I need not tell you in Seattle how important to the Northwest, and to the whole United States, are the great Pacific fisheries from the Columbia River northward to Alaska. They would be ruined by uncontrolled international competition, but fortunately there is a powerful trend in the world today toward conservation on a cooperative basis. That there is such a trend is in no small part owing to the examples of what are unquestionably the two greatest experiments in international conservation treaties—our agreements with Canada on Pacific halibut and sockeye salmon. Many things are happening in fisheries at this moment. Today in Ottawa a United States delegation is negotiating with Canadian representatives on the conservation of the pink salmon of the Juan de Fuca—Georgia Strait area. If this conference is successful—and we believe it will be—pink salmon which are of joint interest to our fishermen and Canadian fishermen will be placed under a U. S.—Canadian regime similar to that which has for 20 years been so effective in the sockeye-salmon fishery.

I am glad to say that at that conference table in Ottawa, sitting as members of the United States delegation, are seven citizens of the State of Washington. They include the Director of the Washington State Department of Fisheries and his technical coordinator, the Dean of the School of Fisheries of the University of Washington, and four representatives of the salmon industry of this State.

In Washington, D.C., the North Pacific Fur Seal Conference is now moving toward a successful close. Japan and the Soviet Union as well as the United States and Canada are all taking part. You will remember the four-power Fur Seal Treaty of 1911 was terminated in 1941. The present negotiations are seeking to reestablish a new four-power arrangement for the proper conservation of this important resource. This negotiation has been a long one—it is almost a year old now. We have had a hard time trying to reconcile widely different positions and at the same time protecting our own interests. We think we have been able to do so. Fur seals raise many large questions for the four nations—not only scientific questions but questions of search and seizure of ships on the high seas, of the authority of an international commission over a resource of this kind, and the very large question of the relative interests of nations in a marine creature such as the seal, which is born on the land of one country but spends most of its life—9 months each year—at sea.

I have, myself, had a limited part in the Fur Seal Conference. I talked on several occasions to both the Japanese and the Soviet representatives in an effort to work out a compromise. Perhaps the main thing I learned from the conference was the following description of a fur seal which I quote: “Amphibious is the fur seal, ubiquitous and carnivorous, uniparous, gregarious and withal polygamons.” I might say that I had to look up “uniparous” in the dictionary, where I found that it means producing but one egg at a time.

Your own city will, on November 12, play host to the annual meeting of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission. The principal fisheries experts of the United States, Canada, and Japan will gather in Seattle, and I believe also that the Commission has extended an invitation to the Soviet Union to send observers to the meeting.

U. S. Policies in the Pacific Area

Since I was out here a year and a half ago discussing the situation in the Far East, events in the Middle East and Africa have had a tendency to push the Far East out of the headlines. You may recall that at that time the situation in the Far East was extremely tense during the crises over the Taiwan Straits. I need not tell you who live on the west coast that developments in Asia have a vital bearing on our national security. During the interval since my last visit we feel that progress has been made in the furtherance of our policies in the Pacific area. The lines of the free world—Communist struggle are more clearly drawn, and the concept of liberty is working its inevitable erosion within the rigid structure of communistic dictatorship. Communism in the Far East has reacted as it has elsewhere in other times and other places. Wherever it has found a solid bedrock of determined resistance, it has turned away and sought instead for the soft spots more to its liking. It has abandoned methods of
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outright military aggression and has resorted to classical nonmilitary methods intended to deceive the ingenuous.

In Korea we have witnessed flagrant violation of the terms of the armistice by the Communist authorities in the North who, though they have reduced the Chinese Communist manpower in North Korea, have illegally modernized the force structure, created a new air force, and have brought in new weapons. The United States as part of the United Nations forces in Korea has scrupulously respected the terms of the armistice during the 3-year period which has elapsed since its signing. The armistice provisions were never designed to maintain the position in perpetuity but to provide for an interim period leading to a political conference. Due to Communist obstruction, the political conference proved impracticable and the state of armistice continues. However, the Republic of Korea forces and those of the United Nations will not again be taken by surprise. They would not be denied means for effective defense against future aggression.

In Southeast Asia, the Republic of Viet-Nam has made remarkable strides in achieving political, economic, and military stability in the free area of a country which remains unhappily divided and occupied in the North by Communists. On Friday of this week President Diem will officiate at the celebration of the first anniversary of the Republic, which has now drafted a new constitution as its basic charter. The United States continues to provide substantial support and encouragement to the Republic of Viet-Nam in its struggle to promote the growth of democratic government in this important area. We are cooperating with the Republic of Viet-Nam in several fields and we believe that this policy, in addition to promoting the best interests of the people of the Republic of Viet-Nam, also contributes to our national security.

**Conversations With Chinese Communists**

Conversations between American and Red Chinese representatives continue at Geneva, Switzerland. One product of these conversations has been the release of some of our citizens wrongfully detained in Red China, most of them jailed and mistreated. By this process the number has been reduced from 52 to 10, and we propose to continue our efforts until the last American held there has been released. For the rest, the Chinese Commu-
U.N. Charter. The only territorial decision taken is agreement by the Soviet Union to transfer to Japan the small islands of Habomai and Shikotan after the conclusion of a peace treaty. The agreement brings into force the convention on fishing in the open seas in the northwest part of the Pacific between the Soviet Union and Japan and promises that measures will be taken to preserve and develop the fish reserves and to regulate and limit the catching of fish in the open sea. These agreements, of course, leave many questions for future settlement, particularly in the field of trade between the two countries.

The steady quiet development of the Southeast Asia collective-defense treaty organization, known as SEATO, is heartening evidence that other Asian nations are equally alert to the Communist peril. In this organization five nations in Asia—Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines—have joined with England, France, and the United States in an agreement to oppose further aggression or subversion in Southeast Asia. How much this single fact may have influenced the course of history in Asia may not be known for many years. This expression of common determination is a vital and lasting contribution to peace in the Pacific area.

Your thoughts here in the Northwest turn naturally to the Orient, where ties of historic tradition, economic interest, and geographic location lead them. We bear this constantly in mind, but at the same time we try to see the whole picture in perspective.

The Suez Crisis

The attention of the whole world recently has focused on the Suez crisis. This situation came about, as you know, because Egypt undertook to control a waterway which for many years had been under international operation. This action was taken under circumstances which indicated that the purpose of the Egyptian Government was to exercise its control in such a way as to promote what Colonel Nasser repeatedly described as the “grandeur” of Egypt rather than to operate the canal in the general interest. Your Secretary of State has been laboring round the clock since August skillfully and energetically seeking a peaceful, effective, and just solution of an exceedingly complex problem.

The United Nations Security Council on October 13 unanimously adopted six principles which it is hoped may govern efforts to solve the problem. This step reflected substantial progress toward a peaceful solution. A most significant principle is that the operation of the canal shall be insulated from the politics of any nation. This principle was opposed by the Soviet Union when we advanced it in London last August; so its unanimous adoption now is an indication that we are moving forward. The Security Council also agreed that there should be no discrimination, overt or covert, among users of the canal.

This particular crisis, of course, must be viewed against the backdrop of the complex Arab-Israel relations and of important American interests in the Middle East. Your Government has persistently made substantial efforts to bring about improved Arab-Israel relations, which continue in an uneasy state of armistice charged by emotionalism. The United States has given strong support to the Secretary-General of the U.N. in his repeated efforts to devise means to end the unhappily persisting series of incidents. All of our efforts, through every channel available to us, have been directed toward achieving a peaceful settlement of this troublesome issue.

Throughout the world we are faced with varying degrees and rates of change. As we concern ourselves with those things which have changed, we must bear in mind those things which remain unchanged.

The Soviet Union Today

Nowhere is this more true than in the Soviet Union of today. There is no doubt that important changes have occurred in its policies since Stalin’s death in 1953, and there can be no question that we should recognize these changes and allow for them. But it would be as dangerous for us to ignore those things which have not changed as to fail to recognize things which have changed.

In the first place the Soviet Union of today remains as devoted as was the Soviet Union of yesterday to the eventual destruction of our freedom and way of life. The Communist leaders themselves have stated plainly that the change in their manners does not indicate a change in their purpose. In fact the Russians publicly told us that pigs will fly before such a change occurs.

In the second place the Soviets continue to support their hostile and aggressive purpose with a
continuing military buildup. It is true that they have announced a reduction of their ground force. But the evidence is abundant that they are continuing with the rapid improvement of all important weapons, including the new weapons of mass destruction and the aircraft and missiles with which to deliver them.

In the third place Soviet efforts are still largely devoted to the expansion of heavy industry. Thus popular welfare continues to have a low priority, while the economic power required to support their military buildup continues to receive primary attention. I am told the division of investment between heavy industries and consumer-goods industries remains at a 10 to 1 ratio, showing that the “creature comforts,” except for a special few, are not objects of serious official concern.

In the fourth place the Soviet Union continues to be a dictatorship. Only tyrannical and absolute rule could continue the present enforced military buildup, with all that it entails. The new leadership is collective and does not attempt to endow its members with the godlike attributes of Stalinist days. But in the Soviet Union there are still no checks against abuse by those who continue to hold unlimited power.

Finally, the Soviet bloc of nations has been in the past a tightly organized group, with the U.S.S.R. the dominant and dominating member, and there is as yet no evidence of any thoroughgoing change. We must in prudence assume that, while the Soviet leaders are finding it expedient to modify their techniques of dominance, the dominance continues, with the military and economic resources this places at the Soviet command.

These, then, are the things which remain unchanged in the Soviet Union: its purposes, its military power, its technique of maneuver—as in the A-bomb test issue—its industrial expansion, its dictatorial government, and its dominant control over the populations and resources of the Soviet-bloc nations.

Stalinist Methods Bringing Diminishing Returns

It seems clear, however, that the changes have been changes of detail and approach rather than of fundamentals. Stalinist methods were bringing diminishing returns in terms of industrial output and loyalty to the state. Public resentment, unable to find expression otherwise, showed itself in sullen unresponsiveness. Therefore the leaders resorted to concessions, adjustments, and liberalizing gestures in order to make the Communist system and the Soviet state more effective.

In foreign affairs also it is clear that Stalinist policies of threat and force were bringing losses rather than gains; so here, too, the leadership made changes. As an alternative to bluster and brutality they are trying “peaceful coexistence.” The first step in showing the world they could coexist was to heal the breach with Yugoslavia, and this they did. Along the same lines was their ostensibly loosening of Soviet control over the satellites. Another step has been to bring out the old device of the “united front,” by means of which Communist parties in other nations attempt to gain influence and respectability by forming alliances with other left-wing groups. The Soviets have also sought by all means to promote neutralism among free nations, apparently feeling that those nations who are not against them may someday join with them. They have turned the main focus of their efforts upon free Asia, Africa, and Latin America, although they have by no means abandoned their purpose of improving their position in Europe.

Soviet policy toward the less-developed countries stresses the exploiting of local disputes and economic problems and the use of trade and technical assistance. Its short-term purpose is to disrupt cooperative arrangements among free nations, especially NATO, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and the Baghdad Pact. In the longer run we may safely assume that they hope to find an opportunity to bring these nations under Communist domination and to use their resources to tip the balance of world power in their favor.

There is little to be gained from idle debate as to whether the new Soviet look is more or less dangerous to the free world and to America than the Stalinist one. The answer depends chiefly upon how we conduct ourselves.

There are certain general principles which must guide our actions, I believe, if we are successfully to deal with the problems posed by the new Soviet approach. I want to touch upon two of these principles.

The postwar Soviet expansion was checked without another world war because resistance to it was organized among the free nations. America played an important role in organizing the mutual defense agreements upon which this resistance was built. We invested heavily in
these arrangements, and it is now the evident purpose of the Soviets to destroy them. If they succeed in this purpose, the individual free nations which are party to the agreements will find their freedom and survival gravely threatened. Unless we continue to devote ourselves to maintaining these arrangements, the Soviet chances will be good.

This is not to say that our military programs abroad cannot be improved. Studies now under way might well disclose the need for alterations. But the essential function—to join together our strength in order to guard our freedom—remains a first principle of our foreign policy.

The other principle with which I want to deal has to do with the other great area of our mutual security effort, the economic. The underlying principle of our economic effort is not as obvious as the one which underlies our defense arrangements. The need for a military defense against a military threat is relatively easy to understand. That is why the Stalinist policy of threat finally became unproductive. The free nations became aroused and united. A program of economic penetration and cultural and scientific exchanges is far subtler than military threat. It is harder to identify and less easy to evaluate. It is more difficult, in terms of ideas, to devise a means of meeting it, and, once a means has been devised, it is more difficult to obtain broad public understanding, interest, and support.

Yet our opponents have turned some of their best efforts toward economic penetration; so it is essential that we Americans understand how this new Soviet effort has been mounted and how this new threat, like the old one, can be dealt with.

Communism and U.S. Foreign Economic Policy

I think we must remember several things in connection with foreign economic policy:

In the first place, we must realize that the pressure for economic development among the young nations, the less-developed countries of the Near East, Africa, and free Asia, is not going to abate in our time. This is a vast, historic tide, whose power no nation can long resist or ignore. The Soviets know this and seek to use this movement to their advantage. They hope that among the problems and needs that will arise as this tide of economic expansion moves along they will find opportunities for gaining influence within the young nations and ultimately control over them.

Now, in the second place, we must recognize that America's basic aim in the world is consistent with the desire of other nations to be independent, while the Soviet aim is not. As a nation founded on liberty we can only be true to our heritage if we respect the right of other nations to achieve and maintain liberty. And in a world where other nations desire to be free, the key to our own security lies in the continued existence of a system of free and independent nations, unified toward the end of protecting their freedom. The Soviets, by contrast, are committed by doctrine, by political faith, to seek to extend their control over other states and to see in this control their only security. Freedom anywhere threatens tyranny everywhere; thus tyranny anywhere is hostile to freedom everywhere.

Now, if we recognize the determination of the young nations to make freedom a going concern through adding economic development to their political independence, and if we accept that the key to our own security lies in the continued existence of a system of free nations, then the third point follows of necessity. It is not enough merely to offer our sympathy and good wishes to nations seeking to give their freedom permanent reality. We must help them.

The details of our foreign economic policies are being examined and debated at this time, and it is neither proper nor necessary for me to enter that debate. But whatever changes, if any, are finally made, they must take into account the fact that the Soviet economic offensive cannot be met by a negative program of attempting to match whatever the other side does, nor by trying to outbid them in offers of assistance. Rather we must follow a positive program of seeing to it that our help is made available to those nations which need it in order to remain free.

The effect of economic conditions upon communism is rather graphically illustrated right here in our own land. William Z. Foster, who is at least nominally the head of the American Communist Party, recently explained publicly the reasons why communism has lost influence in America. Writing for the Communist newspaper, The Daily Worker, he said that the relatively good economic conditions which workers in this country have enjoyed in recent years have done more to restrict the growth of communism in America than any other factor.
In many years of experience in many lands it has been my observation that men frequently embrace tyranny where freedom has failed to offer them a decent life.

Against this background perhaps the reasons behind the decision to continue economic aid to Marshal Tito begin to come into focus. In assisting Yugoslavia we do not endorse its form of government, nor the philosophy upon which its government is based. Our aid is offered rather because Yugoslavia continues to be independent of Soviet control and has needed assistance to continue its independence.

The value to the free world and to enslaved peoples of continued Yugoslav independence is clearly illustrated by recent events. When the Soviet Union sought to achieve a more peaceful relationship with the rest of the free world, it had first to make its peace with Marshal Tito. But acknowledging the “respectability” of Tito in turn made Titoism in some measure respectable, and this has lent encouragement to the other satellites in seeking greater independence from Moscow. The recent events in Warsaw illuminate this point. The new trend appears to have come into conflict with the degree of authority which Moscow wishes to continue to exercise over the other satellites. It is reported that the Soviets have warned the other Communist parties against overly great fraternization with the Yugoslavs, who encourage the trend toward independence. The Tito-Khrushchev talks appear to have been an effort on the part of Moscow to convince President Tito of the dangers of too liberal an interpretation of the new “equality” among all Communist parties. So far there is no evidence that the Yugoslavs have retreated from their independent position.

Thus our aid to Yugoslavia has helped to bring about some loosening of the bonds upon the once-free nations of Eastern Europe. It has helped create problems for the Communist leaders which they have not yet been able to resolve.

United Nations Day

Today we are celebrating United Nations Day. It is entirely fitting that we pause from our preoccupation with the immediate problems facing us and speak for a moment about this important birthday.

Eleven years ago today the U.N. Charter, drafted here on the Pacific coast and signed by 51 nations, came into effect. There have been a lot of changes in the world since 1945. The U.N. has in many ways become something quite different from what its founders contemplated. But it remains a basic framework for international action that is as valid for 1956 as it was for 1945. It remains “a center,” in the words of the charter, “for harmonizing the actions of nations” in the attainment of “common ends.” The interests of nations are varied and rarely identical. But practically all nations share a real national interest in the existence of the U.N. In 11 years not a single nation has left the U.N. Its membership has, on the contrary, grown from 51 to 76, with more nations about to be added.

I have already mentioned the work of the U.N. in trying to find a solution to the Suez and Palestinian problems. I might also mention that the General Assembly of the U.N. will at the session beginning on November 12 in New York discuss the final report of the International Law Commission on the regime of the high seas and the regime of territorial waters. And this, as you know, is a matter of great interest to our coastal States and brings us right back to the Pacific Northwest.

I have circled the globe—from here to the Far East, to Suez, through the Soviet Union, and back to Seattle. I have tried to give you a glimpse of the world’s problems as we see them in Washington and of our efforts and hopes for their solution. Foreign relations place the responsibility on all of us to try to understand the problems and do what we can to meet them. I thank you for enabling me this evening to share this important duty with you of the Institute of International Affairs.

Air Transport Discussions With Korea

Press release 552 dated October 24

Arrangements have been made between the United States and the Republic of Korea for the commencement in Washington on October 29, 1956, of discussions concerning an air transport agreement between the two countries.

The United States delegation will be headed by Howard L. Parsons, Director, Office of Northeast Asian Affairs, Department of State. Minister Pyo Wook Han of the Embassy of Korea will be chief delegate of the Republic of Korea delegation. He will be assisted by Commercial Attaché Myung Won Shim and by Capt. Yong Wook Shimn, president of Korean National Airlines.
Foreign Aid Under the Microscope

by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs

My subject has to do with the foreign aid program of the United States. Foreign aid is a matter with which we, as a nation, have had some experience throughout our history. The founding fathers were deeply concerned with it—perhaps none of them more so than Benjamin Franklin. I suppose it is really a Philadelphia custom to bring in the name of Benjamin Franklin. I speak with some authority, because in a talk about international trade in Philadelphia about a year and a half ago I could not resist telling a story in which Franklin, observing in London how three flies were revived by the sun’s rays after being drowned in a bottle of wine, expressed a wish that he could be “immersed in a cask of Madeira wine, with a few friends,” to be recalled to life a hundred years hence by the warm sunshine of his dear America.

But after all, it is a pleasant custom—talking about Franklin, that is—and very apt for speechmakers on this side of the Delaware too, for Franklin was no stranger to New Jersey. Indeed, New Jersey has her claim to that great patriot. He has left us a graphic account of how he trudged across this State at the age of 17, rain-soaked, tired, hungry, thirsty, almost penniless, on his way from Boston to Philadelphia and camped along your river bank, perhaps where some big factory now covers the landscape.

Later, one of his best-known humorous writings was his account of a “Witch Trial at Mount Holly,” a place which I think must not be too far from here, judging by the signs on the Jersey Turnpike. Still later, he bought 300 acres near Burlington and performed some important agriculural experiments there. He printed the paper money of the colony of New Jersey. In London he served as agent for the New Jersey Assembly.

However, the picture of Franklin that is important for our subject this evening does not specifically concern New Jersey, nor Philadelphia, nor Boston. It is the picture of Franklin in France during our Revolutionary War, a Franklin in his seventies, plainly dressed, bespectacled, perhaps the most renowned man in the world at that time—scientist, statesman, patriot, man of letters, printer, publisher, merchant, diplomat.

Having richly earned the right to retire, was this Titan satisfied to repair to his comfortable house in Philadelphia, resting on the honors that had been heaped upon him during his long and astonishing career, reminiscing and taking tender care of his gallstone and his gout? He was not. Having sailed past the guns of the British Navy on a dangerous voyage in which he faced an almost certain death on the gallows had he been captured, this indomitable old man was actively seeking help for his country in France. Surrounded by British spies and working amidst fearful aggravations and difficulties, he sought to obtain more and ever more French foreign aid for the newly established United States of America. Under pressure from the Continental Congress and from George Washington himself in the darkest months of the war, Franklin had to apply for loan after loan, even when it was personally humiliating to do so, and finally with the help of this French “mutual security program” our national independence was accomplished.

We also know that the Dutch and others were similarly approached at this time. But I have used this single episode as a forceful reminder that our country has known both ends of foreign
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We know how it feels to be the aider and how it feels to be the aided.

Let us now come to our own time and speak of 1956.

We have in this country an intercollegiate sport that may not be as spectacular as football but, in its own way, is just as vigorously contested. I refer to intercollegiate debating. Every year the intercollegiate authorities, through some sort of machinery with which I am unfamiliar, grind out a subject-of-the-year which is debated on platforms throughout the entire Nation. And this year the subject they have chosen is as follows:

"RESOLVED: That the United States Should Discontinue Direct Economic Aid to Foreign Countries."

At the very time when our college students are earnestly contending with one another over whether to do away with economic assistance, some of their elders, men of much experience in world affairs, are just as earnestly contending that historical events require us to alter our aid programs in order to place even greater emphasis on the economic and less on the military.

Interest in foreign aid is by no means confined to these two viewpoints, but they do indicate the wide range of public concern. They also illustrate the gaps that exist among current views about the various foreign operations which we sometimes refer to as the mutual security program and sometimes simply as “foreign aid”—a term which is often misleading but which is so firmly rooted in the language that it is difficult to avoid.

**Reexamination of Program**

We shall make no effort to reconcile these widely separated viewpoints here tonight. This is not the place to try. But we can perhaps agree, as I think most Americans do agree, that our country has reached a period when it must ask itself the hardest questions imaginable and then make a serious, concerted, nonpartisan effort to agree on the answers. Such an effort has in fact commenced and will be going on for the next few months. This is a time of thought and reexamination, to me a stimulating time, when a great Nation puts a great program under the microscope for study.

Governmental evaluations of major programs, of course, go on continually; and changes are made as necessary. In the present situation, however, something new has been added. Both the executive and legislative branches have commenced studies in which they have recruited the help of distinguished private citizens. Next year, when it comes time to decide what the mutual security program will be like in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, these broad studies will be useful to the President and the Congress. Even if they result in no fundamental alterations in the program, at least the country and the world will know better what the national objectives are and how the Government proposes to achieve them.

Tonight it is my purpose to report to you about the principal studies that have been set in motion and to give you some of the questions they are striving to answer. But first it might be useful to look backward a few years and remind ourselves of the main events that have brought us to the present juncture.

First, there was World War I. It changed the global balance of power. Europe, which for centuries had been the world power center, began a relative decline and contracted economic diseases which were to persist for decades. The United States emerged as a formidable world force. The Russian revolution cast a shadow on world affairs, small at first, but threatening.

One thing led to another until the civilized world was plunged into the nightmare that we call World War II. And, when the war finally ended, other nightmares followed—a hostile and aggressive Soviet Russia bent on fastening communism on the world; the monsters of “hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos” stalking through Western Europe; and the ominous mushroom of nuclear fission.

The United States, mightier than ever, its factories and farms prolific, its homeland physically undamaged though many thousands of families had lost members in battle, found itself faced with a world responsibility that has seldom come to any nation in history. You remember how America responded with a great bipartisan program, the Marshall plan. We can best recapture the electric atmosphere of those days by recalling the historic speech of Arthur Vandenberg in the Senate of March 1, 1948, when he said:

This legislation, Mr. President, seeks peace and stability for free men in a free world. It seeks them by economic rather than by military means. It proposes to help our friends to help themselves in the pursuit of sound and successful liberty in the democratic pattern. The quest can mean as much to us as it does to them. It aims to
preserve the victory against aggression and dictatorship which we thought we won in World War II. It strives to help stop World War III before it starts. It fights the economic chaos which would precipitate far-flung disintegration. It sustains western civilization. It means to take Western Europe completely off the American dole at the end of the adventure. It recognizes the grim truth—whether we like it or not—that American self-interest, national economy, and national security are inseverably linked with these objectives.

So ends the quotation from Senator Vandenberg. I was on the floor of the Senate when he made his famous address, and I clearly recall its insight, force, and effect. The Marshall plan performed its mission. And in those crowded years new developments altered the course of our foreign aid. One such development was the Communist invasion of Korea, which hastened a shift of emphasis away from economic aid and toward military assistance for the free world. Another was a remarkable new force in world affairs, the emergence of nationalism and economic aspirations in the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. As Europe rose again to her feet, our economic assistance shifted increasingly toward the so-called underdeveloped regions where populations are pressing governments to attain higher standards of living.

There is no question that the military and economic strength of the free world has increased and that the mutual security program has made—and is making—significant contributions to this increase. But the world situation does not stand still, and in the last year or two many interesting and complex problems have insistently demanded attention.

There is a growing competition in many countries between the heavy cost of a modern military establishment and the cost of economic growth. Many free-world governments are finding it difficult to maintain the kind of security force they need and also to finance and carry forward programs of economic development. The cessation of actual fighting on battlefronts in Asia has highlighted economic considerations and has shown the great and difficult choices that must be made, especially by the less-developed countries.

The problem has been intensified by a number of changes in Soviet policy since the death of Stalin. The fundamental objectives of the Communists unfortunately remain the same. One of the significant Soviet changes has been toward more flexibility in international affairs. The Communists have begun extensive economic activities, including trade and aid, in those seething areas that I mentioned before—that is, the less-developed countries, especially in the Middle East and South and Southeast Asia.

In an effort to deal with some of these problems, earlier this year the executive branch asked the Congress for greater flexibility in the administration of our mutual security program, and especially for authority to make long-term commitments. These requests were not fully granted. But they brought into sharper focus the fact that a certain amount of misunderstanding has developed over the last few years both in this country and abroad concerning the objectives of our programs.

President's Citizen Advisers

For these and other reasons the President last month enlisted a distinguished group of citizens to assist in a reexamination of our programs. This group is called the President's Citizen Advisers on the Mutual Security Program. They held their first meeting on September 27 and by now are deep in their assignment with the aim of making a progress report by December 1 and a final report by next March 1.

As coordinator of the citizen advisers, the President appointed Benjamin Fairless, former president and chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corporation. The six other advisers are:

Colgate W. Darden, Jr., president of the University of Virginia
Richard R. Deupree, chairman of the board of Proctor and Gamble Company
John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America
Whitelaw Reid, chairman of the board of the New York Herald Tribune
Walter Bedell Smith, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency, former Under Secretary of State, and now vice chairman of the American Machine and Foundry Company
Jesse W. Tapp, vice chairman of the board of directors of the Bank of America

The President gave these men a big order. He asked them to recommend concerning:

1. The purposes, scope, development, and operation of the overseas assistance programs in rela-

---

tion to our own foreign policy and national interests;
2. The possible magnitude and duration of the programs in the light of our own economic capabilities;
3. The geographic distribution and composition of the programs; and
4. Methods of developing and administering programs which will most effectively and economically achieve the agreed purposes.

The President further requested the citizen advisers in studying those broad issues to give him their views on a number of specific questions. If I summarize these questions, we will have before us in capsule form some of the serious problems which our country now faces:

What should be the balance among military, economic, financial, and technical assistance? What are the best means of achieving flexibility and continuity? Under what terms and conditions should assistance be made available to foreign countries? What is the relationship between the disposal of surplus agricultural products and our mutual security operations? What is the role of private lending institutions and of private investment? What are the relative advantages of providing assistance on a bilateral or multilateral basis? What are the relative advantages of providing assistance on a loan or grant basis?

Studies by the Congress

Meanwhile, the Congress is already hard at work with microscopes of its own. Normally the committee hearings on the aid program do not begin until Congress has convened in January and is well along in its session. This year the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the chairman of which is Representative James P. Richards of South Carolina, has already held a series of preliminary hearings. Witnesses from both inside and outside the Government have given their thoughtful views, and this committee and its staff plan a vast amount of further work before recommending action to the House some time next spring.

On the Senate side, a study is under way that is perhaps unique in the history of congressional inquiries. If I devote more time to describing the Senate project, it is because the Senate project has some unusual ramifications.

Last July 11, the Senate adopted a resolution—Senate Resolution 283, to be exact—in which it created a Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program. This group consists of the full membership of the Foreign Relations Committee plus two leading members of the Appropriations Committee and two leading members of the Armed Services Committee.

This special committee, by the terms of the resolution, will "make exhaustive studies of the extent to which foreign assistance by the United States Government serves, can be made to serve, or does not serve, the national interest" and will direct its attention to a series of matters including the proper objectives of United States aid programs and the methods of accomplishing the objectives.

The committee is authorized to spend up to $300,000 in probing into those matters. Senator Walter F. George, who is chairman of the committee but who is presently in Europe in connection with his new responsibilities as Special Representative and Personal Ambassador of the President, has appointed six Senators to serve as an executive committee during the adjournment of Congress. They are Senators Green, Russell, Fulbright, Bridges, your own Alexander Smith of New Jersey, and Knowland. Senator Fulbright is acting chairman of the executive committee.

Now, the most unusual feature of this study is that the committee has made commercial contracts with a number of outside institutions and private firms to look into various aspects and report their conclusions. Contracts have been signed with the following:

The Brookings Institution, to study the administrative aspects.
The Systems Analysis Corporation, to study certain aspects of military assistance.
The Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, likewise to study military assistance.
Louis J. Kroeber and Associates, to make a study of personnel for the assistance programs.
American Enterprise Association, Inc., to study the role of private enterprise in foreign assistance.
The National Planning Association, to study the impact of the programs on our domestic economy.
The Research Center for Economic Development and Cultural Change, of the University of Chicago, to study the processes of economic development.
The Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to study the objectives of economic assistance.
Stuart Rice Associates, to study the aid activities of other free nations.
The Council for Economic and Industry Research, Washington, D. C., to study foreign assistance activities
of the Communist bloc and their implications for the United States.

Jerome Jacobson Associates, to study the use of private contractors in the foreign aid programs.

The special committee is also engaging a number of experienced citizens to visit different parts of the world and make on-the-spot observations. Last week seven names were announced in this connection. One is Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of New Jersey’s great Rutgers University, who is already in South Asia observing the programs in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Afghanistan. The others are former Ambassador Norman Armour; former Ambassador James C. Dunn; William Randolph Hearst, Jr., the newspaper publisher; Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University; James Minot, former Government official; and Clement D. Johnston, chairman of the executive committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

So much for the Senate study. The studies which I have described, plus the regular policy planning of the executive agencies such as the Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Department of Defense, plus the advice of already-existing advisory committees, plus regular work of other congressional committees which I have not mentioned, plus the inevitable articles and editorials in hundreds of newspapers and magazines, plus the thoughtful discussions and ideas of many Americans in private life—perhaps I should add, plus the eloquence of the intercollegiate debaters—all add up to a pretty big microscope. But after all, the creature under observation is a pretty big specimen.

You may have been struck by the fact that the President’s Citizen Advisers and the Senate special committee are not merely examining techniques and methods. They are also directed to consider why we have a mutual security program in the first place. They are asking: What are our purposes? What are we seeking? In other words, the examiners are directed to get down to fundamentals, and it is devoutly to be hoped that they will put fundamentals ahead of operating details.

**Principle Behind Foreign Aid**

This leads me, in closing my talk, to mention one of the most important fundamentals of all—the principle that when we help other countries we do it in our own interest as well as theirs.

I know there are those who look upon foreign aid as a great give-away program. If I thought it to be such I would prefer to leave it to churches, missionaries, the private citizen, and institutions. But the broad concept underlying our loans, technical assistance, and grants to other countries is that such efforts are in our own enlightened self-interest because, to the extent they foster the national strength and independence of others, they strengthen the prospects for peace and freedom, and in the long run they promote our own continued economic growth.

No country should look upon aid from the United States as something to which it can lay claim as a matter of right, regardless of whether or not it is in the interest of the United States.

The so-called “recipient” country must of course accomplish the major part of the job through its own resources. The United States, in what it is able to do, is not seeking mere gratitude, but a healthier and more prosperous world to live in. The stronger our friends are, the more secure we are. As Senator Vandenberg said of the Marshall plan, “The quest can mean as much to us as it does to them.”

It should not be surprising to anyone that the fundamental concept of our foreign aid is our own national interest. We all know that nations do not put the interests of other nations above their own. The French adored Benjamin Franklin and they were filled with romantic ardor by our Declaration of Independence, but the decisive reason why the French crown aided the United States was the cold conviction that it would be in the national interest of France to do so. This fact did not make the aid any less beneficial to the United States.

In like manner, the aid we provide to other countries is in our national interest, but this fact does not make the aid any less beneficial to the recipients.

The real question is not whether nations act in their self-interest. The real question is where a nation conceives its interest to be. The foreign operations of the United States are tangible evidence that this country conceives its long-range interests to coincide with the well-being and independence of other peoples.

Thus, what we call “foreign aid” is a matter of cooperation and partnership.

In spite of this simple fact, it is phenomenal
after all these years how many people still fail to grasp that principle.

Perhaps the term itself, "foreign aid," is partly to blame. It is short enough to fit into a headline, but it does not always fit the true facts. To some in the United States, the word "aid" suggests charity. To some in other parts of the world, the word "aid" has the unfortunate connotation of "donor and recipient," "rich uncle and poor relation," "successful — unsuccessful," "superior — inferior."

Besides, "foreign aid," being a convenient sort of handle, is used indiscriminately for activities which differ widely from one another, such as loans of various kinds, the teaching of technical skills, gifts of food to help people in emergencies, grants of equipment to foster economic development, and the transfer of military weapons for the common defense of the free world. Surely "aid" is hardly a precise term to describe each of these operations.

We are, however, saddled with the term "foreign aid" because it has become deeply implanted in the language. I do not suggest that we can cease using it altogether. But I do suggest that in the present period of national reexamination it will be well for all of us — our Government officials and our private citizens, our molders of public opinion, and our intercollegiate debaters — to keep in mind that "foreign aid," whatever you call it, carries with it the built-in concept that our programs aid others and aid us, too, because they and we have common interests.

Visit of Rumanian
Election Observers

Press release 554 dated October 24

The Department of State announced on October 20 that the U.S.S.R. and Rumania had accepted the invitation to send representatives to the United States to view at first hand the free electoral processes in this country. The Russian observers arrived on October 22.

Arrangements have been completed for the first half of the itinerary of the Rumanian observers. The second half of the itinerary is to be arranged after the observers have arrived in Washington to correspond with the request of the visitors and as the developments of the political campaign indicate.

The Rumanian Government has informed the Government of the United States that its observers will be Constantin Paraschivescu-Balaceanu, member of the Presidium of the Grand National Assembly and Rumanian member of The Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration; Gheorghe Macovescu, journalist and Director General of Cinematography in the Ministry of Culture; and Ladislau Banyai, rector of the Bolyai University of Cluj and deputy of the Grand National Assembly.

The Department of State has made arrangements with the Governmental Affairs Institute to handle the details of the visit. Durrin Allin of the Institute and an interpreter will travel with the Rumanian observers during their stay in the United States. The Rumanian observers will arrive at Idlewild, N.Y., on October 24 and will fly to Washington the same day. In Washington they will receive a briefing at the Governmental Affairs Institute on American politics and elections. They will also visit the Republican National Headquarters and the Democratic National Committee.

On October 25 they will return to New York, where they will hear President Eisenhower speak at Madison Square Garden. On October 26, they will fly to San Francisco, Calif., and on October 27 they will hear the Democratic candidate for President, Adlai Stevenson, at an open-air rally in Washington Square.
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## Calendar of Meetings

### Adjourned During October 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Committee To Review the Salary, Allowances and Benefits System</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>September 11-October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d ICAO Air Navigation Conference</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>September 18-October 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO Tripartite Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>September 19-October 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO/WHO Regional Nutrition Committee for South and East Asia; 4th Meeting</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>September 25-October 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Regional Conference on Exchange of Publications</td>
<td>Habana</td>
<td>October 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan American Highway Conferences: 2d Meeting of Permanent Executive Committee</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>October 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pacific Commission: Technical Meeting on Pastures and Livestock</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>October 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM Council: 5th Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: Working Party on Dairy Products</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>October 1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Council for the Exploration of the Sea: 4th Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>October 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Committee on Weights and Measures</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>October 1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sugar Council: Statistical and Executive Committees</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 2 (1 day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sugar Council: 9th Meeting</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hague Conference on International Private Law: 8th Session</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>October 3-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N., ECE Working Party on Arbitration: 3rd Meeting</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Tin Study Group and Management Committee: 8th Meeting</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>October 8-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Regional Conference for Asia and the Far East: 3rd Session</td>
<td>Bandung, Indonesia</td>
<td>October 8-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Conference to Consider the Status of Tangier</td>
<td>Fedala, Morocco</td>
<td>October 8-31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATT Contracting Parties: Intersessional Committee</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 10 (1 day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Committee on the Administrative Budget</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>October 10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers: 4th Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 15-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Committee on Development of Trade: 5th Session and East-West Trade Consultations</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 15-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on German External Assets</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>October 15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMO Commission for Maritime Meteorology: 2d Session</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>October 16-26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO World Eucalyptus Conference</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>October 17-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO Panel on Future Requirements for Turbo-Jet Aircraft: 1st Meeting</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>October 17-31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N., ECE Timber Committee</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 22-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Union of Official Travel Organizations: 11th Assembly</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>October 22-27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In Session as of October 31, 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Pacific Fur Seal Conference</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>November 28, 1955 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Sugar Conference: 2d Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Special Committee on Question of Defining Aggression</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>October 8-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATT Contracting Parties: 11th Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>October 11-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pacific Commission: 16th Session</td>
<td>Nouméa, New Caledonia</td>
<td>October 18-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Improvement of National Statistics: 4th Session</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>October 22-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation: 2d Meeting</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>October 22-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


**November 5, 1956**
Calendar of Meetings—Continued

**In Session as of October 31, 1956—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CITY/LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Executive Board and Program Committee</td>
<td>New York, Rome</td>
<td>October 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 1st Meeting of Consultative Subcommittee on Economic Aspects of Rice</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>October 29-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECAFE Subcommittee on Trade: 2d Session</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>October 29-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Executive Board: 46th Session</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>October 31-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scheduled November 1, 1956-January 31, 1957**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CITY/LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan)</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>November 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO International Rice Commission: Ad Hoc Working Group on Storage and Processing of Rice</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>November 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Electric Power Committee: Working Party on Rural Electrification</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>November 5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO General Conference: 9th Session</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>November 5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO Special Meeting on Charges for Airports and Air Navigation Facilities</td>
<td>New Delhi, Montreal</td>
<td>November 6-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th International Grassland Congress</td>
<td>Wellington, New Zealand</td>
<td>November 9-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Electric Power Committee</td>
<td>Brussels, Geneva</td>
<td>November 12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Cenosis Study Group: 1st Meeting</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>November 12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO International Rice Commission: 5th Session</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>November 12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. General Assembly: 11th Session</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>November 12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO Special Limited Caribbean Regional Air Navigation Meeting</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>November 14-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Commission: Conference on Town and Country Development Planning</td>
<td>Guatemala City</td>
<td>November 14-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Parliamentary Union: 45th Conference</td>
<td>Bali</td>
<td>November 14-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan): Officials Meeting</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>November 14-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO Panel on Aircraft Rescue and Fire-fighting Equipment at Aerodromes</td>
<td>Brussels, Geneva</td>
<td>November 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Regional Conference for Latin America: 4th Session</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>November 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECLA Trade Committee</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>November 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO Governing Body: 133d Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>November 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIT): Preliminary Study Group</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>November 22-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs Cooperation Council: 9th Session</td>
<td>Brussels, Geneva</td>
<td>November 26-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Technical Meeting on Housing and Planning</td>
<td>Bogota, Geneva</td>
<td>November 26-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Housing Committee: 13th Session and Working Parties</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>November 26-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Travel Congress: Permanent Executive Committee</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>November 26-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU International Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIT): 18th Plenary Assembly (Final Meeting)</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>December 3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Committee on Agricultural Problems: 8th Meeting</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>December 3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Steel Committee and Working Parties</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>December 3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan): Ministerial Meeting</td>
<td>Wellington, New Zealand</td>
<td>December 4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Middle East Conference on Vocational and Technical Education (with FAO and ILO)</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>December 4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Wheat Council: 21st Session</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>December 4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Executive Board: 46th Session</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>December 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood: Semiannual Meeting of Directing Council</td>
<td>Montevideo</td>
<td>December 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU International Telegraph Consultative Committee (CCIT): 8th Plenary Assembly (Final Meeting)</td>
<td>Barbados, British West Indies</td>
<td>December 10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Commission: 23d Meeting</td>
<td>Brisbane, Australia</td>
<td>December 10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposium on Tropical Cyclones</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>December 10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Coal Committee</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>December 10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Inland Transport Committee</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>December 10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIT): Plenary Assembly of New CCIT (former CCIT and CCIF combined)</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>December 15-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Question of Defining Aggression

Statement by William Sanders

The present Committee of government representatives has met pursuant to the General Assembly resolution of December 4, 1954, which created it [895 (IX)]. By its resolution, the Assembly has requested that the Committee, having regard to the ideas expressed and drafts submitted at the ninth session of the Assembly, present to the eleventh session this year a detailed report followed by a draft definition of aggression. The General Assembly's resolution, in its preamble, recites the necessity of coordinating the views expressed by members of the United Nations on this problem.

The record of the repeated and repetitious discussions of this matter within the United Nations gives evidence, it seems to me, of a growing awareness of the difficulties and complexities of the problem. The discussions have underscored the point that the supposed advantages of a definition of aggression are not as self-evident or as easily obtainable as had been supposed and that, more fundamentally, a definition could do more damage than good. Apart from the technical problems, which in themselves present unresolved difficulties of a far-reaching character, there has been a deepening cleavage on the problems of substance.

In issue is the validity of the starting premise that a definition would strengthen the procedures and machinery for the maintenance of peace. This premise is countered by the view that a definition...
would encourage dangerous illusions that the instrumentalities of peace would thereby be strengthened, and more, that in practice a definition would bring about results contrary to the objective pursued. One aspect of this fundamental issue is posed in terms of the opposing views concerning whether a definition would facilitate and expedite action by the United Nations organs in the event of aggression. It is argued that a definition of aggression would guarantee or promote agreement in advance of the exact occasion for automatic action by the United Nations; the reply is made that a definition would, on the contrary, confuse and restrict future discussion and action on the part of the appropriate organs. Another aspect of the basic problem relates to the deterrent effects of a definition, that is, whether it would or would not inhibit a potential aggressor. The proponents of definition argue firmly that it would have such an effect; the opponents claim equally firmly that a definition would instead become a vehicle for propaganda and "a trap for the innocent and a signpost for the guilty."

These issues and differences are among the many that have prevented agreement in the General Assembly. They explain why this Committee was established.

With this situation before us we are not expected, I am sure, simply to report a result which expresses the lowest possible denominator of agreement. I said at our first meeting that ours is not a paper operation. By this I meant that we are not expected, surely, to submit as the end product of our labors the statistical distillation of a comparative study of ideas, views, and drafts. Neither the creation of this Committee by the General Assembly nor acceptance of membership in it by our governments carried any implication that the basic issues of substance and method had somehow been compromised or resolved. The General Assembly cannot be said to have finally settled, in adopting a resolution creating a committee to study the problem, a basic issue of principle involved in the problem. The Committee is therefore not limited to a task of working out the details of decisions already taken on the principal substantive issues. It must itself consider these issues, and it is requested to report on them in detail and to follow its report with a draft definition. The performance of this Committee, it would seem, is not to be judged simply on whether or not it succeeds in attaching a draft definition to its report. In such an important matter, the Assembly will look to the substance of the report, the thoroughness with which all problems have been considered, and the potentialities for good or bad inherent in any definition that might be appended. In short, we are neither compelled nor expected to avoid the problems inherent in the definition of aggression by ignoring them.

The members of the Committee are representatives of governments, not persons serving in an individual or expert capacity. As such they will and must continue to represent the views of their governments. This does not argue for inflexibility of positions but for freedom to explore and debate the matter in its entirety.

In this spirit and with this approach in mind, I should like with your permission, Mr. Chairman [Enrique de Marchena, Dominican Republic], to review briefly the basic problems as my delegation sees them.

Our first task, I suggest, is to explore and, if possible, to agree upon the criteria or tests which any definition must meet if it is to forward the ends which this second Special Committee has been created to serve. Without such exploration and without a wide area of solid agreement on the criteria to be used, we will in the end do a disservice to the United Nations and to the cause of peace.

Criteria To Guide the Task

The first, or basic, criterion would appear to be almost self-evident and one on which agreement should be unanimous. It follows from a realization that this problem has been pursued because people in this world want peace and justice. To meet this want, we must understand, and should be prepared to state, whether and how a definition of aggression, if recommended by this Committee and embodied in a resolution of the General Assembly, would help in maintaining and restoring peace.

To apply this basic criterion it is necessary to test any definition in light of the occasions when it is most likely to be invoked in aid of or in opposition to efforts to keep and to restore the peace. These are:

1. Consideration of action through United Nations organs;
2. Consideration of action under arrangements for collective security or in individual self-defense.

Proponents of definitions have stated their supposed good effects for international peace and security in a variety of ways. A synthesis is found in the words of M. Politis in introducing his proposal at the League of Nations Conference for Reduction and Limitation of Armaments in 1933:

Its effect and its practical advantage would be that it warned States of the acts they must not commit if they did not wish to run the risk of being declared aggressors. Thanks to it, public opinion would be able, when a grave incident occurred in international relations, to form a judgment as to which State was responsible. Lastly, and above all, it would facilitate its task, it would be less tempted to incur the danger of excusing, on political grounds, the act of aggression which it was called upon to judge.

A contrary view on the utility of a definition in the United Nations Charter was expressed by M. Paul-Boncour in the report of Committee III/3 at San Francisco in 1945:

... it became clear to a majority of the Committee that a preliminary definition of aggression went beyond the possibilities of this Conference and the purpose of the Charter. The progress of the technique of modern warfare renders very difficult the definition of all cases of aggression. It may be noted that, the list of such cases being necessarily incomplete, the Council would have a tendency to consider of less importance the acts not mentioned therein; these omissions would encourage the aggressor to distort the definition or might delay action by the Council. Furthermore, in the other cases listed, automatic action by the Council might bring about a premature application of enforcement measures.

The Committee therefore decided to adhere to the text drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks and to leave to the Council the entire decision as to what constitutes a threat to peace, a breach of the peace, or an act of aggression.

Both of these statements refer to the effect of a definition on the work of international organs, the action of individual states, and the development of informed public opinion, from the point of view of securing international peace. This suggests that our basic criterion presents at least two important questions:

1. How will a proposed definition affect the work of United Nations organs?
2. How will it influence the decisions of individual states, acting collectively or individually?

Each of these questions in turn involves two additional inquiries:

1. How will it affect a potential aggressor? and,
2. How will a proposed definition affect public opinion?

Test of Use by United Nations Organs

The charter envisages three types of situations that may serve as the basis of Security Council action under chapter VII. Under chapter VII the Council may act to deal with a threat to the peace, a breach of the peace, or an act of aggression. As a matter of charter law, the powers and responsibilities of its organs are the same with respect to each of these situations.

It is also to be noted that the charter imposes on the Security Council the necessity of making a considered judgment in selecting the means to keep the peace. By the same token it excludes the possibility of so-called automatic sanctions. Under the League of Nations, there was a considerable effort to create a system of automatic sanctions. Under such a system a predetermined formula or definition would have played an essential role. The charter rejects such an approach. Under the charter, then, it does not matter under which finding the United Nations considers peace and justice impaired — whether by a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression. In each case, the Security Council is expected to maintain or restore international peace and security, and it is empowered to and should use whatever means — from conciliation to force — may be best to achieve this end. Since the problem is how best to act, given facts warranting any of the three findings, a definition of one of them, no definition of the other two, and a great debate on which is the right finding, might well be irrelevant and a disservice to peace, because a diversionary and wasted effort.

 Granted, then, that any given definition judged by this criterion might seem useless, might it not assist in analyzing the facts, even though no final determination were made that aggression had occurred? In this connection, any definition considered should be very closely examined for its consistency with the charter and the extent to which it will require analysis of the attitude and conduct of states in relation to the successive stages of Security Council or General Assembly consideration of the matter. In an area where facts are often extremely difficult to marshal quickly and where the parties put forward conflicting versions
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of them, it must constantly be asked: How is this or that definition likely to affect this problem, taking into account the fact that use of force can and must be regarded as lawful or unlawful only with full regard to all relevant provisions of the charter and decisions, actions, and requests of the competent United Nations organs?

Reference has been made to the problem of marshaling the facts. The difficulty is heightened by the covert forms which acts of aggression may and often do assume and the tendency of aggressors to conceal their guilt by charges against their victims. Here then is another test for any definition: How will it affect the task of a United Nations organ that must seek out the facts? Will it make a difficult task the more difficult?

For the sake of brevity, I shall not here dwell on another important aspect of this same topic; it has been fully debated in the past. It is the point that a definition will not facilitate but rather hinder expeditious actions by organs of the United Nations by transferring the focus of attention from the real problem of ascertaining the facts to the artificial and formal one of determining whether the facts fit the definition.

**Test of Use in the Context of Collective or Individual Self-Defense**

Turning now to the use of a definition in the context of collective or individual self-defense, it has been suggested that we approach the problem before the Committee by defining armed attack as this term is used in article 51 of the charter, that is, by defining when a state may resort to armed force in self-defense. While this suggestion was advanced as one incorporating a narrow and restrictive concept, it was nevertheless objected to on the ground that such a definition would facilitate preventive war. It seems at least premature to conclude that a definition which has not been put before us would encourage preventive war. The suggestion and rejoinder do, however, indicate two reasonable tests of a definition, whether of aggression or of armed attack—or, for that matter, of self-defense—which, although easy to state, may tax our wisdom to apply. These tests are:

1. Could the definition prejudice a legitimate resort to self-defense as recognized under article 51?

2. Might it discourage reference of a dangerous situation to the competent organs of the United Nations even where circumstances might clearly permit such a reference?

We have seen that, in the context of chapter VII, aggression has no consequences distinguishing it from a threat to the peace or breach of the peace. All of us are aware of the fact that self-defense is a remedy of last resort in a world system that seeks to eliminate resort to force and to substitute peaceful methods of settlement.

It will be observed that in considering the concept of aggression in relation to article 51 of the charter we are compelled to recognize a variety of possible relationships between that concept and the concepts of armed attack and of "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense." Whatever definition we might be considering will have to be thought of in terms of its effect on the relationship we may consider exists among the three concepts. Whatever the precise nature of that relationship, there would probably be general agreement that changes in attitude toward one concept will not be without effect on the other two.

It is in this light that the two tests above suggested seem particularly important. A definition of any one of the three concepts which in any way impaired the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 would, of course, be contrary to the intent of the charter and, by handicapping the member state which might be the object of an armed attack, might, in fact, be an incentive to aggression.

Events surrounding the outbreak of armed conflict are frequently complex and seldom fully revealed to the world or even to the governments most concerned at the time. A definition must, therefore, be most carefully examined to determine whether it is calculated to lead governments to ascertain and to take full account of all the relevant facts.

In this connection it should be borne in mind that a definition that appears to any member to characterize a particular act as an act of aggression or as armed attack may encourage resort to force without awaiting Security Council or General Assembly consideration. These organs are by the law required to proceed through deliberative and to some degree impartial—at least multipartial—process to a reasoned choice of method; but an individual member, with a necessarily partial viewpoint, is generally under strong pressures
to take the strongest possible steps. It is well known that both sides to a serious controversy are usually firmly convinced of their version of the facts and the justice of their case. The existence of a definition is not likely to affect this truth one way or another. What it may do, however, is to diminish the pressures to seek initial United Nations consideration and increase the pressures to resort to force in self-defense, leaving eventual United Nations consideration to the second stage of a report in the Security Council, in conformity with article 51. The definition could do this by supplying a purportedly exact and agreed criterion or set of criteria which, it may be believed, was intended to require or license resort to collective force against the other side and clearly to authorize it in self-defense.

I have referred at some length to the problems posed by article 51 because they reproduce and exemplify, in terms of a recent discussion in the present Committee, the dilemmas which confront us in all aspects of the task of defining aggression.

Utility in Context of a Code of Offenses

We should also consider the basic criterion in the light of the proposed code of offenses. In this context, the main impetus for such a definition is clearly to provide against the need for formalizing legal rules for individual punishment after the crimes were committed. This is a thoroughly civilized and creditable aim. The answer is not, however, now to formulate a new definition of aggression for a new code. We already have an agreed code in the charter of the United Nations. It provides for peaceful procedures and calls for support of them. It outlaws resort to force except in conformity with its provisions. If the day should come when an international criminal jurisdiction appeared wise, timely, and feasible, the law to be enforced would necessarily be the law of the United Nations Charter. While it is theoretically true that many of its provisions could be elaborated by amendment, we know perfectly well that such elaborations are not likely in the immediate future. In any event, if an international criminal jurisdiction existed today and if a member state moved against another state as the North Koreans did against Korea, it is difficult to see how the legal rights and duties of the disputants could better have been clarified than as occurred in the case of Korea and as recorded in successive resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly, acting under and in application of the provisions of the governing law—the charter.

Some General Tests

In whatever context it is envisaged, a definition should be measured by certain general tests.

First, it should not create more definitional problems than it purports to solve. To define aggression as the first unprovoked attack, for instance, leaves one with the task of defining "first," "unprovoked," and "attack." This is not easy to agree about, as anyone who has read the history of the problem will recognize.

Second, it should not, by specifying particular acts of aggression, allow others to appear to be sanctioned, or at least considered less important.

Finally, definitions should be realistically appraised in the light of history. A very familiar and cogent example is the analysis of the proposals of the Soviet Union in the perspective of history.

The examples of aggression appearing in the Act of Chapultepec of 1945 and the Rio Treaty of 1947 must be understood as based upon a very substantial area of mutual trust and understanding, and thus as an outcome of the historical development of inter-American hemispheric solidarity and defense. Under the charter of the United Nations there is no such restricted geographical and cultural focus.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, in the view of my delegation, there are many criteria or tests which should be met before this Special Committee could commend a definition of aggression to the General Assembly with assurance that its definition would in no way diminish the ability, moral force, and determination of the United Nations to maintain peace.

U.S. Alternate Representative on OAS Council

President Eisenhower on October 24 appointed William L. Krieg, Deputy Director of the Office of Inter-American Regional Political Affairs, Department of State, to be Alternate Representative of the United States on the Council of the Organization of American States.
Signing of Tax Convention With Austria

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Press release 555 dated October 25

On October 25, Secretary Dulles and Dr. Karl Gruber, Austrian Ambassador in Washington, signed a convention between the United States and Austria for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income.

The convention is substantially similar to income-tax conventions now in force between the United States and numerous other countries, containing provisions for reciprocal exemptions or credits with respect to taxation of various types of income and provisions relating to administrative cooperation.

The convention applies, so far as United States taxes are concerned, only to the Federal income taxes. It does not apply to the imposition or collection of taxes by the several States, the District of Columbia, or the territories or possessions of the United States, except that it contains a broad national-treatment provision in regard to taxation similar to a provision customarily found in treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation.

It is provided in the convention that it shall be effective on and after January 1 of the calendar year in which the exchange of instruments of ratification takes place. It will be necessary to transmit the convention to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY DULLES AND AMBASSADOR GRUBER

Press release 558 dated October 25

Following are the texts of the remarks of Secretary Dulles and the Austrian Ambassador, Dr. Karl Gruber, at the signing of a convention between the United States and Austria on the avoidance of double taxation.

Secretary Dulles

Mr. Ambassador, I am happy to join with you in signing this convention on the avoidance of double taxation on income. The treaty to which we have just put our names will be of especial significance to Austrian citizens living in the United States and American citizens living in Austria. It will, I hope, stimulate the flow of private investment and promote the growing trade between our two countries.

In a larger sense, today marks the first anniversary of the date on which your country was finally freed from the presence of foreign troops after 17 years. The restoration of Austrian independence was one of the objectives for which the United States fought in the Second World War. In the Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, with the French Committee for National Liberation adhering later, declared that they wished "to see reestablished a free and independent Austria, and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighboring states which will be faced with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace." 1

The reestablishment of a free and independent Austria remained one of the principal objectives of American foreign policy in the ensuing decade. In his address of April 16, 1953, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, President Eisenhower referred to the persistent efforts of the United States to conclude the Austrian treaty and listed the conclusion of the treaty as one of the specific steps to be taken to promote justice and peace throughout the world. 2

The long negotiations to obtain an Austrian State Treaty, with which I myself was first associated in 1947 as an adviser to Secretary of State Marshall, finally culminated in the treaty that came into effect last year. 3 Throughout these protracted negotiations, your countrymen displayed remarkable patience and steadfast loyalty to the ideals of freedom despite the frustrations of a long occupation. Without the courage of the Austrian people, the consummation of the treaty would have been impossible.

---

1 Bulletin of Apr. 27, 1953, p. 599.
2 For text of treaty, see ibid., June 6, 1955, p. 916.
Today there are “those neighboring states” who await the fulfillment of the promise of political and economic security which was made in Moscow in 1943. The political and economic achievements of your Government cannot but be an inspiration to them.

On the eve of your Flag Day, which commemorates the reestablishment of Austrian independence, I take great pleasure in wishing the people of your country continued peace and prosperity.

**Ambassador Gruber**

Mr. Secretary, I am very pleased that we have been able to sign another agreement, which will still further strengthen the existing friendly relations between Austria and the United States. This Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income will certainly help to avoid friction and complications in an important field of our relations.

I am happy that the relations between our two countries are traditionally excellent and are based firmly on mutual friendship and understanding. In the time of Austria's greatest need the United States of America gave us great relief, a relief which saved our children and, later, helped us to reconstruct Austria’s industries.

In addition to the material aid which Austria received from the United States since the end of the World War hostilities, you gave us your assistance in the continual struggle for the conclusion of a reasonable treaty in order to restore a free and independent Austria.

You, personally, Mr. Secretary, have worked with relentless zeal for the reestablishment of a free Austria. Even though we finally had to enter a compromise to conclude this treaty, we think this treaty has been a good thing and has helped to strengthen the principle of free government in a very important part of Europe.

Since you, Mr. Secretary, had to present the State Treaty to the American Senate for ratification, I think it is appropriate for me to say now that this last year has already justified the judgment expressed at that time.

We know that for a few years to come Austria will still have some difficult times to overcome, as we must fulfill the economic clauses of the treaty mentioned above. But we will work hard toward that end, and I hope that, as in the past, we can count on your friendly understanding for our various problems.

On the occasion of signing this agreement, which again emphasizes the mutual understanding between our two countries, I am therefore very happy to express the gratitude of the Austrian people to your Government and to the American people.

**Tax Conventions With Italy Enter Into Force**

Press release 559 dated October 26

On October 26, 1956, the two tax conventions between the United States and the Italian Republic signed at Washington on March 30, 1955, were brought into force by the exchange of instruments of ratification. The exchange took place in Rome.

The convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income is effective as of January 1, 1956.

The convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances is applicable to estates or inheritances in the case of persons dying on or after October 26, 1956.

The provisions of the conventions with Italy follow in general the pattern of tax conventions in force between the United States and numerous other countries. The conventions are designed, in the one case, to remove an undesirable impediment to international trade and economic development by eliminating as far as possible double taxation on the same income and, in the other case, to eliminate double taxation in connection with the settlement in one country of estates in which nationals of the other country have interests.

In the United States, the conventions apply only with respect to United States, that is, Federal taxes. They do not apply to the imposition of taxes by the several States, the District of Columbia, or the territories or possessions of the United States. The Italian taxes to which the conventions apply are taxes imposed by the national government. They do not apply to taxes imposed by provinces or municipalities.

---
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Atomic Energy
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wise or proper instrument for the settlement of international disputes.

To say this in this particular instance is in no way to minimize our friendship with these nations nor our determination to retain and to strengthen the bonds among us. And we are fully aware of the grave anxieties of Israel, of Britain, and of France. We know that they have been subjected to grave and repeated provocations.

The present fact, nonetheless, seems clear: The actions taken can scarcely be reconciled with the principles and purposes of the United Nations to which we have all subscribed. And, beyond this, we are forced to doubt even if resort to war will for long serve the permanent interests of the attacking nations.

Future U.S. Policy

Now we must look to the future.

In the circumstances I have described, there will be no United States involvement in these present hostilities. I therefore have no plan to call the Congress in special session. Of course, we shall continue to keep in contact with congressional leaders of both parties. At the same time it is—and it will remain—the dedicated purpose of your Government to do all in its power to localize the fighting and to end the conflict.

We took our first measure in this action yesterday. We went to the United Nations Security Council with a request that the forces of Israel return to their own land and that hostilities in the area be brought to a close. This proposal was not adopted, because it was vetoed by Great Britain and France.

The processes of the United Nations, however, are not exhausted. It is our hope and intent that this matter will be brought before the United Nations General Assembly. There, with no veto operating, the opinion of the world can be brought to bear in our quest for a just end to this tormenting problem. In the past the United Nations has proved able to find a way to end bloodshed. We believe it can and will do so again.

My fellow citizens, as I review the march of world events in recent years, I am ever more deeply convinced that the processes of the United Nations need further to be developed and strengthened. I speak particularly of increasing its ability to secure justice under international law.

In all the recent troubles in the Middle East, there have indeed been injustices suffered by all nations involved. But I do not believe that another instrument of injustice—war—is the remedy for these wrongs.

There can be no peace without law. And there can be no law if we were to invoke one code of international conduct for those who oppose us and another for our friends.

The society of nations has been slow in developing means to apply this truth. But the passionate longing for peace on the part of all peoples of the earth compels us to speed our search for new and more effective instruments of justice. The peace we seek and need means much more than mere absence of war. It means the acceptance of law, and the fostering of justice, in all the world. To our principles guiding us in this quest we must stand fast. In so doing we can honor the hopes of all men for a world in which peace will truly and justly reign.

TEXT OF SOVIET STATEMENT OF OCTOBER 30

Following is an unofficial translation of the statement broadcast by Moscow Radio on October 30 to which President Eisenhower referred in his address to the Nation.


The principles of peaceful coexistence, friendship, and cooperation among all states have always been and still form the unshakable foundation of the foreign relations of the U.S.S.R. This policy finds its most profound and consistent expression in the relationship with socialist countries. United by the common ideal of building a socialist society and the principles of proletarian internationalism, the countries of the great commonwealth of socialist nations can build their relations only on the principle of full equality, respect of territorial integrity, state independence and sovereignty, and noninterference in one another’s domestic affairs.

This does not exclude, but on the contrary presupposes, close fraternal cooperation and mutual aid between the countries of the socialist commonwealth in the economic, political, and cultural spheres. It is on this basis that after World War II and after the rout of fascism the regimes of the people’s democracies came into being in a number of countries of Europe and Asia, which were strengthened and display great vitality.

In the process of the establishment of the new regime and the deep revolutionary transformation in social relations there were not a few difficulties, unsolved problems, and out-and-out mistakes, including some in the relations between the socialist states—viations and mistakes which infringed the principles of equality in relations between socialist states.

November 12, 1956
The 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union resolutely condemned these mistakes and violations and demanded that the Soviet Union apply Lenin's principles of the equality of nations in its relations with other socialist states. This statement took complete cognizance of the historical past and the peculiarities of each country which has taken the road of building a new life.

The Soviet Government consistently puts into practice those historic decisions of the 20th Congress, which create conditions for the further strengthening of friendship and cooperation between socialist countries on the inviolable basis of maintaining the complete sovereignty of each socialist state.

As recent events have shown, the need has arisen for an appropriate declaration to be made on the position of the Soviet Union in the mutual relations between the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries, primarily in the economic and military spheres. The Soviet Government is ready to discuss with the governments of other socialist states measures insuring the further development and strengthening of economic ties between socialist countries, in order to remove any possibilities of violating the principle of national sovereignty, mutual advantage, and equality in economic relations.

This principle should extend also to advisers. It is common knowledge that during the first period of the formation of the new social order, at the request of the governments of the people's democracies, the Soviet Union sent to these countries a certain number of specialists—engineers, agronomists, scientific workers, and military advisers. During the later period the Soviet Government on many occasions asked the socialist states about the recall of its advisers.

In view of the fact that by now the people's democracies have formed their own qualified national cadres in all spheres of economic and military construction, the Soviet Government considers it as urgent to examine, together with other socialist states, the question whether a further stay of U.S.S.R. advisers in these countries is expedient.

In the military sphere, the Warsaw Treaty is an important foundation for mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. Its participants took upon themselves appropriate political and military obligations, including obligations to adopt agreed measures essential for strengthening their defense potential, so as to protect the peaceful labors of their people, guarantee the inviolability of their frontiers and territories, and insure defense against possible aggression.

It is known that, in accordance with the Warsaw Treaty and with government agreements, Soviet units are stationed in the Hungarian and the Rumanian Republics. In the Polish Republic, Soviet military units are stationed on the basis of the Potsdam Four-Power Agreement and the Warsaw Treaty. In other people's democratic countries there are no Soviet military units.

With a view to insuring the mutual security of the socialist countries, the Soviet Government is ready to examine with other socialist countries that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty the question of Soviet troops stationed on the territory of these countries. In this the Soviet Government proceeds from the general principle that the stationing of troops of one state that is a party to the Warsaw Treaty on the territory of another state that is a party to the Warsaw Treaty should take place on the basis of an agreement among all its participants and not only with the agreement of the state on whose territory these troops are stationed or are planned to be stationed at its request.

The Soviet Government regards it as indispensable to make a statement in connection with the events in Hungary.

The course of the events has shown that the working people of Hungary, who have achieved great progress on the basis of their people's democratic order, correctly raise the question of the necessity of eliminating serious shortcomings in the field of economic building, the further raising of the material well-being of the population, and the struggle against bureaucratic excesses in the state apparatus.

However, this just and progressive movement of the working people was soon joined by forces of black reaction and counterrevolution, which are trying to take advantage of the discontent of part of the working people to undermine the foundations of the people's democratic order in Hungary and to restore the old landlord and capitalist order.

The Soviet Government and all the Soviet people deeply regret that the development of events in Hungary has led to bloodshed. On the request of the Hungarian People's Government the Soviet Government consented to the entry into Budapest of the Soviet Army units to assist the Hungarian People's Army and the Hungarian authorities to establish order in the town. Believing that the further presence of Soviet Army units in Hungary can serve as a cause for even greater deterioration of the situation, the Soviet Government has given instructions to its military command to withdraw the Soviet Army units from Budapest as soon as this is recognized as necessary by the Hungarian Government.

At the same time, the Soviet Government is ready to enter into relevant negotiations with the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic and other participants of the Warsaw Treaty on the question of the presence of Soviet troops on the territory of Hungary.

The defense of socialist achievements by the people's democracy of Hungary is at the present moment the chief and sacred duty of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, and of all the Hungarian working people.

The Soviet Government expresses confidence that the peoples of the socialist countries will not permit foreign and internal reactionary forces to undermine the basis of the people's democratic regimes, won and consolidated by the heroic struggle and toil of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia of each country.

They will make all efforts to remove all obstacles that lie in the path of further strengthening the democratic basis of the independence and sovereignty of their countries, to develop further the socialist basis of each country, its economy and culture, for the sake of the constant growth of the material welfare and the cultural level of all the workers. They will consolidate the fraternal unity and mutual assistance of the socialist countries for the strengthening of the great cause of peace and socialism.
United Nations Consideration of Developments in the Middle East

On October 29, following the invasion of Egypt by Israel, the United States requested a meeting of the Security Council to consider developments in the Middle East. At this urgent session the United States introduced a resolution calling upon Israel to withdraw its armed forces behind the established armistice lines and asking all U.N. members to refrain from the use of force or threat of force, to assist in insuring the integrity of the armistice agreements, and to refrain from giving any military, economic, or financial assistance to Israel "so long as it has not complied with this resolution." During the Security Council debate the delegates were informed that France and the United Kingdom had issued a 12-hour ultimatum to Israel and Egypt demanding a cease-fire, withdrawal from the canal area, and acceptance of Anglo-French occupation of key canal points. In the vote in the Council, France and the United Kingdom vetoed the U.S. draft resolution (amended to include a call for an immediate cease-fire). On October 31 the Security Council called for an emergency session of the General Assembly, under the Uniting-for-Peace resolution, and in the early hours of the morning of November 2 the Assembly, by a vote of 64 to 5, adopted a U.S. resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire, urging the withdrawal of all forces behind the armistice lines, and urging that "upon the cease-fire being effective," steps be taken to reopen the Suez Canal. On November 3 France, Israel, and the United Kingdom rejected the U.N. cease-fire demand. Following are the texts of a letter to Bernard Cornut-Gentille, President of the Security Council in October, requesting the Council meeting, statements in the Council by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., U.S. Representative to the United Nations, and statements in the Assembly by Secretary Dulles, together with the Council and Assembly resolutions and pertinent statements released by the White House.

LETTER FROM AMBASSADOR LODGE TO PRESIDENT OF SECURITY COUNCIL, OCTOBER 29
U.N. doc. 8/3706 dated October 30

Excellency: The Government of the United States has received information to the effect that in violation of the Armistice Agreement between Israel and Egypt, the armed forces of Israel have penetrated deeply into Egyptian territory. This military action commenced October 29 and is continuing in the Sinai area. The situation makes imperative an immediate meeting of the Security Council, charged as it is with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security as well as responsibility for the observance of the Armistice Agreement.

I have the honor, therefore, in behalf of my Government to request you to convene a meeting of the Security Council as soon as possible to consider "The Palestine Question: Steps for the Immediate Cessation of the Military Action of Israel in Egypt".

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
Adoption of Agenda

U.S./U.N. press release 2484 dated October 30

The United States has requested this urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider steps to be taken to bring about the immediate cessation of military action by Israel against Egypt.

The Security Council has been meeting on the Palestine question within the last few days and repeatedly in recent months to consider actions which the Council unanimously believed constituted a grave danger, and I am sure therefore that there can be no question about the adoption of the agenda.

I request, therefore, Mr. President, that you put to the vote the question of the adoption of the agenda, which I am certain each member of the Council will consider appropriate in these grave circumstances, and that the Council will act with the same unanimity now as it has on the Palestine question in numerous recent meetings.

After the adoption of the agenda, Mr. President, I would appreciate the opportunity to speak immediately on the substance of the question.

(The agenda was adopted unanimously, and Ambassador Lodge then made the following statement:)

We have asked for this urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the critical developments which have occurred and are unfortunately still continuing in the Sinai Peninsula as a result of Israel's invasion of that area yesterday. It comes as a shock to the United States Government that this action should have occurred less than 24 hours after President Eisenhower had sent a second earnest, personal appeal to the Prime Minister of Israel urging Israel not to undertake any action against her Arab neighbors and pointing out that we had no reason to believe that these neighbors had taken steps justifying Israel's action of mobilization.

Certain things are clear.

The first is that, by their own admission, Israeli armed forces moved into Sinai in force "to eliminate Egyptian Fedayeen bases in the Sinai Peninsula." They have admitted the capture of Quseima and Ras Al Naqb.

Secondly, reliable reports have placed Israeli armed forces near the Suez Canal.

Thirdly, Israel has announced that both the Egyptian and Israeli armed forces were in action in the desert battle.

An official announcement in Tel Aviv said that Egyptian fighter planes strafed Israeli troops. We have a report that President Nasser has called for full mobilization in Egypt today and that the Egyptian Army claims that it has halted the advance of major Israeli forces driving across the Sinai Peninsula.

The Secretary-General may receive more information from General Burns and the Truce Supervision Organization, and I am sure that we shall continue to be fully informed as we proceed with our deliberations here.

These events make the necessity for the urgent consideration of this item all too plain. Failure by the Council to react at this time would be a clear avoidance of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The United Nations has a clear and unchallengeable responsibility for the maintenance of the armistice agreements.

The Government of the United States feels that it is imperative that the Council act in the promptest manner to determine that a breach of the peace has occurred, to order that the military actions undertaken by Israel cease immediately, and to make clear its view that the Israeli armed forces be immediately withdrawn behind the established armistice lines. Nothing less will suffice.

It is also to be noted that the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization has already issued a cease-fire order on his own authority, which Israel has so far ignored. Information has reached us also that military observers of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization have been prevented by Israeli authorities from performing their duties.

We as members of the Council accordingly should call upon all members of the United Nations to render prompt assistance in achieving a withdrawal of Israeli forces. All members specifically should refrain from giving any assistance which might continue or prolong the hostilities. No one nation certainly should take advantage of this situation for any selfish interest.

1 *Bulletin* of Nov. 5, 1956, p. 699.
White House Statements Concerning Aggression in the Middle East

Following are three statements on the Middle East situation issued by James C. Hagerty, press secretary to the President.

Statement of October 29

At the meeting the President recalled that the United States, under this and prior administrations, has pledged itself to assist the victim of any aggression in the Middle East.

We shall honor our pledge.

The United States is in consultation with the British and French Governments, parties with us to the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, and the United States plans, as contemplated by that declaration, that the situation shall be taken to the United Nations Security Council tomorrow morning.

The question of whether and when the President will call a special session of the Congress will be decided in the light of the unfolding situation.

Statement of October 30

As soon as the President received his first knowledge, obtained through press reports, of the ultimatum delivered by the French and United Kingdom Governments to Egypt and Israel, planning temporary occupation within 12 hours of the Suez Canal Zone, he sent an urgent personal message to the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Prime Minister of the Republic of France.

The President expressed his earnest hope that the United Nations Organization would be given full opportunity to settle the items in the controversy by peaceful means instead of by forceful ones.

This Government continues to believe that it is possible by such peaceful means to secure a solution which would restore the armistice conditions between Egypt and Israel, as well as bring about a just settlement of the Suez Canal controversy.

Statement of November 3

The United States will today propose to the General Assembly of the United Nations two additional resolutions with respect to the critical Middle Eastern situation.

Sixty-three other nations—members of the General Assembly—joined with our country on November 2d in approving the United States resolution urging an immediate cessation of hostilities in Egypt. It is the earnest hope of the United States that all parties to the conflict will be guided by this conclusive evidence of world opinion.

The additional resolutions which will be presented deal with the necessity of seeking prompt solutions to basic problems which have given rise to the present conflict.

The first resolution will propose a new approach to the settlement of major problems outstanding between the Arab States and Israel with a view to establishing conditions of permanent peace and stability in the area.

The second resolution will deal with means of finding a solution to the Suez Canal controversy. It will seek the earliest possible opening of the canal and the working out of permanent arrangements for the functioning of the canal.

The resolutions will be presented to the General Assembly by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, head of the United States delegation.

Each of us here, and all members of the United Nations, have a clear-cut responsibility to see that the peace and stability of the Palestine area is restored forthwith. Anything less is an invitation to disaster in this part of the world.

This is an immediate responsibility, Mr. President, which derives from the Council's obligations under its cease-fire orders and the armistice agreements between the Israelis and the Arab States and endorsed by this Security Council. It derives, of course, also from the larger responsibility under the United Nations Charter.

On behalf of the United States Government I give notice that I intend at the afternoon session to introduce a resolution whereby the Council will call upon Israel for a withdrawal and indicate such steps as will assure that she does.

Introduction of U.S. Draft Resolution

U.S./U.N. press release 2453 dated October 30

The United States has now introduced its draft resolution, as I said this morning that I would be doing. It is contained in document S/3710, which is before you. Before it was officially introduced, every effort was made to get copies of it to each member of the Council as soon as possible, and I hope each member has had an opportunity to give it careful consideration.

The issues are very large, but the language, I think, is very simple and very direct. The resolution which the Government of the United States proposes in this case as the first and imperative step reads as follows:

[At this point Ambassador Lodge read the draft]
The U.S. Proposal in the Security Council

U.N. doc S/3710

The Security Council,

Noting that the armed forces of Israel have penetrated deeply into Egyptian territory in violation of the armistice agreement between Egypt and Israel;

Expressing its grave concern at this violation of the armistice agreement;

1. Calls upon Israel and Egypt immediately to cease fire;
2. Calls upon Israel immediately to withdraw its armed forces behind the established armistice lines;
3. Calls upon all Members
   (a) to refrain from the use of force or threat of force in the area in any manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations;
   (b) to assist the United Nations in ensuring the integrity of the armistice agreements;
   (c) to refrain from giving any military, economic or financial assistance to Israel so long as it has not complied with this resolution;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council informed on compliance with this resolution and to make whatever recommendations he deems appropriate for the maintenance of international peace and security in the area by the implementation of this and prior resolutions.

The vote on Oct. 30 was 7 to 2 (France, U.K.), with Australia and Belgium abstaining. Because of the French and British vetoes, the resolution failed of adoption. France and the United Kingdom also vetoed a Soviet-proposed resolution which contained some of the elements of the U.S. draft. Belgium and the United States abstained on the Soviet proposal.

---

The resolution submitted by the United States (U.N. doc. S/3710).

The resolution, I think, is self-explanatory.

The preamble notes a fact which is not disputed, namely, the fact of Israeli military penetration deep into Egyptian territory, and the fact that that constitutes a violation of the armistice agreements.

The second paragraph expresses grave concern at this violation, a concern which I am sure all of us must feel.

The third paragraph, numbered 1, calls for a withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces behind the established armistice lines. This is elemental.

Paragraph 2 (a) of the resolution repeats the language of our charter in article 2 (4).

Subparagraph (b) calls upon the members to assist the United Nations in insuring the integrity of the armistice agreements, which were negotiated under the auspices of the United Nations and to which we have many times expressed allegiance.

Subparagraph (c) calls for the suspension of military, economic, or financial assistance so long as Israel has not withdrawn its armed forces behind the established armistice lines. This is of course a minimum sanction.

The final paragraph requests the Secretary-General to keep us informed on compliance with the resolution.

Now, Mr. President, it has been suggested that the Security Council defer action on this resolution. We have just learned of the notice sent by the United Kingdom and France to Egypt regarding the occupation of the Suez Canal positions at Port Said, Ismailia, and Suez by Anglo-French forces.

The Security Council remains seized of several items concerning the situation in the Near East, but we believe we should deal first with the invasion of Egypt. Then, if it is desired to resume the discussion of the Suez matter and the other items which are on our agenda, we believe that the present resolution, if promptly adopted and carried out, would effectively meet the situation created by the present military penetration of Egypt.

This is stated to be the reason for the 12-hour ultimatum which the Governments of the United Kingdom and of France have given to Egypt and Israel, which in the case of Egypt calls for the occupation of the Canal Zone.

If this resolution is adopted and complied with by Israel, then the basis for the ultimatum will have disappeared.

Saying this, I wish to make it clear that we do not imply that in any circumstances this ultimatum would be justifiable, or be found to be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

We submit, Mr. President, that it is hardly possible to take exception to the terms of our resolution, in view of the situation which the stern march of events constrains us to consider.

We sincerely hope that the Council in its urgent consideration of the matter placed this morning...
before the Council will take what is an obvious and elementary and in essence an unavoidable step for us, the adoption today of this draft resolution.

As members of this Council have stated in their interventions this morning, our responsibility compels us to do no less than this.

I therefore, Mr. President, move the adoption of this resolution and I trust that this adoption will take place without delay.

U.S. Position

U.S./U.N. press release 2486 dated October 30

I realize that the hour is getting late, and I shall only take a few moments.

I want first to express appreciation to all those around this table who have spoken favorably of our resolution. Let me say, too, that I agree with those who have said that this resolution should not be amended. I say this not because the resolution is perfect but because it is vital that we act with speed.

We are somewhat like a doctor who faces a patient with a ruptured appendix in whose abdomen gangrene has set in. A clean, quick operation is needed. And that is what our resolution seeks to do. I therefore hope amendments will not be offered.

I also request that the resolution be voted on as a whole under rule 32, because it really is a whole and it has a unity of its own.

There is one change which has been suggested by several and which in the interests of harmony I will accept, even though I personally do not think it is necessary. It would insert a new paragraph 1, reading as follows: "1. Calls upon Israel and Egypt immediately to cease fire." That means that paragraph 1 would be renumbered to be paragraph 2; paragraph 2 would be renumbered to be paragraph 3; and paragraph 3 would be renumbered to be paragraph 4.

Now, Mr. President, in the interests of bringing the Council up to date so that the Council will be possessed of all the facts that we have, let me give this added information which has just been sent to me from Washington. As soon as President Eisenhower received his first knowledge obtained through press reports of the ultimatum delivered by the French and United Kingdom Governments to Egypt and Israel, planning temporary occupation within 12 hours of the Suez Canal Zone, he sent an urgent personal message to the Prime Minister of Great Britain and to the Prime Minister of France. President Eisenhower expressed his earnest hope that the United Nations organization would be given full opportunity to settle the issues in the controversy by peaceful means instead of by forceful ones.

Mr. President, the United States continues to believe that it is possible by such means to secure a solution which would restore the armistice conditions between Egypt and Israel as well as bring about a just settlement of the Suez Canal controversy.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, NOVEMBER 1

Press release 556 dated November 2

I doubt that any delegate ever spoke from this forum with as heavy a heart as I have brought here tonight. We speak on a matter of vital importance, where the United States finds itself unable to agree with three nations with whom it has ties, deep friendship, admiration, and respect, and two of whom constitute our oldest, most trusted and reliable allies.

The fact that we differ with such friends has led us to reconsider and reevaluate our position with the utmost care, and that has been done at the highest levels of our Government. Even after that reevaluation, we still find ourselves in disagreement. Because it seems to us that that disagreement involves principles which far transcend the immediate issue, we feel impelled to make our point of view known to you and through you to the world.

This is the first time that this Assembly has met pursuant to the Uniting-for-Peace resolution which was adopted in 1950. I was a member of the United States delegation and had the primary responsibility for handling that proposal in committee and on the floor of this Assembly. It was then during the period of the Communist attack upon the Republic of Korea, and at that time surely we little thought that it would be invoked for the first time under the conditions which now prevail.

What are the facts that bring us here?

---

2 For text, see Bulletin of Nov. 20, 1950, p. 823.
There is, first of all, the fact that there occurred beginning last Monday a deep penetration of Egypt by Israeli forces. Then, quickly following upon this action, there came action by France and the United Kingdom in subjecting Egypt first to a 12-hour ultimatum and then to armed attack, which is now going on from the air with the declared purpose of gaining temporary control of the Suez Canal, presumably to make it more secure.

Then there is the third fact that the matter, having been brought to the Security Council, was sought to be dealt with by a resolution which was vetoed by the United Kingdom and by France, which cast the only dissenting votes against the resolution.

Thereupon, under the provisions of the Uniting-for-Peace resolution, the matter came here under a call from the Secretary-General, instituted by a vote of seven members of the Security Council, requiring that this Assembly convene in emergency session within 24 hours.

Now, Mr. President and fellow delegates, the United States recognizes full well that the facts which I have referred to are not the only facts in this situation. There is a long and a sad history of irritations and of provocations. There have been armistice violations by Israel and against Israel. There have been violations by Egypt of the treaty of 1888 governing the Suez Canal, and a disregard by Egypt of the Security Council resolution of 1951 calling for the passage through that canal of Israeli ships and cargoes. There has been a heavy rearmament of Egypt under somewhat ominous circumstances. There was the abrupt seizure by Egypt of the Universal Suez Canal Company, which largely under British and French auspices had been operating that canal ever since it was opened 90 years ago. There have been repeated expressions of hostility by the Government of Egypt toward other governments with whom it ostensibly had, and should have, friendly relations.

We are not blind, Mr. President, to the fact that what has happened in the last 2 or 3 days comes out of a murky background. But we have come to the conclusion that these provocations, serious as they are, cannot justify the resort to armed force which has occurred within the last 2 and 3 days and which is going on tonight.

To be sure, the United Nations perhaps has not done all that it should have done. I have often pointed out, particularly in recent weeks, that our charter by article 1, paragraph 1, calls for the settlement of these matters in accordance with the principles of justice and of international law, and it calls not merely for a peaceful solution but a just solution. The United Nations may have been somewhat laggard, somewhat impotent in dealing with many injustices which are inherent in this Middle Eastern situation. But I think that we ought, and I hope will—perhaps at the next regular meeting of this General Assembly—give our most earnest thought to the problem of how we can do more to establish and to implement principles of justice and of international law. We have not done all that we should have done in that respect, and on that account a part of the responsibility of present events lies here at our doorstep.

But, Mr. President, if we were to agree that the existence of injustices in the world, which this organization so far has been unable to cure, means that the principle of renunciation of force is no longer respected and that there still exists the right wherever a nation feels itself subject to injustice to resort to force to try to correct that injustice, then, Mr. President, we would have, I fear, torn this charter into shreds and the world would again be a world of anarchy. And all the great hopes that are placed in this organization and in our charter would have vanished, and we would be, as we were when World War II began, with only another tragic failure in place of what we hoped would be—and still can hope will be—a barrier against the recurrence of a world war which, as our preamble says, has “twice in our lifetime . . . brought untold sorrow to mankind.”

### Review of Suez Canal Negotiations

Now, Mr. President, this problem of the Suez Canal, which lies at the base perhaps in considerable part of the forcible action now being taken, had been dealt with over the past 3 months in many ways and on many occasions. I doubt if in all history so sincere, so sustained an effort has been made to find a just and a peaceful solution.

When on July 26 the Universal Suez Canal Company was abruptly seized by the Egyptian Government, all the world felt that a crisis of momentous proportions had been precipitated.

---

For text, see ibid., Sept. 17, 1951, p. 479.
Within, I think, 3 days after that event, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France met together in London to see what to do about the situation. Already at that time there were voices raised in favor of an immediate resort to force to attempt to restore the status quo ante the Egyptian seizure. But it was the judgment of all three of our Governments that that resort to force would be unjustified, certainly under the then conditions, and that first efforts should be made to bring about a peaceful and just solution.

Instead of any resort to force at that critical moment, the three Governments agreed to call a conference of the principal users of the Suez Canal—24 nations representing the clearly surviving signatories of the convention of 1888, eight countries who principally used the canal, and eight countries whose pattern of traffic showed particular dependence upon the canal. And 22 of those 24 nations met. Egypt declined. Out of the 22, 18 agreed upon what they thought were sound principles for arriving at a peaceful solution which would be just and fair and which would secure for the future the open use of this waterway.

That agreement of the 18 was carried as a proposal to Cairo and presented to President Nasser, who rejected it.

Then the 18 met again in London and again considered a proposal to create an association, a cooperative group of the users. We felt that that association might be able to work out on a practical provisional basis with the Egyptian canal authorities an acceptable arrangement for assuring the operation on a free and impartial basis of the canal. Then while that was in process of being organized—the Users Association—the matter was brought to the Security Council of the United Nations by France and the United Kingdom. There six principles were unanimously adopted with the concurrence of Egypt, who participated in the proceedings though not a member of the Council. Those principles were in essence the same principles that had been adopted by the 18 nations at London. There was a second part of the resolution which looked forward to the implementation of these principles. That part failed of adoption, this time by a veto of the Soviet Union.

But despite that fact there occurred under the auspices of the Secretary-General—to whom I would like to pay tribute for his great contribution in this matter to a just and peaceful solution—there occurred under his auspices exchanges of views as to how to implement these six principles.

I do not think it is an exaggeration to say what I am quite sure he would confirm, that very considerable progress was made. It seemed as though a just and peaceful solution acceptable to all was near at hand, and it was hoped that those negotiations would be continued.

I recall that at the close of our session of the Security Council, I made a statement which was concurred in, or acquiesced in, by all present, stating that the Security Council remains seized of the problem and that it was hoped that the exchanges of views with the Secretary-General and the three countries most directly concerned—Egypt, France, and the United Kingdom—that those discussions and exchanges of views would continue.

They did not continue, although I am not aware of any insuperable obstacle to such a continuance. Instead there developed the events which I have referred to, the invocation of violence, first by Israel and then by France and the United Kingdom, the events which again brought the matter to the Security Council and which, in the face of veto, has brought the matter here to us tonight.

Surely I think we must feel that the peaceful processes which the charter requests every member to follow had not been exhausted. Even in the case of Israel, which has a legitimate complaint due to the fact that Egypt has never complied with the 1951 resolution of the Security Council recognizing Israel’s right to use of the canal—even there, there was a better prospect because the principles adopted by the Security Council, with the concurrence of Egypt, called for the passage of ships and cargoes through the canal without discrimination and provided that the canal could not be used or abused for the national purposes of any nation, including Egypt.

So, Mr. President and fellow delegates, there seemed to be peaceful processes that were at work and which, as I say, had not yet, it seemed to us at least, run their course. And while, Mr. President, I would be the last to say that there can never be circumstances where resort to force may not be employed—and certainly there can be resort to force for defensive purposes under article 51—it seems to us that, under the circumstances
General Assembly Resolution on Middle East

U.N. doc. A/3256

The General Assembly,

Noting the disregard on many occasions by parties to the Israel-Arab Armistice Agreements of 1948 of the terms of such agreements, and that the armed forces of Israel have penetrated deeply into Egyptian territory in violation of the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel,

Noting that armed forces of France and the United Kingdom are conducting military operations against Egyptian territory,

Noting that traffic through the Suez Canal is now interrupted to the serious prejudice of many nations,

Expressing its grave concern over these developments,

1. Urges as a matter of priority that all parties now involved in hostilities in the area agree to an immediate cease-fire and as part thereof halt the movement of military forces and arms into the area;

2. Urges the parties to the Armistice Agreements promptly to withdraw all forces behind the Armistice lines, to desist from raids across the Armistice lines into neighbouring territory, and to observe scrupulously the provisions of the Armistice Agreements;

3. Recommends that all Members refrain from introducing military goods in the area of hostilities and in general refrain from any acts which would delay or prevent the implementation of this resolution;

4. Urges that upon the cease-fire being effective steps be taken to reopen the Suez Canal and restore secure freedom of navigation;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to observe and promptly report on the compliance with this resolution, to the Security Council and to the General Assembly, for such further action as they may deem appropriate in accordance with the Charter;

6. Decides to remain in emergency session pending compliance with this resolution.

1 Adopted by the Assembly on Nov. 2 by a vote of 64 to 5 (Australia, France, Israel, New Zealand, United Kingdom) with 6 abstentions (Belgium, Canada, Laos, Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa).

2 At noon on Nov. 2 Lincoln White, Acting Chief of the News Division of the Department of State, told correspondents that the United States had stopped "all shipments of military goods to the area of hostilities."

which I described, the resort to force, the violent armed attack by three of our members upon a fourth, cannot be treated as other than a grave error, inconsistent with the principles and purposes of the charter and one which if persisted in would gravely undermine our charter and undermine this organization.

Introduction of U.S. Draft Resolution

The question then is: What do we do?

It seems to us imperative that something be done because what has been done in apparent contravention of our charter has not yet gone so far as irretrievably to damage this organization or to destroy it. Indeed, our Uniting-for-Peace resolution was designed to meet just such circumstances as have arisen. It is still possible for the united will of this organization to have an impact upon the situation and perhaps to make it apparent to the world, not only for the benefit of ourselves but of all posterity, that there is here the beginning of a world of order. We do not, any of us, live in societies in which acts of disorder do not occur. But we all of us live in societies where, if those acts occur, something is done by constituted authority to deal with them. At the moment we are the constituted authority. And while we do not have under the charter the power of action, we do have a power of recommendation, a power which, if it reflects the moral judgment of the world community, of world opinion, will, I think, be influential upon the present situation.

It is animated by such considerations, Mr. President, that the United States has introduced a resolution which I should like to read to you:

[At this point, the Secretary read the draft resolution submitted by the United States (U.N. doc. A/3256).]

That, Mr. President, is the proposal of the United States delegation.

Now, I recognize full well that a recommendation which merely is directed to a cease-fire, to getting back of the armistice lines the foreign land forces in Egypt which so far as we are aware today are only those of Israel, of stopping the attacks by air and not bringing new belligerent forces into the area, and then, as rapidly as possible of the reopening of the Suez Canal—that a resolution which puts primary emphasis upon these things is not an adequate or comprehensive treatment of the situation. All of us, I think, would hope that out of this tragedy there should come something better than merely a restoration of the conditions out of which this tragedy came about. There must be something better than that. Surely this organ-
ization has a duty to strive to bring about that betterment. If we should do only that, we too would be negligent and would have dealt only with one aspect of the problem.

I have said and deeply believe that peace is a coin which has two sides—one of which is the avoidance of the use of force and the other is the creation of conditions of justice—and in the long run you cannot expect one without the other.

I do not by the form of this resolution want to seem in any way to believe that this situation can be adequately taken care of merely by the steps that are in this resolution. There needs to be something better than the uneasy armistices which have existed now for these 8 years between Israel and the Arab neighbors. There needs to be a greater sense of confidence and security in the free and equal operation of the canal than has existed since 3 months ago when President Nasser seized the Suez Canal Company. These things I regard of the utmost importance.

But, Mr. President and fellow delegates, if we say that it is all right for the fighting to go on until these difficult and complicated matters have been settled, then I fear a situation will have been created such that no settlement will be possible, that the war will have intensified and may have spread, that the world will have been divided by new bitternesses, and that the foundations for peace will have been tragically shattered.

These things that I speak of need to be done. I believe that they are in process of being done because the Security Council is already seized of these matters and has been working upon them in a constructive way. But I think we must put first things first. I believe that the first thing is to stop the fighting as rapidly as possible lest it become a conflagration which would endanger us all—and that is not beyond the realm of possibility.

As President Eisenhower said last night, the important thing is to limit and extinguish the fighting insofar as it is possible and as promptly as possible.

I hope, therefore, Mr. President and fellow delegates, that this point of view reflected in this resolution will prevail. I fear that if we do not act and act promptly, and if we do not act with sufficient unanimity of opinion so that our recommendations carry a real influence, there is great danger that what is started and what has been called a police action may develop into something which is far more grave. Even if that does not happen, the apparent impotence of this organization to deal with this situation may set a precedent which will lead other nations to attempt to take into their own hands the remedying of what they believe to be their injustices. If that happens, the future is dark indeed.

We thought when we wrote the charter in San Francisco in 1945 that we had seen perhaps the worst in war, that our task was to prevent a recurrence of what had been, and indeed what then had been was tragic enough. But now we know that what can be will be infinitely more tragic than what we saw in World War II.

I believe that at this critical juncture we owe the highest duty to ourselves, to our peoples, to posterity, to take action which will assure that this fire which has started shall not spread but shall promptly be extinguished. Then we shall turn with renewed vigor to curing the injustices out of which this trouble has arisen.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, NOVEMBER 2

U.S. delegation press release 2491 dated November 2

I want first to express the gratification felt by my delegation that it was possible for it to formulate a resolution which gave expression to what seems to have been the overwhelming wishes of this Assembly, a resolution which I think will have historic significance. I know that the resolution was far from perfect and far from satisfactory to all of us, including perhaps myself. It was a situation where I felt that the importance of acting promptly was very great.

In my opening remarks, I spoke of the importance of a constructive development, a positive development of this situation, and not merely attempting to turn the clock back. Mr. Pearson [Lester B. Pearson, of Canada, Secretary of State for External Affairs] also spoke rather fully upon that point. I want to emphasize my complete agreement with what he said, not only my personal agreement but the feeling of President Eisenhower himself, whom I talked to a few hours ago about this aspect of the matter. It is a phase of the situation which we deem of utmost importance, and the United States delegation will be very happy indeed if the Canadian delegation would formulate and introduce as part of these
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proceedings a concrete suggestion along the lines which Mr. Pearson made.

Before leaving this forum, Mr. President, I merely want to add one word, if I may, to express my endorsement of the intervention made by the Honorable Delegate of Italy with reference to the Hungarian situation.

I think we must not allow our preoccupation with what is going on in the Middle East to keep us from also observing with equal intensity what goes on in that part of the world. We have had encouraging reports of the withdrawal of foreign forces from Hungary, but there have also come in tonight disturbing reports about the reintroduction of foreign forces into Hungary, in face of the fact that we have before us the declaration of the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Hungary that they have declared their neutrality and do not invite the presence any longer of foreign forces.

So I hope, Mr. President, that this matter which is on the agenda of the Security Council will be kept urgently before it and that we shall not be preoccupied with the Middle East to the exclusion of assisting the state of Hungary to regain its independence.

Americans and Others Evacuated From Egypt

Press release 569 dated November 3

The Department of State announced on November 3 that it was in communication with Ambassador [Raymond A.] Hare in Cairo.

Ambassador Hare said there has been successful evacuation from Egypt of all Americans and of many other foreign nationals desiring to leave. Large convoys organized by the American Embassy in collaboration with other American agencies traveled from Cairo to Alexandria during the last few days without serious incident. From there the evacuees, American and foreign, were moved from Egypt aboard American vessels. Among the foreign nationals thus evacuated were an unknown number of Hungarians and approximately 110 Germans. A number of Polish nationals were offered transportation on American vessels but apparently had already made other arrangements. French nationals traveled from Cairo with the convoy but were unable to leave Alexandria on American vessels as planned because of inability to obtain exit permits.

Ambassador Hare emphasized the complete cooperation which he had received from all levels of the Egyptian Government in effectively implementing our evacuation plans.

Middle East Passport Restrictions

Nonissuance of Passports for Travel to Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria

Press release 565 dated October 31

The Department of State announced on October 31 that, because of the troubled conditions in the eastern Mediterranean area, passports are not being issued, extended, or renewed for travel to or in Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria. Passports will be endorsed: "This passport is not valid for travel to or in Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria." An exception may be made, however, when the Department of State is satisfied that the presence of the person in one of these countries would be in the best interests of the United States. When exception is made, an appropriate endorsement will be placed in the passport.

Persons planning to travel in Middle Eastern countries other than the four specified above for passport restrictions are urged to defer their plans if it is at all possible to do so.

Invalidation of Outstanding Passports

Press release 567 dated November 2

The Department of State announced on November 2 the issuance of an order invalidating all outstanding passports for travel to Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria, except those of persons remaining in those countries and of Government officials and their families en route to or stationed there. Passports of persons within any of these four countries will become invalid for return thereto when they proceed to a country other than Aden, Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Muscat and Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen. Passports invalidated for travel to or in Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria will remain invalid for travel there unless specially endorsed for travel to or in one or more of these countries or until the order is revoked.
The Hungarian Question in the Security Council

The United States, the United Kingdom, and France on October 27 requested the President of the Security Council, Bernard Cornut-Gentille of France, to call a meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Hungary. The Council met on October 28 and decided by a vote of 9–1 (U.S.S.R.), with Yugoslavia abstaining, to place the item on its agenda.

On November 2 another Council meeting was called, again at the request of the three Western powers, who referred to the "critical situation in Hungary" as the basis for their action (U.N. doc. S/3723). On November 3, the U.S. Representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., introduced a resolution calling on the Soviet Union to "desist from any form of intervention, particularly armed intervention, in the internal affairs of Hungary." The Soviet Union vetoed the proposal at an early morning session on November 4. The Council then decided to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly, under the Uniting-for-Peace resolution, to consider the question.

Following are texts of the first U.S.-U.K.-French letter requesting a meeting of the Council, statements made by Ambassador Lodge before the Council, and the U.S. draft resolution.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, OCTOBER 27\(^1\)

U.N. doc. S/3590

Under instructions from our Governments, we have the honour to address you in your capacity as President of the Security Council with regard to the situation created by the action of foreign military forces in Hungary in violently repress-

\(^1\) In a statement issued on the same date (U.S./U.N. press release 2479), Ambassador Lodge said:

"The situation in Hungary has developed in such a way as to cause deep anxiety and concern throughout the world. Available information indicates that the people of Hungary are demanding the fundamental rights and freedoms affirmed in the charter of the United Nations and secured to them by the Hungarian peace treaty."

"They are being subjected to very repressive measures by foreign military forces, and they are reported to be suffering very heavy casualties."

"The members of the United Nations clearly have a deep interest in this situation and cannot remain indifferent to it. They must assert their serious concern and consider how best they might discharge the obligations which they have assumed under the charter."

ing the rights of the Hungarian people which are secured by the Treaty of Peace to which the Governments of Hungary and the Allied and Associated Powers are parties.

Pursuant to the provisions of Article 34 of the Charter, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America request the inclusion in the agenda of the Security Council of an item entitled: "The situation in Hungary", and request further that you convene an urgent meeting of the Security Council for the consideration of this item.

Accept, Excellency, etc.

Bernard Cornut-Gentille
Permanent Representative of France
Pierson Dixon
Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
H. C. Lodge, Jr.
Permanent Representative of the United States of America
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STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, OCTOBER 28

U.S./U.N. press release 2480

Let me first say that I think it is a most unusual procedure—and one which I have never observed in the 3½ years that I have been here—to interrupt the speaker and then try to adjourn the session. It is clear that we are not going to try to reach a vote today on anything of substance, so there can be no sound reason for delay. The representative of the Soviet Union [Arkady A. Sobolev] said he wanted to know what our reasons were for bringing in this letter, and then he moves to adjourn, which makes it impossible for any of us to set forth our reasons. I consider that a highly illogical procedure. If he will listen, he will now hear what our reasons are for the step that we have proposed.

Now, as far as the remarks which have been made about the United States are concerned, I will merely say at the outset that these are the things which I do know about my country.

First, the United States has done not one single improper thing in this case at any time.

Secondly, no one in the world has ever been or is oppressed by the United States.

Thirdly, the American people have a deep and natural sympathy for people in Hungary and in other countries who are struggling for their liberty.

Fourth, we have this sympathy because the ancestors of many Americans came from these oppressed lands, and we have sympathy because it is a cardinal belief of the American people that our Declaration of Independence which brought this country into existence, as Abraham Lincoln said, “gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world, for all future time.”

Fifth, Mr. President, the United States has no desire to impose its way of life on any other country. If we give help to nations struggling for independence, that help will be given—as all our help is always given—with no strings attached.

I would like to quote what Secretary Dulles said in Dallas last night,² inasmuch as reference has been made to his speech:

... The captive peoples should never have reason to doubt that they have in us a sincere and dedicated friend who shares their aspirations. They must know that they can draw upon our abundance to tide themselves over the period of economic adjustment which is inevitable as they rededicate their productive efforts to the service of their own people, rather than of exploiting masters. Nor do we condition economic ties between us upon the adoption by these countries of any particular form of society.

And let me make this clear, beyond a possibility of doubt: The United States has no ulterior purpose in desiring the independence of the satellite countries. Our unaltered wish is that these peoples, from whom so much of our own national life derives, should have sovereignty restored to them and that they should have governments of their own free choosing. We do not look upon these nations as potential military allies. We see them as friends and as part of a new and friendly and no longer divided Europe. We are confident that their independence, if promptly accorded, will contribute immensely to stabilize peace throughout all of Europe, West and East.

We hope, therefore, and I say this with the utmost sincerity, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union will see all these things in their true light and will cease their oppressive measures.

Now, Mr. President, this urgent meeting of the Security Council has been called to consider the situation in Hungary resulting from the violent suppression of the Hungarian people by armed force. The Hungarian people are demanding the rights and freedoms affirmed in the charter of the United Nations and specifically guaranteed to them by the peace treaty to which the Governments of Hungary and the Allied and Associated Powers are parties.

While the request for this meeting was made by France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, there are many others, I am sure, who would have joined in had time permitted consultation. It should be looked upon as a request by all like-minded, freedom-loving members who feel as we do about this matter—and I am happy to learn that others have associated themselves with this action today.

The convening of this Council reflects the deep anxiety and concern throughout the world regarding the bloodshed in Hungary. We fervently hope that the action in bringing this matter to the Council and the Council’s decision to consider the grave events in Hungary will move those responsible for the repression of the Hungarian people to discontinue such measures. We hope, too, that the Council’s action in considering this urgent and important matter will demonstrate to the Hungarian people that their plight is not forgotten but has engaged the sympathetic attention of all the world.

We in this Council cannot stand indifferent when

---

such events take place. The Council must consider a situation so flagrantly contrary to the purpose and principles of the charter. We must consider carefully, in the light of developments, the steps this Council can appropriately take to help bring about an end to these repressions and to assist the Hungarian people in the enjoyment of their fundamental rights.

While Hungary has been cut off from normal communication with the outside world, this much seems to be known about the fighting, the extent and seriousness of which has been confirmed by official Hungarian Government broadcasts.

Last Tuesday [October 23], peaceful demonstrations took place in Budapest. Demands were made, including a demand that Soviet troops leave Hungary. Police fired upon the demonstrators.

On Wednesday, Soviet tanks and Hungarian political police fired on Hungarian citizens who assembled on Parliament Square, resulting in unknown but reportedly large casualties.

By Friday fighting had spread beyond Budapest and had reached the Austrian frontier.

The Hungarian authorities say they are negotiating with the Soviet Union for the withdrawal of all Soviet troops, but at the same time it is reported that Soviet military reinforcements had recently entered Hungary from the outside and large-scale fighting has ensued.

This in brief, Mr. President, is the nature and scope of the situation we are here to consider. They are events which speak with a clarity which no one can misunderstand.

As a member of the Security Council, the United States Government is prepared to join in considering what this Council can properly do in order that the repressive acts against the Hungarian people may be brought to an end and conditions established under which they are enabled to enjoy their fundamental human rights. We hope that all of the members of the United Nations who share this concern will give the tragic situation in Hungary their earnest and active consideration.

These same charges, may I say, were made in past years repeatedly in the United Nations by the late Mr. Vyshinsky, when he represented the Soviet Union. They were all repeatedly rejected by the United Nations.

If it were not so tragic, it would be laughable to hear the Soviet representative complain about United States interference in the internal affairs of Hungary, when every edition of the newspapers tells of the Soviet Army killing Hungarians in large numbers. That, Mr. President, is real interference and of the most brutal kind. To it such things as foreign radio broadcasts simply cannot be compared at all.

There is a limit, after all, even to the absurdities of Soviet propaganda. The murderers of innocent women and children may point their bloody hands at those who send Christmas packages and seek to pin the blame on them, but no one will be fooled.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, NOVEMBER 2

Only yesterday the General Assembly met in an emergency session to consider the grave crisis in Hungary. Its members demonstrated a remarkable degree of unanimity in calling for a cessation of hostilities in that area. The dangers of this situation have not lessened, and we must continue to give it our close attention. At the same time, the world community cannot attain to ignore the equally urgent and dangerous situation developing in Hungary. We cannot stand idly by while the people of Hungary are engaged in a desperate struggle to put an end to the Soviet Union's domination of their national life. The application of the principle of peace with justice cannot be restricted to one geographic area at a time; it is a universal principle that must be upheld in all places and at all times.

Events in Hungary have moved swiftly since the Council voted last Sunday to place on its agenda the item entitled "The Situation in Hungary." The time has come when we must give earnest consideration to what the United Nations can do now that will assist the brave Hungarian people in their struggle for freedom. The use of armed might by the U.S.S.R. to repress the legitimate demands of the people of Hungary to enjoy the fundamental human rights secured to them by the
treaty of peace has profoundly shocked the whole world. The brave people of Hungary have earned the respect and admiration of free people everywhere.

The United States respects the right of every nation to determine its own political organization freely and without intervention from any outside source. America was a source of inspiration and encouragement to those stirring liberal movements which swept through Europe in 1848. The words spoken by Secretary of State Daniel Webster more than a century ago on the occasion of the visit of the great Hungarian patriot, Louis Kossuth, to the United States still have meaning today: for Webster spoke stirringly of "Hungarian independence, Hungarian self-government, Hungarian control of Hungarian destinies."

In 1918 American insistence upon the recognition of the principle of national self-determination prepared the way for the independent democratic republics of Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. For nearly two decades the sympathy of all freedom-loving peoples has gone out to the nations of Eastern Europe whose legitimate aspirations to independence were suppressed, first by the Nazis and then by the presence of Soviet troops.

The Hungarian people are now reasserting their right to an independent national existence. Although early reports indicated that Hungary had requested the assistance of Soviet forces, since our last Council meeting it has become abundantly clear that not only the people of Hungary, but their Government as well, desire to have all Soviet forces withdrawn from Hungary. Unfortunately, despite the clear desire of Hungary, it is at this moment unclear whether the U.S.S.R. will respond to this legitimate request. Indeed, there is now confirmation from the Government of Hungary itself that new Soviet troops have entered Hungary.

It is true that we have had the encouraging news announced by the Soviet Government in Moscow on October 30 of what appears to be a significant modification in the relations of the nations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. That announcement emphasized that "the countries of the great commonwealth of socialist nations can build their relations only on the principle of full equality, respect of territorial integrity, state independence and sovereignty, and noninterference in one another's domestic affairs." The Soviet statement went on to say that "the Soviet Government is ready to examine with other socialist countries that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty the question of Soviet troops stationed" on their territory.

This statement was amplified—and, I must add, somewhat blurred—by an explanation indicating that stationing troops of one member state of the Warsaw Treaty on the territory of another member state "should take place on the basis of an agreement among all its participants and not only with the agreement of the state on whose territory these troops are stationed or are planned to be stationed at its request." With particular respect to Hungary, the statement said that the U.S.S.R. had instructed "its military command to withdraw the Soviet Army units from Budapest as soon as this is recognized by the Hungarian Government to be necessary." It also expressed willingness to enter into negotiations on the question of the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary with Hungary and other participants of the Warsaw Treaty.

On October 31, in an historic address broadcast to the United States, President Eisenhower referred to the dramatic events in Hungary "where this brave people, as so often in the past, have offered their very lives for independence from foreign masters." While he noted the obscurity of the present situation, he emphasized that "if the Soviet Union indeed faithfully acts upon its announced intention, the world will witness the greatest forward stride toward justice, trust, and understanding among nations in our generation."

Yesterday there were most significant developments in Hungary. Budapest Radio announced that the President of the Council of Ministers, Imre Nagy, in his capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs, summoned the Soviet Ambassador to Hungary to protest in the strongest terms the entry of additional Soviet troops into Hungary. The Hungarian Government demanded the instant and immediate withdrawal of all Soviet forces. The Soviet Ambassador was informed of Hungary's repudiation of the Warsaw Treaty and of the declaration of Hungary's neutrality.

At the same time the Government of Hungary sent an urgent communication to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which has now been documented and circulated to all members. In addition to reporting the above events, it re-
provisions of the rules to protect the interests of Hungary and of the Security Council as regards the representation of that country here. It is now more important than it usually is for us to be sure that, in a country where events are in such a turmoil, the representation should be truly representative.

I therefore think that that should be the next step: to ascertain the facts. We must, above all, be helpful to the Hungarian people by acting with knowledge of the facts, and then the action that we take will be constructive and will be in the interests of peace and justice and national independence.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, NOVEMBER 3

Though events of the past few days have been confused, one fact is crystal clear. The Hungarian people want the Soviet Union to get out of their country so that they may live their lives as they wish without foreign interference.

Let me recount briefly the events of the past few days. On October 28, after fighting continued in Budapest, Premier Nagy ordered a general and immediate cease-fire. Revolutionary councils which had sprung up in various localities demanded withdrawal of Soviet forces. That afternoon Premier Nagy announced an agreement had been reached with the U.S.S.R. whereby Soviet forces would leave Budapest. He stated also that negotiations were being initiated to secure a general Soviet withdrawal from Hungary. The radio in eastern Hungary, manned by patriotic Hungarians, received Nagy's declaration with general approval but insisted that Soviet troops must leave all Hungary, not just Budapest.

On October 29 fighting diminished but the Soviet troops remained in Budapest. There were, however, reports of actual Soviet withdrawals from the city.

On the 30th of October shooting and fighting again erupted in Budapest. Despite earlier reported agreement on the departure of Soviet troops, they still had not withdrawn. The Nagy government announced on this same date abolition of the Communist one-party system. A "Little Cabinet" was formed representing several political parties. Shortly thereafter Radio Budapest
announced that it had changed management and that henceforth "it would broadcast only the truth" in contrast to the past when the radio had "lied day and night" on "all wave lengths." Throughout the day the withdrawal of Soviet troops was again at the center of demands published in the country.

On the 31st Soviet withdrawal from Budapest seemed at last to be under way. Premier Nagy called for abrogation of the Warsaw Pact and once again categorically demanded that Soviet troops withdraw. In the provinces several groups, which had joined to form a "Transdanubian National Council" centered in the town of Gyor in northwest Hungary, formulated a comprehensive list of demands including free elections, a neutrality proclamation, democratic freedom, and reliable guaranties on Soviet withdrawals from Hungary. The Hungarian armed forces themselves were taken over by new leaders who voiced similar demands.

On November 1, while Soviet units seemed to be quitting Budapest, there were reports, since confirmed by the Hungarian Government, of a renewed influx of Soviet troops into Hungary. Premier Nagy protested to the Soviet Ambassador the new Soviet troop movements. At the same time he notified the Soviet Union of Hungary's repudiation of the Warsaw Treaty and of its future status of neutrality. Nagy also telegraphed these declarations to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and asked, as we have already noted, that the matter of Hungary's neutrality and its guaranty be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly. In addition, Nagy wired Soviet President Voroshilov to ask appointment of a Soviet delegation to initiate prompt discussions on troop withdrawals. The new leaders of Hungary's Foreign Office announced the recall of the Hungarian delegates to the U.N. who had been appointed several days before. During the day Cardinal Mindszenty returned to Budapest and spoke to the people. At nightfall Soviet troops had reportedly surrounded Hungary's three major airfields, allegedly to safeguard air transport for departing Russians. In the meantime, Hungary's revived political parties moved to organize themselves, while the discredited Communist Party announced its name was changed to "the Socialist Workers Party."

As our meeting closed last night the Secretariat distributed a communication from the Government of Hungary [U.N. doc. S/3726]. One paragraph of that communication is of special relevance to us. Let me read it.

On the 2d of November further and exact information, mainly military reports, reached the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, according to which large Soviet military units crossed the border of the country, marching toward Budapest. They occupy railway lines, railway stations and railway safety equipment. Reports also have come about that Soviet military movements of east-west direction are being observed on the territory of Western Hungary.

This information underlines the importance of what I said here last night, that the Council needs to have a clear picture of the situation actually prevailing in Hungary.

I should like to address several questions. I should like first to put a question to Dr. Szabo 6 and then to the representative of the Soviet Union.

First, can Dr. Szabo give us further details concerning the events reported in the communication we received from his Government last night? If he does not have current information, I should like to renew the request I made last evening that the Secretary-General get in touch directly with the Hungarian Government in order that this Council may know the facts.

Second, last night Mr. Sobolev told us categorically that no new Soviet troops had entered Hungary. Meantime, we received the second communication from the Government of Hungary, not only confirming the earlier report of the entry of new Soviet forces into Hungary but also describing further arrivals of Soviet forces.

I am also constrained to note, Mr. President, that a convoy of American citizens seeking to leave Hungary yesterday was turned back by Soviet forces just short of the Austro-Hungarian border. The United States immediately protested this action. I have just learned that the same convoy has been stopped a second time. These incidents raise serious questions regarding the accuracy of the assertions that the Soviet representative made here last night.

I therefore ask the Soviet representative if he would comment on these aspects of the Hungarian situation which I have just cited.

I note the most recent reports indicate that at this very moment a mixed Hungarian-Soviet com-

---

6 Janos Szabo, a member of the Hungarian mission to the U.N., on Nov. 3 was designated by Premier Nagy to represent Hungary before the Security Council.
mission is presumably negotiating in Budapest with regard to the withdrawal of Soviet forces. I think an up-to-date report from Mr. Sobolev and the representative of Hungary on these developments would also be welcome—that is, the success the mixed commission is having concerning the withdrawal of Soviet forces.

Now let me turn to the action which the United States believes is the proper course in the light of present developments in Hungary. The United States has submitted a draft resolution, with three main elements, all of which are designed to insure that the Hungarian people have an opportunity to determine their own destiny without outside interference.

The first two urge the U.S.S.R. to stop intervening, and in particular with armed forces, in the internal affairs of Hungary and to make appropriate arrangements with the Hungarian Government to withdraw all Soviet forces from Hungary without delay. The Soviet announcement of October 30, which the Soviet representative cited as the policy of the Government last night, should provide a basis for dealing with this problem. Nothing would be more welcome—let me say this with sincerity—than action by the Soviet Union on its initiative to back up this announcement with deeds.

Third, the resolution requests that the Secretary-General, with the heads of appropriate specialized agencies, investigate on an urgent basis the need of the Hungarian people for food and medicine and other similar supplies and to report to the Security Council as soon as possible. In this connection, members as well as national and international humanitarian organizations are asked to cooperate in making supplies available to the Hungarian people.

The United States has already offered assistance, and the American Red Cross has sent medical supplies. I announced here last night that President Eisenhower has said that $20 million was being made available by the United States for relief supplies for the Hungarian people.

Mr. President, the resolution before the Council is a serious proposal by the United States which we believe will advance the true interests of the Hungarian people and promote the cause of international peace with justice.

TEXT OF U.S. DRAFT RESOLUTION VETOED BY U.S.S.R. ON NOVEMBER 4th

U.N. doc. S/7730/Rev. 1

The Security Council,

Considering that the United Nations is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members;

Recalling that the enjoyment of human rights and of fundamental freedoms in Hungary were specifically guaranteed by the peace treaty between Hungary and the allied and associated powers signed at Paris on 10 February 1947 and that the general principle of these rights and freedoms is affirmed for all peoples in the Charter of the United Nations;

Convinced that present events in Hungary manifest clearly the desire of the Hungarian people to exercise and to enjoy fully their fundamental rights, freedoms and independence;

Deploring the use of Soviet military forces to suppress the efforts of the Hungarian people to reassert their rights;

Noting moreover the Declaration by the Soviet Government of 30 October 1956, of its avowed policy of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States;

Noting the communication of 1 November 1956 of the Government of Hungary to the Secretary-General regarding demands made by that Government to the Government of the U.S.S.R. for "instant and immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces";

Noting further the communication of 2 November 1956 of the Government of Hungary to the Secretary-General asking the Security Council "to instruct the Soviet and Hungarian Governments to start the negotiations immediately" on withdrawal of Soviet forces;

Anxious to see the independence and sovereignty of Hungary respected;

1. Calls upon the Government of the U.S.S.R. to desist forthwith from any form of intervention, particularly armed intervention, in the internal affairs of Hungary;

2. Calls upon the U.S.S.R. to cease the introduction of additional armed forces into Hungary and to withdraw all of its forces without delay from Hungarian territory;

3. Affirms the right of the Hungarian people to a government responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being;

4. Requests the Secretary-General in consultation with the heads of appropriate specialized agencies to explore on an urgent basis the need of the Hungarian people for food, medicine and other similar supplies and to report to the Security Council as soon as possible;

5. Requests all Members of the United Nations and invites national and international humanitarian organizations to co-operate in making available such supplies as may be required by the Hungarian people.

* The vote was 9–1 (U.S.S.R.), with Yugoslavia abstaining.
U.S. Aid to Hungary

Following are texts of an announcement by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA), a statement by President Eisenhower, and a letter to the President from E. Roland Harriman, chairman of the American National Red Cross, concerning aid to Hungary.

ICA ANNOUNCEMENT, OCTOBER 31

The United States has offered 2,000 tons of foodstuffs for the relief of distress in Hungary and among Hungarian refugees in Austria.

The food, which includes dried milk, cheese, rice, butter, and oil, has been made available by the American Embassy in Vienna to the League of Red Cross Societies for distribution.

More than half the food is already in Austria, consisting of stocks intended for distribution by voluntary relief agencies such as the National Catholic Welfare Council, the World Council of Churches, the Lutheran World Federation, the International Rescue Committee, American Friends of Austrian Children, and others.

These agencies turned back their allocations of these foods to the United States, which in turn has made them available to the Red Cross so that immediate shipments to Hungary could begin.

The balance of the food supplies left the United States on the S. S. Melrose and is scheduled to arrive in Trieste November 7 for transshipment to Hungary.

The food stocks used in the distribution for Hungary will be replaced by the United States Government.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, NOVEMBER 2

White House press release dated November 2

All America pays tribute in these troubled days to the courage and sacrifices of the Hungarian people in their determination to secure freedom. In struggling to obtain this goal for their country, the Hungarians are undergoing grave physical hardships and privations.

In order to help the Hungarian people in this hour of need, I am authorizing immediately an initial allocation of $20 million from the funds appropriated by the Congress for emergency use, to be employed for food and other urgent relief necessary for the alleviation of their sufferings.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM MR. HARRIMAN, NOVEMBER 2

White House press release dated November 3

My dear Mr. President: I thought you might like to have a summary of the day and night efforts in which the American Red Cross has been engaged since last Saturday [October 27] in providing urgently needed medical and food supplies for the people of strife-torn Hungary.

Working through the League of Red Cross Societies in Geneva, we have been buying medical supplies and food in Europe and at the same time, with the assistance of the U.S. Air Force and commercial airlines, have been sending emergency cargoes of drugs and foods from this country.

It is interesting to note that we are not acting alone in this venture. Thirty of the 75 Red Cross Societies throughout the world, coordinated by the League and the International Red Cross Committee, are pouring literally thousands of tons of relief supplies into this beleaguered nation. Five representatives of the International Red Cross are now in Budapest coordinating the speedy and impartial distribution of supplies.

Since last Saturday, when we first learned through Geneva of the urgent need in Hungary, the American Red Cross has spent or allocated approximately $130,000 for relief, $100,000 of which is being expended by the League in Europe. Six air shipments have been sent from here, the latest of which was an Air Force Globemaster carrying 15 tons of medicines and food which left Andrews Field Wednesday night for Vienna, the point from which all Red Cross supplies are being trucked or flown into Budapest.

First supplies were carried by TWA planes and included ten thousand vials of penicillin—enough for 100,000 injections; five thousand yards of gauze and six thousand vials of gas gangrene anti-tetanus serum.

The U.S. Air Force Globemaster's relief cargo on Wednesday included 2,400 vials of tetanus antitoxin; 1,300 yards of gauze; 500,000 2 x 2 dressings; 407,000 vitamin capsules and 400 pounds of absorbent cotton. There also were 11,500 pounds of evaporated milk, 5,000 pounds of baby food; 1,470 pounds of vegetable oil; 1,500 pounds
of shortening; 1,000 pounds of dehydrated soups; 2,630 pounds of canned meats and 1,000 pounds of sugar.

The League of Red Cross Societies also is preparing to distribute in Hungary, 2,000 tons of American food stockpiled in Europe which was made available by the U.S. International Cooperation Administration. The food has been accepted by the League as a gift from the American people for relief to Hungary, and we are paying the shipping charges to transport it to that country.

American Red Cross activities in Geneva are being coordinated by James T. Nicholson, our Executive Vice President who was attending an International Red Cross meeting when the revolt broke out. He has been in constant touch with us here and, through the League, with the Hungarian Red Cross. The first word from Hungary reached Geneva by telephone late Saturday night after the League had made efforts throughout the day to contact the Red Cross in Budapest.

All in all, the response in our own country and in most Red Cross Societies throughout the world has been magnificent.

I'll be happy to keep you advised of later developments.

Faithfully,

E. Roland Harriman

U.S.S.R. Asked To Recall
Member of U.N. Delegation

Press release 564 dated October 29

The following is the text of a note delivered on October 29 by the U.S. Mission to the United Nations to the Permanent Representative of the U.S.S.R. Mission to the United Nations.

Konstantin P. Ekimov, a member of the U.S.S.R. Delegation to the United Nations, has engaged in activities with respect to Tanya Romanov,1 an American citizen, which constitute an abuse of the privilege of his residence in the United States. K. Ekimov's actions were outside the scope of his official capacity as a member of the Soviet Delegation to the United Nations and therefore in violation of the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations.

It is therefore requested that arrangements be made for K. Ekimov's expeditions departure from the United States.

Anniversary of Republic of Viet-Nam

White House press release dated October 25

Following is a letter from President Eisenhower to Ngo Dinh Diem, President of the Republic of Viet-Nam, on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Republic of Viet-Nam, October 26.

October 22, 1956

Dear Mr. President: The admiration with which I have watched the progress of the Republic of Viet-Nam during the past year prompts me to send to you the warmest congratulations of the American people on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Republic and upon the promulgation of the Vietnamese Constitution.

The American people have observed the remarkable struggle of the Vietnamese people during the past years to achieve and to maintain their independence. The successes of the Republic of Viet-Nam in thwarting the aggressive designs of Communism without, and in surmounting the most difficult obstacles within, have shown what can be achieved when a people rally to the cause of freedom.

We in America pray that those now still living in the enslaved part of your country may one day be united in peace under the free Republic of Viet-Nam.

The achievements of the Vietnamese people will long remain a source of inspiration to free peoples everywhere. As Viet-Nam enters this new period of national reconstruction and rehabilitation, my fellow countrymen and I are proud to be sharing some of the tasks which engage you.

May the Vietnamese people inspired by your dedicated leadership and the high principles of their democratic institutions, enjoy long years of prosperity in justice and in peace.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

---

1 Two-and-one-half-year-old American-born daughter of émigré parents.
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Strengthening Cultural Ties With Germany

by James B. Conant
Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany

It is indeed an honor and a pleasure for me to attend, as a representative of the President of the United States, the opening of the Nuernberg Amerikahaus. I consider it my finest and most important task to help promote better understanding between our two nations, and it is hardly necessary to point out to this audience how much the Amerikahaeuser have done to bring about such mutual understanding.

It is equally unnecessary for me to point out that a mutual (and let me stress the word “mutual”) cultural exchange between Germany and America is nothing new. As a former scientist and a former president of an American university, I know very well how much American science owes to German scientists and to the German universities, and I have often spoken of this debt of gratitude. Especially in the field in which I was trained, in organic chemistry, Germany was so far advanced in the 19th and the early 20th century that most of our young American chemists wanted to work and study in Germany for at least a year. Unfortunately, the First World War prevented me from coming to Germany as a student, but in 1925, as a young professor, I was able to make up for what I had missed as a student. In that year I was able to visit Germany for several months. I remember particularly a meeting of the German Chemical Society which took place here in Nuernberg, a meeting where I could talk shop with my German colleagues and at the same time could enjoy the art treasures of your city.

However, not only my work as a chemist but also my work as a university president helped me to understand how much American science owes to German science. The men who during the 19th century reorganized some of the old universities in the United States, or founded new ones, knew the German universities quite well and to some extent took them as models. A number of these Americans had themselves studied and traveled in Germany and were carrying on a lively and stimulating correspondence with their German colleagues.

Not even during the terrible years after 1933 were the cultural ties between Germany and America broken completely, for many German artists and scientists persecuted by Hitler sought refuge beyond the Atlantic Ocean and even during the war years acted as German cultural ambassadors in the United States.

I have already stressed that the cultural ties between Germany and America were by no means one-sided. Exactly as many of my countrymen watched with eager interest the cultural life in your country, so many of your countrymen showed great interest in developments in America. As far back as the days of James Fenimore Cooper, American literature had its admirers in Germany. The works of the outstanding American authors—be it Thomas Wolfe, or Hemingway, or Faulkner, or O’Neill—have been translated into German and published in your country within a few years after publication in America.

It is particularly fortunate that during the postwar years, shortly after one of the most bitter wars in world history, both Germans and Americans were eager to seek a better understanding and to promote a more active cultural exchange. I am very happy that during those years the American exchange program could give thousands of Germans a chance to visit the United States and that the Amerikahaeuser could give millions of Germans a chance to inform themselves about America.

To the exchangees we said: “Come and see America for yourself. Make up your own mind, but first take a good look. Don’t be satisfied with an oversimplified formula. Look both at our achievements and at our problems. We do not pretend that we have found solutions for all our problems, and we do not pretend that all our solutions can automatically be transferred to another country. However, we are convinced that, if we Americans and you, the citizens of the other countries of the free world, get to know each other better, our nations will be able to cooperate more effectively in our common interest and in the interest of the whole free world.”

I should like to give the same sort of advice to the future visitors of the Amerikahaus. The programs and facilities of the Amerikahaus—the exhibitions, lectures, concerts, films, books—can give the visitors at least an impression of life in the United States. And because the Amerikahaus reflects the great diversity within our Nation, you

1 Translation of remarks made in German at the opening of the new Amerikahaus at Nuernberg on Oct. 13 (U.S. Embassy, Bonn, press release).
may find a surprising, even confusing, variety of opinions expressed in the 20,000 books in the library of the Amerikahaus. If, for instance, you should be interested in the Civil War, you can find in the library of the Amerikahaus books in which the point of view of the Northern States is presented, but also books written from the point of view of the South. Among the books on current political problems you will find books written by convinced Republicans and books written by equally convinced Democrats. In the music section you will find the works of some American music critics who enthusiastically praise our contemporary music, but also the books of other music critics who sharply criticize it. Finally, the Amerikahaus library offers not only books on America written by Americans but also books on America written by foreign visitors. In short, the Amerikahaus is not trying to force on its visitors an official picture of America but wants to give its visitors a chance to form their own opinions. I am convinced that this is an excellent way to promote international understanding, and I am equally convinced that such understanding is vitally important, since today no nation can hope to safeguard peace, prosperity, and security entirely by its own efforts.

In any case, Europe and America cannot ignore each other; since year by year America and Europe are moving closer together. On the oldest terrestrial globe, which Martin Behaim produced here in your city, the American continent does not appear. However, in the year in which Behaim built his globe, Columbus reached America, and before Behaim’s death another German cartographer already had drawn a rough map of the new continent and had even given it the name it bears to this day. But the early maps showed little more than an inaccurate outline of America; the interior was either left empty or was filled with the products of the cartographer’s imagination. Even after the maps became scientifically exact, many Europeans continued to see America the way it had appeared on those early maps; in their picture of America there were many large blank spaces and much was rather fanciful.

In the olden days, when a trip to America still was a time-consuming and difficult undertaking, this lack of accurate information was not particularly dangerous. Today, when an airplane can make a round trip from Europe to America and back again in one day, we—on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean—certainly must know much more about each other. We must learn to understand each other, and—let me say this again—the Amerikahaus can do much to promote such mutual understanding.

During the summer of 1954 I visited your city officially. Mrs. Conant and I still like to think of the very friendly welcome we received here in Nuremberg. But my visit today has a great advantage over the previous visit. Then I came as a High Commissioner; today I have the pleasure to come here in a capacity which I find much more agreeable, in the capacity of an American Ambassador. Let me now, in my capacity as Ambassador of the United States, thank the people and the government of the city of Nuremberg for their friendly cooperation during the construction of the Amerikahaus. Without their cooperation this Amerikahaus could not have been built.

I also should like to wish the director of the Amerikahaus, Mr. [Bart N.] Stephens, and his staff the best of luck for their future work. I know that Mr. Stephens recently received a meritorious service award for his work during the past years, and I am convinced that he will be equally successful in the future. May the Amerikahaus under his direction help to promote a real mutual understanding between the German and the American people!

President Wishes Secretary Dulles Speedy and Full Recovery

Statement by President Eisenhower

White House press release dated November 4

I know I speak for all Americans—and for freedom-loving peoples the world over—in wishing the Secretary of State a speedy and full recovery from his operation.

As Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles has devoted himself unselfishly to his complicated and strenuous duties—even, as it is now apparent, at the risk of his own health. He has given untiringly of himself to the cause of world peace based on justice and, as such, is my invaluable associate.

Until he can resume his full duties, the splendid State Department staff, headed by Herbert Hoover, Jr., that the Secretary has developed, will operate in his stead. In doing so, they, and I, will constantly have the advantages of his experience, wisdom, and courageous spirit.
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Immigration of Adopted Foreign-Born Orphans

Statement by President Eisenhower

White House press release dated October 28

I have been particularly concerned over the hardship that ensues to American citizens who have adopted foreign-born orphans and who have then found that they cannot bring their adopted children into the United States because quotas under the Walter-McCarran Act and the Refugee Relief Act are exhausted. Many of these foster parents are members of our armed forces who have completed tours of duty overseas and are forced to leave their adopted children behind.

I requested the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to determine whether it is possible to alleviate this problem—within the framework of existing law. The Secretary of State and the Attorney General have just reported to me that this can be done. Provision for bringing these orphans to our country, pending action by Congress to amend the law, will be put into effect immediately.

National Olympic Day, 1956

A PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS the XVth Olympic Games of the modern era will be held in Melbourne, Australia, beginning November 22 and ending December 8, 1956; and

WHEREAS these games afford an opportunity for the finest men and women athletes from more than seventy participating countries to assemble together in an atmosphere of friendly competition and good sportsmanship; and

WHEREAS these athletes, who represent different nations, creeds, and races, meet together in competitive tests of their athletic abilities under rules and conditions which offer equality of opportunity for all; and

WHEREAS experience has shown that contestants and spectators have returned to their homes from Olympic Games not only refreshed in their friendships and richer in their understanding of other peoples, but also with new insight into the brotherhood of man; and

WHEREAS in these times of international tension the peoples of the world need the stabilizing influence of the friendly relations, wholesome competition, and high ideals of sportsmanship engendered by the Olympic Games; and

WHEREAS the United States Olympic Association is presently engaged in assuring maximum support for the team representing the United States at Melbourne:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President

of the United States of America, do hereby designate Saturday, October 27, 1956, as National Olympic Day; and I urge the fullest possible participation in its observance by people throughout the United States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this twenty-sixth day of October in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

By the President:
JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

International Conference on Airport Charges

The Department of State announced on November 3 (press release 568) that the United States Government will be represented by the following delegation at the International Conference on Airport Charges which is being convened by the International Civil Aviation Organization (Icao) at Montreal, Canada, on November 6:

Chief Delegate
Warner H. Hord, chairman, Chief, Office of Carrier Accounts and Statistics, Civil Aeronautics Board

Alternate Delegates
Herbert J. Guth, Program Planning Office, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce
Mary C. Hiltyer, Assistant Chief, Foreign Aviation Division, Bureau of Air Operations, Civil Aeronautics Board

Advisers
E. Thomas Barnard, Executive Director, Airport Operators' Council
Paul F. Steiner, Deputy Director, Washington National Airport, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce
George L. Stillwagon, Chief, Research and Service Section, Office of Carrier Accounts and Statistics, Civil Aeronautics Board

A detailed study of international airport fees was issued by the Air Transport Committee of the organization in 1954. The purpose of this meeting will be to explore the subject of airport charges, as well as the problem of deriving additional revenue from various airport services.
The United Nations in an Interdependent World

by Francis O. Wilcox
Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs

Eleven years ago today the United Nations Charter came into effect. I need not remind this audience that the charter was written in San Francisco during 3 arduous months of debate, negotiation, and compromise. Many of us here remember the momentous day when the representatives of 51 nations signed this declaration of man's intent “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.”

It is probably fortunate that the charter was forged in the heat and urgency of war when a common danger and a common hope bound nations together. Time has shown that the result was by no means a perfect document. But it was, I think, a better one than we could have written 6 months, or 6 years, or even 11 years later.

For it is well to remember that before the charter was signed the war had ended in Europe and before it was ratified the atomic age had come upon us. The cohesive forces which molded the wartime alliance were removed while nationalist and self-determination movements were on the upsurge in many lands. I very much doubt that in this postwar period we could have recaptured the maninity of purpose that made the charter possible.

It has rightly been called a preatomic charter, but even so it has demonstrated great durability and flexibility. Since 1945 twenty-five additional states have subscribed to its terms, three more are about to, and still others are waiting. In this same period not a single nation has left the organization. This is remarkable testimony to the fact that the United Nations must be serving the collective interests of its members; and it must be responsive as well to the foreign-policy objectives of individual states.

San Francisco, Patron of Peace

There could be no more fitting and symbolic place to mark this anniversary than San Francisco, a city which over the past 11 years has more than once been the patron of peace. I refer not only to the great charter conference.

In 1952 this was the site of the signing of the Treaty of Peace between Japan and 48 former wartime enemies. It was “a just and lasting peace” with a nation that long since should have taken its rightful place in the United Nations. The sole responsibility for this exclusion rests with a state which was one of the last to declare war and is one of the last to make peace with Japan. Now that Russia and Japan have agreed upon peace terms, I hope that speedy action may be taken to pave the way for Japan’s entry into the United Nations at the earliest possible moment.

In June 1955 San Francisco was again host to the United Nations on the 10th anniversary of the signing of the charter. This time 60 countries were represented, 37 by their Foreign Ministers. They came not only to rededicate their governments to the principles of the charter but to indicate their affection for the beautiful city of its origin.

Bipartisan Support for United Nations

There are significant dates directly ahead of us. Two weeks from now is our national election. The following week the 11th General Assembly convenes in New York. To some people this might seem an embarrassing sequence of dates. “How is it possible,” they may ask, “for a great nation like the United States to appear in the General Assembly only 6 days after election day, ready to debate foreign-policy issues of far-reaching importance?”
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The answer lies in the solid bipartisan support the Congress and the American people have traditionally given the United Nations. Since that day in July, 11 years ago, when the Senate approved the charter by the overwhelming vote of 89-2, the record of nonpartisan support for the United Nations has been remarkably consistent.

This year our delegation to the General Assembly will be made up of five Democrats and five Republicans, including two distinguished sons of California—William F. Knowland, minority leader of the Senate, and Paul G. Hoffman, formerly administrator of the European Recovery Program. This year, too, both parties have once again recorded in unmistakable terms in their platforms their enthusiastic endorsement of the United Nations.

I am immensely pleased that this is so. Whatever one’s views may be of bipartisan foreign policy in general, it would be tragic for us to take any other approach to our relations with the United Nations. For the United Nations is a going concern with continuing responsibilities. If our participation in the organization were to be seriously disrupted or placed in jeopardy by the outcome of our national elections, we would indeed be doing a great disservice to the United Nations and the cause of world peace.

**The United Nations in an Interdependent World**

I am sure that sometimes after reading the papers and listening to the radio we may form the impression that the United Nations certainly gets into a lot of trouble. The reverse, of course, is obviously true: A lot of trouble gets into the United Nations.

Take the current problem of Suez as an example. Although this issue is not yet settled, it affords an important case history of when and how the United Nations may usefully be brought into a critical situation.

Almost immediately following the Egyptian Government’s announcement in July that it had nationalized the Suez Canal Company, voices were heard from many quarters urging that the matter be put before the United Nations.

Those principally involved in the problem, however, attempted first of all to use the normal channels of diplomacy. This procedure was completely in conformity with article 33 of the charter, which recommends that the “parties to any dispute . . . first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, . . .” etc. It was in this spirit that the London and Cairo meetings were held. It was only when these methods failed to achieve a just settlement that both parties turned to the United Nations.

Resort to the United Nations after other efforts at solution had failed was entirely in conformity with the purposes and principles of the charter, which calls upon members “to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.”

Nearly 2 months elapsed between President Nasser’s seizure of the canal and consideration by the United Nations. During that time the principals had a fair opportunity to attempt a settlement among themselves. When that phase ended without agreement, it was of the utmost importance to have an international organization to turn to in the attempts to find a solution.

In my opinion the mere act of bringing the Suez problem to the United Nations served to ease tensions. While people talk, tempers tend to cool. It is true that the Security Council has not yet achieved a permanent settlement. It did provide a basis for further negotiations based on six agreed principles, to which all the parties adhered. The Secretary-General can continue to play a key role as a go-between. This all represents progress.

It is very possible that the United Nations in this case has again been instrumental in preventing open conflict by providing a forum where the disputants could exchange views face to face and engage in what the Secretary-General has called quiet diplomacy. In this sense, as in many others, the United Nations remains as President Eisenhower has described it—a “sheer necessity.”

As nations become more and more interdependent on one another for security, for economic well-being, and for social progress, they require a common meeting ground and a common set of principles to guide their conduct. These the United Nations provides. Because of this increasing interdependence of nations, if we did not have a United Nations, we would have to create one.

---

United Nations Day Message

by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
U.S. Representative to the United Nations

As the United Nations reaches its eleventh anniversary it is good to remember how many of our United States and free world successes in recent years have been gained at the United Nations.

Just this month the United Nations played a vital part in the dispute over the Suez Canal. It provided a meeting place where the two sides could agree on the principles for a just settlement. Secretary-General Hammarskjold's diplomatic skill was once again of great value. As a result, the danger of a terrible war over Suez has been largely averted.

There are still some very stubborn threats to the peace throughout the world, but the history of the United Nations contains many examples of how the United Nations helps free nations which seek peace with justice. Looking back just a few years we recall these other achievements:

We have continued to build the United Nations into a realistic and effective agency for peace, able to put a damper on disputes before they turn into wars and thus to guard mankind against the frightful calamity of a nuclear global war.

Through the United Nations, President Eisenhower's plan to harness the atom not for man's death but for his life, has taken great forward steps and has generated world-wide good will for the United States. At this very time, as a result of that proposal, the International Atomic Energy Agency is being created.

The United Nations Security Council played a decisive role in foiling the communist attempts to take over Guatemala in 1954.

In 1955 Red China bowed to the dramatic demand of the United Nations General Assembly and released our fifteen fliers who were being held as pawns in a war of blackmail and hate propaganda.

We have used the uniquely influential United Nations forum to arouse world opinion against communist attempts to take over Formosa, with the result that in that dangerous area we still have peace—and have surrendered nothing.

We have used the United Nations loudspeaker again and again to nail communist distortions on the spot, and to expose the brutal Red techniques of forced confessions, slave labor and the use of tanks against the workers of East Berlin and Poznan.

On thirty separate occasions in the past three years, we have led the United Nations in its rejection of attempts to seat Communist China.

Through United Nations aid programs—such as the Children's Fund and Technical Assistance—we have shown that the United States is sincerely interested in other people's welfare.

The United Nations is not a government or a living miracle. It cannot bring heaven down to earth. But after eleven years, we have learned more and more what a practical device it is for promoting peace with justice, which is the goal of all free men.

October, 1956.

Political Interdependence

There are three main types of lasting issues before mankind and the United Nations. The first is political. Basically, this is the issue of how nations can, in the words of the charter, "practice tolerance and live together in peace." Now the United Nations cannot make nations peaceable. Disputes and threats to the peace will no doubt continue. But the United Nations makes it much more difficult for states to "get away with it" than in the past.

This is not because the United Nations has an effective international police force to punish immediately an aggressor. It does not have. It does have the moral force of world public opinion, which can be brought to focus on a problem swiftly and often effectively. This force should not be underestimated. It acts as the collective conscience of mankind.

It does have machinery for conciliation, negoti-
economic power. The impact of the industrial revolution has been felt throughout the world, but its benefits have been very unevenly distributed.

On the one hand, countries with large populations and limited material resources have become highly industrialized, requiring an increasing dependence on imports of raw materials from outside their borders. On the other hand, countries with great material resources lack the technology and capital to exploit them and therefore have remained underdeveloped.

A tremendous pressure for catching up and "evening up" exists in the underdeveloped countries. This revolution of rising expectations, as it has been called, has received great impetus since the end of the Second World War. Some of its causes are fast-growing populations, the speed of modern communications and transportation, the emergence of some 800 million people into self-government or independence, the conflict and competition of ideologies, and the potentialities of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The states of the world are, as never before, economically and socially interdependent.

The founders of the United Nations fully recognized this growing interdependence and its implications for the cause of peace. They called upon members to promote "higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development" and "solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems" in order to create "conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations."

The organization's members, individually and collectively, have already gone a long way in putting these recommendations into practice. I am thinking particularly of the important role played by the Expanded Technical Assistance Program and by such specialized agencies as the International Bank and the Monetary Fund, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Labor Organization, Unesco, and others.

The United Nations cannot solve the complex economic and social problems of the world, but it can and is making a significant contribution to their solution. The role of the United Nations in fostering collective action for the common welfare is helping to create the basic conditions for peace. In the process all nations are learning to view their own interests from a wider viewpoint than the purely national one.

Admittedly the economic and social work of the United Nations is not very spectacular. Slow, steady progress in ridding the world of malaria, for example, does not catch the headlines like the work of the Security Council. But the fact remains that United Nations technical experts are rolling up their sleeves and helping millions of people at the grassroots in many lands to a better life. In so doing they are building more solid foundations for a lasting peace and establishing a genuine reputation for practical accomplishment for the United Nations.

One of our staff members recently visited a village in Thailand some time after World Health Organization experts had helped the local agencies eradicate malaria. He inquired of one of the villagers if he knew of President Eisenhower, or Prime Minister Nehru, or the United Nations. In each case the answer was a puzzled "no." "Well," said the staff member, "do you know what Who is?" "Oh, yes," replied the villager, as a smile of recognition came over his face, "he's the man who helped us kill all the mosquitoes in the village."

The Interdependence of Human Rights

In the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms there has never been a common standard to guide governments or to which oppressed populations could aspire. Indeed, with the great diversity of cultures, customs, and political systems in the world it might have seemed folly to even seek such a yardstick. Yet the United Nations has come very close to achieving agreement on such a universal standard.

The elements of this standard have been democratically arrived at, not autocratically imposed. They reveal the remarkable similarity of mankind's estimate of his inherent rights and responsibilities in a free society.

They have been embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a goal to achieve in both domestic and international relations. They are not, in our opinion, a proper subject for an international convention or treaty. We do not believe that you should try to legislate international morality when you lack enforcement power. And the United Nations does not have, nor do we wish to see it acquire, such powers in this field. It is only too easy for a state to ratify a treaty and
thereby assume before the world standards of virtue and respectability which it has no intention of fulfilling.

This does not mean that the United Nations is powerless in the matter of human rights. The real power of the United Nations is its ability to use world public opinion to secure adherence to universally accepted standards of conduct and morality. The process is sometimes painfully slow, but it is very difficult to resist.

The point I wish to make is this: The United Nations, in a little over a decade, has proved that it can serve effectively in finding solutions to the age-old problems of international relations—problems that could not be solved at all or as well by traditional diplomatic negotiations. It is a new instrument available to us, and we are gradually learning how to use it. We must not overburden it or run to it with issues that can better be dealt with elsewhere. Neither can we let it dry up or wither on the vine from disuse or neglect of its powers.

Nature of the 11th General Assembly

Against this background let us consider for a moment the nature of the 11th General Assembly, in which we shall shortly be confronted by problems in all the fields I have mentioned.

The most striking and important new factor is the enlargement of the United Nations from 60 to 76 members. Three more countries—Sudan, Morocco, and Tunisia—have been recommended by the Security Council and undoubtedly will be admitted at the beginning of the session.

These new admissions make the United Nations by far the most nearly universal political organization in human history. The 16 new states alone represent 155 million people living in an area of 1,000,000 square miles. The addition of these new members will change in various ways the nature of the General Assembly.

For one thing, the United Nations will speak even more with the voice and weight of world public opinion. Yet at the same time it will probably be more difficult to find areas of majority agreement in the enlarged Assembly.

For another thing, the new members change the ratio and proportion of the various groups or blocs within the United Nations. For instance, with the old membership of 60, the 20 Latin American countries constituted one-third of the vote in the General Assembly and needed the addition of only one more vote to control the outcome of any important issue requiring a two-thirds majority. In a 79-member United Nations, Latin America will represent just over 25 percent, against the previous 33½ percent. I am not implying, of course, that the other American Republics always voted as a bloc. I merely use this to illustrate the change in composition of the General Assembly.

Europe has strengthened its representation by 10 states, including 4 within the Communist bloc. The Middle East and African representation has increased by 2, Asia and the Far East by the addition of 4.

Moreover, the addition of the new members will have a direct effect on the outcome of important issues which come regularly before the General Assembly. On so-called colonial matters, for example, the new members will have increased substantially the anticolonial group. Similarly, the present and potential increase in the African-Asian membership certainly indicates that there will be increasing pressure in the months ahead for United Nations actions on social and racial problems. It is probable, too, that at least 10 of the 16 new members will add their voices to the large group of nations already pressing for more ambitious United Nations activity in the field of economic development and technical assistance.

I think it is clear that the changes in the composition of the General Assembly brought about by the addition of new members will call for very careful planning and a greater degree of flexibility on our part. By the same token, a greater responsibility than ever before devolves upon the smaller powers and the underdeveloped countries not to disregard the legitimate interests and heavy responsibilities of the great powers on world economic and political issues.

Some Specific Issues

I don’t think I shall be disclosing any secrets if I discuss in advance with you some of the specific issues coming before the next General Assembly. I shall do so with the purpose of illustrating the diversity of the problems, how they come to the General Assembly, and how they are handled once they get there.

First is the hardy perennial, the question of which government should represent the Republic of China. I say “first” advisedly because by the
rules of procedure the matter of credentials, or who represents what country, always comes up as one of the first orders of business.

Now there is no question in our minds as to the legitimate government of China. But every year since 1949, when the Communists imposed their regime by force on the mainland of China, the Soviet Union or some member of the Communist bloc has tried to seat a Communist representative in the General Assembly. Every year they have failed—last year by a vote of 42–12. The reason is not far to seek. The Chinese Communists have done nothing to indicate that they are a responsible regime ready to abide by the commonly accepted standards of international relations. In fact they have done just the opposite.

They stand accused by the General Assembly of overt aggression against the United Nations in Korea, in complete disregard of the charter.

They illegally held captive American flyers, contrary to the terms of the Korean armistice.

They still hold in prison a number of American civilians after promising their “expeditious” release over a year ago.

They refuse to renounce the use of force in seeking settlement of their claims in the Formosa Straits area.

They have repeatedly violated the terms of the Korean armistice and continue illegally to build up the military strength of North Korea.

With this kind of record it is clear that the Chinese Communist regime does not deserve a seat, and I think it is fairly safe to predict that it will not be given a seat in the 11th General Assembly.

If anyone has any doubts about the attitude of the American people on this point, let him consult the voting record of the Congress. Time after time Congress has unanimously expressed its disapproval of the Chinese Communist regime and voted against its admission to the United Nations.

**Disarmament**

The problem of disarmament will come before the General Assembly when the Disarmament Commission submits its progress report. This is an issue of such dimensions that you might say that it has nowhere else to go except to the United Nations. Nuclear weapons, if they are ever used, will be no respecter of boundaries or of neutrality. The United States was the first to bring the issue to the United Nations, and we have been the most persistent in pursuing every prospect for safeguarded disarmament.

It is true that the production of nuclear weapons goes on and that the terrible threat of nuclear warfare casts a deep shadow over mankind. It is also true that we have not yet succeeded in agreeing on a workable and safeguarded disarmament plan. This is not a failure chargeable to the United Nations, however. Neither is it any reason to give up hope or slacken our efforts. On the contrary, if we can only inch ahead, that is still progress. We must move ahead on any front we can. We must make every opportunity and seize every opportunity for genuine accord with the Soviet Union. But we must not be trapped into confusing tempting promises with genuine proposals.

The nub of the problem remains the question of establishing an effective inspection and control mechanism. We have contended that any disarmament plan is a sham and a delusion unless it is accompanied by some means of verifying that the parties are in fact living up to their promises. But so far, at least, the Soviet Union has been inclined to shy away from any effective system of inspection and control. Mr. Khrushchev put it quite clearly last spring when he suggested that the United States should not try to look in everybody's bedroom and everybody's garden.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union does its best to capitalize on the fear that most people have of nuclear war by advancing propaganda proposals. They talk about outlawing the atomic and hydrogen bombs, and they suggest that all countries reduce their armed forces by a fixed percentage. There is a great deal of talk but relatively little in the way of workable, good-faith proposals.

Let us not forget that on a number of crucial issues we have achieved a breakthrough with the Soviet Union as a result of determination, patience, and moral force. This was so in the case of the Berlin airlift, the Austrian peace treaty, and the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It may well be so on disarmament.

**Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy**

If disarmament still eludes us, we can be pleased that an international agency for the peaceful uses of atomic energy is almost within our grasp. Only yesterday agreement of 81 nations was reached in New York on a statute for the new agency.
There was one very critical question which had to be answered before we could go ahead with an international program for the peaceful uses of the atom. How could we make atomic energy materials available to other countries without stimulating them to manufacture nuclear weapons of their own? Could satisfactory safeguards be devised to prevent the spread of such weapons to other countries?

At the present time only three countries have the technical know-how to produce nuclear weapons—the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain. Obviously if, in the foreseeable future, 10 or 15 other nations begin to build stockpiles, the terrifying prospects of a nuclear war would be multiplied.

This is a matter of the utmost delicacy, for few if any sovereign states would willingly give up their right to manufacture atomic or hydrogen bombs. I believe, however, that the new agency will be endowed with sufficient power to make sure that the assistance given is not misused.

This agency will be in a real sense a child of the General Assembly. For it was before the Assembly in December 1953 that President Eisenhower presented the proposal. These were dark days when nothing but danger and evil seemed destined to come from man's greatest discovery. The President's challenge for a constructive and humanitarian development of atomic energy struck fire immediately. Last year it brought results when the Assembly in one of its rare unanimous votes urged that a plan for an international atomic energy agency be drawn up for approval.

That is what has now been accomplished in New York. It is a great step forward toward peace and happiness for people everywhere.

**Enlargement of U.N. Councils**

There are problems which arise in the General Assembly that one might call organic. That is, they reflect the normal growth of the organization. I referred earlier to the implications of the enlarged membership of the United Nations. The organization has grown from its original 51 members to 76 with no enlargement of such important bodies as the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

Take the Security Council, for example. The Asian countries have never been adequately represented. Now, with the addition of six new Asian members, this defect must be remedied without further delay. Likewise, the influx of 10 European members calls for a reallocation of seats to the European region. In the circumstances, it would seem highly desirable to add at least two nonpermanent seats to the 11-member Security Council.

Now, of course, the charter prescribes the number of members on each Council. Therefore, any change in this number means amendment of the charter, which requires a two-thirds vote of the Assembly and then ratification by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations in accordance with their constitutional processes. In our case, of course, this means approval by the Senate.

If the 11th General Assembly decides to alter the composition of the Councils—as I hope it will—it will be the first move to amend the charter. This is good evidence that the charter has been a very workable instrument.

**The Law of the Sea**

There is another problem that will come up before the General Assembly relating to the law of the sea. You may know that the International Law Commission was authorized by the Assembly to study this matter, and it has now made its final report on four problems—"The Regime of the Territorial Sea," "The Regime of the High Seas," "The Contiguous Zone," and "The Continental Shelf." This may sound like a very dull matter, but it could be one of the most complicated and highly charged questions the Assembly has to examine. The International Law Commission has recommended that the General Assembly summon an international conference to examine the law of the sea and to draw up such international agreements as it may deem appropriate.

As you know, we have been having some difficulties off the coasts of Latin America, where a number of states have claimed rights to jurisdiction up to 200 miles from shore and have even interfered with our ships to give effect to these claims.

For some centuries now the 3-mile limit has prevailed. This dates back to the Dutch jurist Bynkershoek, who contended that it would be sensible to extend, in legal theory at least, the shore limits of a sovereign state out 3 miles because that was the distance a cannon could shoot in those days.

Meanwhile, some states have supported a 200-
mile limit for certain purposes, such as the protection of fishing rights and the riches of the sea. Still other states have been inclined to favor a 12-mile limit.

This problem involves the issues which revolve around the concept of the continental shelf and the extent to which states should be permitted to have jurisdiction over territorial seas and the submerged oil lands that may lie beneath them.

We have not formulated any change in our own policy. We adhere to the 3-mile limit as being the soundest basis upon which to operate.

This is the kind of problem which affects many countries and which quite properly belongs in the United Nations. It is another example of our growing interdependence and the absolute necessity of having an organization like the United Nations consider the conflicting interests of all parties concerned.

Obviously, if each country were to determine for itself the extent of its jurisdiction over the territorial seas, chaos would result. It would be very much as though each citizen of San Francisco were to draw upon his own set of traffic regulations.

I have merely touched on the diversity and nature of a few of the 80-odd agenda items which will be considered at the 11th General Assembly. Each item on the agenda will have international implications, will be important, and, in all likelihood, will be difficult. Not all are dramatic in their subject matter, and only a few will make headlines in the papers.

Answering Some Criticisms of the United Nations

As is the case with all manmade organizations, the United Nations will continue to be criticized both for what it does and for what it fails to do. Let us consider briefly some of these criticisms.

Criticism Number One: The United Nations is inadequate because it has failed to solve some of our most urgent problems, such as disarmament and the Palestine situation.

I can understand why people should be impatient about winning the peace. But we should not expect too much of the United Nations. It is made up of sovereign states, and it cannot do more, at a given moment, than its members want it to do. If the organization delays, hesitates, and postpones, it is reflecting only the indecision and the hesitation of its member states.

Moreover, no international organization can be a panacea to cure all the world's ills. Many of our problems are exceedingly complex and may never be finally resolved. In such cases we will have to learn to live with them just as we have learned to live with many of our domestic problems. Still others will require many years of hard work and patient negotiating.

Critics should remember, too, that the United Nations is very much like a court of last appeal. The easy problems are settled elsewhere. Only the really tough problems—the ones that can't be settled any other way—are brought to the United Nations.

Criticism Number Two: The United Nations is relatively weak and impotent and is becoming little more than a huge debating society.

Even strong advocates of the United Nations will readily agree that it is not the organization it was designed to be at the San Francisco conference. As yet, it has no armed forces at its disposal. As yet, it has not developed its enforcement machinery.

Yet, when the Chinese Communists launched their aggression in Korea, the United Nations met the challenge and the invader was thrown back. This was the first time in history that collective action of this kind had ever been taken to stop an aggressor.

Moreover, those who belittle the United Nations as a debating society ought to remember that it is far better to quarrel with adjectives than with nuclear weapons. So long as we can successfully encourage nations to talk instead of shoot, we are on the right track.

Nor is the compelling force of an aroused world opinion something to be swept under the rug and forgotten. More and more, public opinion is acting as a powerful restraining factor upon the aggressive designs of nations bent on destructive ends.

Criticism Number Three: The United Nations is subject to Communist influence and intrigue.

On occasion friends of mine have expressed deep resentment at the thought that the Soviet Union and its satellite states use the forums of the United Nations to propagandize and to further their own foreign-policy objectives. "Why," they argue, "should we sit there and listen to scurrilous attacks upon the United States, the capitalist system, and our democratic way of life?"

The answer is, of course, that we do not sit idly
by while such attacks are being made. We refute them, and we expose the fallacies of the Soviet position. And over the years most of the members of the United Nations have acquired a pretty clear picture of the true nature and the dangers of international communism.

Personally, I am not fearful of the free exchange of ideas. So long as the United States continues to come forward with positive, constructive programs, so long as we are sincere and honest and loyal to the principles for which we have always stood, we need not fear the outcome. With that kind of approach we will always have friends.

Criticism Number Four: The United Nations tends to go beyond the proper confines of an international organization and meddle in the domestic affairs of its member states.

On this point we ought to be categorically clear. The United Nations is, and always has been, an organization of sovereign states. It has none of the attributes of a world government. It is not a superstate. It cannot compel the United States to do anything we do not want to do.

In this connection some people erroneously assume that the United Nations approves treaties that are automatically binding upon the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is true that conferences called by the United Nations—like any other diplomatic conference—may approve treaties. All such treaties, however, must be submitted to the member states for their formal ratification. In our case this means a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate.

This criticism of meddling in internal affairs has been leveled at certain of the United Nations specialized agencies as well. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in particular, has been singled out. It has been charged, as I think you know, with promoting Communist interests and attempting to influence our public school system.

Of course this has no foundation in fact. Unesco is specifically prohibited by its charter from interference of any kind in the domestic affairs of its members. The Department of State, as well as several private organizations, has looked into these accusations and found them groundless. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the U. S. S. R. has long charged that Unesco is a "tool of American reaction" and that Unesco takes an officially hostile position toward the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. On the basis of our own official estimates of the effectiveness of Unesco, and the statements of the Soviet Union, I would say that the organization is serving well the objectives of the free world.

Conclusions

Looking at the United Nations from the vantage point of its birthplace here in San Francisco, I think we can draw some valid conclusions regarding its broad accomplishments:

It has put out the spark of conflict before it became a conflagration in a number of cases, and many people believe it has prevented the outbreak of a third great war;

It has helped our own security by promoting the principle of collective self-defense;

It has marshaled public opinion in support of free-world objectives;

It has exposed the nature and danger of Communist imperialism;

It provides an arena for diplomatic negotiation to advance our foreign-policy objectives;

It is promoting social progress and better standards of life and is helping people toward responsible self-government or independence.

The United Nations has grown with the growing needs of an increasingly interdependent world. It is the servant and not the master of its members. The wisdom with which it is used will determine how well it works. It was created for the purpose of advancing international peace and well-being, and it has no other goal. These purposes are identical with the objectives of American foreign policy. Given our continued faith, understanding, and support, it cannot fail to serve the needs of the American people and free men everywhere.

Provisional Agenda of Eleventh General Assembly

U.N. doc. A/3191 dated September 13

1. Opening of the session by the Chairman of the delegation of Chile
2. Minute of silent prayer or meditation
3. Appointment of a Credentials Committee
4. Election of the President

1 To convene Nov. 12 at U.N. Headquarters, N.Y.
5. Constitution of the Main Committees and election of officers
6. Election of Vice-Presidents
7. Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter
8. Adoption of the agenda
9. Opening of the general debate
10. Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization
12. Report of the Economic and Social Council
13. Report of the Trusteeship Council
14. Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council
15. Election of six members of the Economic and Social Council
16. Election of two members of the Trusteeship Council
17. Election of a member of the International Court of Justice to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Hsu Mo
18. Election of the members of the International Law Commission
19. Appointment of the members of the Peace Observation Commission
20. Election of a United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. G. J. Van Heuven Goedhart: item proposed by the Secretary-General
21. The Korean question:
   (a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea
   (b) Problem of ex-prisoners of the Korean war: report of the Government of India
22. Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments. Conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction: report of the Disarmament Commission (resolution 914 (X) of 16 December 1955)
23. Report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (resolutions 302 (IV) of 8 December 1949 and 916 (X) of 3 December 1955)
24. Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa: reports of the Governments of India and of Pakistan (resolution 919 (X) of 14 December 1955)
25. Admission of new Members to the United Nations
26. Programmes of technical assistance:
   (a) Report of the Economic and Social Council
   (b) Confirmation of allocation of funds under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (resolution 831 (IX) of 26 November 1954)
27. Economic development of under-developed countries:
   (a) Question of the establishment of a special United Nations Fund for Economic Development: report of the Ad Hoc Committee (resolution 923 (X) of 9 December 1955)
   (b) International tax problems: report of the Economic and Social Council (resolution 825 (IX) of 11 December 1954)
   (c) Industrialization of under-developed countries (Economic and Social Council resolutions 597 A (XXI) of 4 May 1956 and 618 (XXII) of 6 August 1956)
28. Establishment of a world food reserve: report of the Economic and Social Council (resolution 827 (IX) of 14 December 1954)
32. Draft International Covenants on Human Rights (decision of the General Assembly of 14 December 1955)
33. Recommendations concerning international respect for the right of peoples and nations to self-determination (decision of the General Assembly of 14 December 1955)
34. Draft Convention on the Nationality of Married Women (decision of the General Assembly of 14 December 1955)
35. Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories:
   (a) Information on educational conditions
   (b) Information on other conditions
   (c) General questions relating to the transmission and examination of information
36. Progress achieved by the Non-Self-Governing Territories in pursuance of Chapter XI of the Charter: report of the Secretary-General (resolution 932 (X) of 8 November 1955)
37. Election to fill vacancies in the membership of the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories (resolution 933 (X) of 8 November 1955)
38. Question of South West Africa: report of the Committee on South West Africa (resolutions 749 A (VIII) of 28 November 1953 and 941 (X) of 3 December 1955)
39. Admissibility of hearings of petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa: advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (resolution 942 (X) of 3 December 1955)
40. The Togoland unification problem and the future of the Trust Territory of Togoland under British administration: reports of the United Nations Plebiscite Commissioner and of the Trusteeship Council (resolution 944 (X) of 15 December 1955)
41. Question of the frontier between the Trust Territory
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of Somaliland under Italian administration and Ethiopia; reports of the Governments of Ethiopia and Italy (resolution 947 (X) of 15 December 1955)

42. Financial reports and accounts and reports of the Board of Auditors:

(a) United Nations, for the financial year ended 31 December 1955
(b) United Nations Children’s Fund, for the financial year ended 31 December 1955
(c) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, for the financial year ended 30 June 1956
(d) United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, for the financial year ended 30 June 1956
(e) United Nations Refugee Fund, for the financial year ended 31 December 1955

43. Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1956
44. Budget estimates for the financial year 1957
45. Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly:

(a) Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions
(b) Committee on Contributions
(c) Board of Auditors
(d) Investments Committee: confirmation of the appointment made by the Secretary-General
(e) United Nations Administrative Tribunal

46. Report of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds
47. Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (resolution 876 (IX) of 4 December 1954)

49. Audit reports relating to expenditure by specialized agencies of technical assistance funds allocated from the Special Account (resolution 519 A (VI) of 12 January 1952)

50. Administrative and budgetary co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

51. Registration and publication of treaties and international agreements: report of the Secretary-General (resolution 906 (X) of 3 December 1955)
52. United Nations salary, allowance and benefits system: report of the Review Committee (resolution 975 (X) of 15 December 1955)
53. System of travel and subsistence allowances to members of organs of the United Nations (resolution 875 (IX) of 4 December 1954)
54. Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its eighth session:

(a) Final report on the regime of the high seas, the regime of the territorial sea and related problems (resolution 890 (IX) of 14 December 1954)
(b) Question of amending article 11 of the Statute of the International Law Commission relating to the filling of casual vacancies in the membership of the Commission (resolution 886 (X) of 3 December 1955)

(c) Other matters

55. Question of defining aggression: report of the Special Committee (resolution 885 (IX) of 4 December 1954)
56. Draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind (resolution 897 (IX) of 4 December 1954)
57. International criminal jurisdiction (resolution 898 (IX) of 14 December 1954)
58. Elimination or reduction of future statelessness: report of the Secretary-General (resolution 896 (IX) of 4 December 1954)
59. The peaceful utilization of Antarctica: item proposed by India
60. Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus: item proposed by Greece
61. Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 106 of the Charter, to increase the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council and the number of votes required for decisions of the Council: item proposed by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain and Venezuela
62. Question of amending the United Nations Charter, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 106 of the Charter, to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council: item proposed by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain and Venezuela
63. Question of amending the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 106 of the Charter: (a) increase in the number of judges of the International Court of Justice: item proposed by Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti and Spain
64. Question of amending article 2 of the Statute of the International Law Commission to increase the membership of the Commission: item proposed by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain and Venezuela
66. The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa: item proposed by India
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U.N. doc. A/3205 dated October 19

1. Question of Algeria: item proposed by Afghanistan, Burman, Ceylon, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen

2. The question of West Irian (West New Guinea): item proposed by Afghanistan, Burman, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen

3. Draft Convention concerning a System of Consultation: item proposed by Argentina

4. The over-all total of the United Nations annual budget expenditure: item proposed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

5. Support from Greece for terrorism in Cyprus: item proposed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
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Ocean Freight Charges on Certain Surplus Agricultural Commodities

White House press release dated October 27

White House Announcement

The President on October 27 issued an Executive order concerning the payment of ocean freight charges on certain surplus agricultural commodities shipped abroad.

At its recent session the Congress amended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to authorize the payment of ocean freight costs from U.S. ports to designated ports of entry abroad on surplus agricultural commodities transferred for famine and other urgent relief (pursuant to title II of that Act) or donated to nonprofit voluntary agencies or to intergovernmental organizations for the assistance of needy persons outside the United States (under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949).

These ocean freight charges may be paid from funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the necessary funds may be transferred to agencies designated by the President. By so designating the International Cooperation Administration, the President has enabled the Commodity Credit Corporation to make the funds available to the International Cooperation Administration and enabled the latter to pay the freight charges.

Executive Order 10685

Providing for the Administration of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as Amended

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and by section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code, and as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

Section 1. The International Cooperation Administration is hereby designated as the Federal agency to which funds required for ocean freight costs authorized under Title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1721-1724), may be transferred by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Section 2. Sections 5 and 6 of Executive Order No. 10560 of September 8, 1954 (19 F. R. 5927), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"Section 5. Reservation of functions to the President. There are reserved to the President the functions conferred upon him by section 108 of the Act (with respect

World Bank Loan to Uruguay for Hydroelectric Power Plant

The World Bank on October 25 made a loan of $25.5 million in various currencies for electric power development in Uruguay. The loan will help to finance the construction of a hydroelectric power plant at Rincon de Baygorria on the Rio Negro and additional transmission and distribution facilities. The project will increase generating capacity in Uruguay by about one quarter and is part of a program being carried out to provide an adequate power system throughout the country.

The loan was made to the Administracion General de las Usinas Electricas y los Telefonos del Estado (U.T.E.), an autonomous government agency responsible for providing electric power and telephone services in Uruguay. U.T.E. supplies power to the smaller communities through Diesel units and to the larger towns and Montevideo, the capital and chief commercial center, through an extensive transmission system fed by two steam plants in Montevideo and a hydroelectric plant at Rincon del Bonete on the Rio Negro about 150 miles north of Montevideo. The Baygorria plant will be connected into this system and raise its generating capacity to 392,000 kilowatts.

Since 1947 there has been a considerable expansion of existing industry and development of new industries in Uruguay, especially in the interior. They have included a cement plant, a tannery, a sugar refinery, fertilizer plants, and paper factories. This industrial growth, together with a steady rise in demand for residential and other uses, has resulted in an increase in the demand for electricity throughout the country.

The site of the Baygorria plant is about 53 miles downstream from the existing Bonete hydroelectric station. The new plant will have only a small reservoir and will utilize the regulated flow of Bonete's large reservoir. The Baygorria plant will have three generating units with a combined capacity of 183,000 kilowatts. High-tension transmission lines and substations will be put up to connect the Baygorria station with Rincon del Bonete and with Montevideo. Also included in the project is a "collector ring" consisting of underground cables, transmission lines, and substations to be built in Montevideo to improve the city's primary distribution system. A small part of the loan will be used to purchase business machines to mechanize U.T.E.'s accounting department.

A contract for the construction of the Baygorria station was awarded in May 1956 to a consortium of European firms on the basis of international bidding. Contracts for the transmission lines and the collector ring are yet to be awarded. The entire project is scheduled for completion in 1961.

The total cost of the project is estimated at the equivalent of $58 million. The bank's loan will provide $25.5 million of the foreign-exchange costs. A large part of the loan will be made in deutschmarks and the remainder in Swedish kroner, Swiss francs, and other currencies. The equivalent of $32.5 million will be financed by U.T.E. from its own resources or local borrowings.

The bank has now made three loans totaling $64 million to U.T.E. A loan of $33 million in 1950 covered most of the foreign-exchange costs of various projects for expanding and modernizing U.T.E.'s power and telephone facilities. This loan has been completely disbursed and the projects finished. A loan of $5.5 million in 1955 is helping to finance an additional 50,000-kilowatt unit at the Battle y Ordonez thermal power station in Montevideo.

After having been approved by the bank's Executive Directors, the loan documents were signed on October 25 by Julio A. Lacarte Muro, Ambassador for Uruguay in Washington, on behalf of the Republic of Uruguay; Orestes L. Lanza, President of U.T.E., on behalf of the borrower; and W. A. B. Hiff, Vice President, on behalf of the World Bank.
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Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Automotive Traffic

TIAS 2487.
Ratification deposited: Yugoslavia, October 8, 1956.

Copyright

TIAS 3324.
Ratification deposited: Italy, October 24, 1956.

TIAS 3324.
Ratification deposited: Italy, October 24, 1956.

Protocol 3 concerning the effective date of instruments of ratification or acceptance of or accession to the convention. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force August 19, 1954.
TIAS 3324.
Ratification deposited: Italy, October 24, 1956.

Trade and Commerce

International convention to facilitate the importation of commercial samples and advertising material. Dated at Geneva November 7, 1952. Entered into force November 20, 1955. ¹
Accession deposited: Portugal, September 24, 1956.

Protocol amending part I and articles XXIX and XXX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955. ²
Signatures: Norway, October 11, 1956; Austria, October 12, 1956.

Signatures: Norway, October 11, 1956; Austria (with statement), October 12, 1956.

Signatures: Norway, October 11, 1956; Austria, October 12, 1956.

Signature: Austria, October 12, 1956.

Procès verbal of rectification concerning the protocol amending part I and articles XXIX and XXX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the protocol amending preamble and parts II and III of the general agreement, and the protocol of organizational amendments to the general agreement. Done at Geneva December 3, 1955.

¹ Not in force for the United States.
² Not in force.
³ Subject to ratification.

 signatures: Norway, October 11, 1956; Austria (with statement), October 12, 1956; France, October 13, 1956.

Wheat

Acceptance deposited: New Zealand, October 26, 1956.

BILATERAL

Canada

Agreement regarding the relocation of that part of Roosevelt Bridge which crosses the Cornwall south channel. Effect by exchange of notes at Washington October 24, 1956. Entered into force October 24, 1956.

Ceylon


Chile


China


Agreement further amending the annex to the agreement of May 14, 1954 (TIAS 2979, 3215, and 3346), relating to the loan of small naval craft to China. Effect by exchange of notes at Taipei October 18 and 20, 1956. Entered into force October 20, 1956.

Finland


Korea


Spain


United Kingdom

The Suez Canal Problem

In this documentary volume is printed a considerable collection of documents pertaining to events from the purported nationalization of the Universal Suez Maritime Canal Company by the Egyptian Government on July 26, 1956, through the Second London Conference on the Suez Canal, September 19-21. Texts of those agreements and treaties of the past century which have a particularly important bearing on the present legal status of the Suez Canal are included. Also in the publication are key documents on the "nationalization" of the canal and on the Western reaction; all the substantive statements of the 22-power London Conference; published papers of the Five-Power Suez Committee and of the Second London Conference on the Suez Canal; and significant public statements of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles on the Suez Canal problem throughout the period from the "nationalization" of the Universal Suez Canal Company to the action at London to establish a Canal Users Association.

Copies of *The Suez Canal Problem, July 26–September 22, 1956* may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for $1.25 each.

**Publication 6392 $1.25**

Please send me ........ copies of *The Suez Canal Problem*.

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Street Address: _________________________________________________________

City, Zone, and State: ________________________________________________

Enclosed find: $__________________________ (cash, check, or money order).
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United Nations Sets Up Middle East Police Force

Statements by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.  
U.S. Representative to the United Nations

Following is a series of statements made in the first emergency special session of the U.N. General Assembly and in the Security Council by Ambassador Lodge on the question of developments in the Middle East, together with texts of pertinent resolutions. For background and earlier U.S. statements on this subject, see Bulletin of November 12, 1956, p. 747.

FIRST STATEMENT IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 3

U.S. delegation press release 2497

The position of the United States was made abundantly clear in the resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly the other night [November 2], and so there is no need for me to repeat it now.

The United States deeply regrets the fact that this resolution, which represented the views of such an overwhelming majority of the United Nations, has not yet brought about a cessation of hostilities. The United States earnestly hopes that all parties in the conflict will be guided by the conclusive evidence of world opinion, which the very large vote the other night symbolized.

The United States is firmly convinced that the problems which gave rise to the present situation can and must be solved by peaceful and just means. A solution on any other basis would, at best, provide only a temporary respite. At worst, it would in all likelihood sow the seeds of even graver problems in the future.

That is why the United States believes that, while we should continue our efforts to obtain quick compliance with the General Assembly's cease-fire resolution, we must not lose sight of the problems and conditions which gave rise to the present situation.

As Secretary Dulles said the other night, the present situation has resulted from "a long and sad history of irritations and provocations." The instability of the armistice agreements is too well known to require comment. They have been violated repeatedly by Israel and by her Arab neighbors. The armistice, which should have led to a peaceful settlement, has instead given rise to growing provocation and increasing tension, especially since the ominous rearmament of Egypt by the Soviet Union.

The abrupt seizure by Egypt of the Universal Suez Canal Company and the failure thus far of efforts to find a solution to this important problem have created a situation of deep concern to many nations.

While the temptation is strong to place the whole blame on the states directly concerned, the fact is, as Secretary Dulles reminded us, that the United Nations must also share responsibility for what has happened. It is clear that we, the members of the United Nations, have not done all that should have been done to bring about the settlement of these matters in accordance with the principles of justice and international law.

That is why the United States today announced that it would introduce two resolutions dealing with the substance of the problems which gave rise to the present critical situation in the Middle East. These proposals are now before the Assem-

¹ For text, see Bulletin of Nov. 12, 1956, p. 754.
² Ibid., p. 751.
bly. With these resolutions we hope that we may begin now to lay the foundation for the constructive action which must follow a cessation of hostilities.

U.S. Resolution on Palestine

The first resolution proposes a new approach to the settlement of major problems outstanding between the Arab States and Israel, with a view to establishing conditions of permanent peace and stability in the area.

Turning now to the first draft resolution which the United States has introduced for the consideration of this body: that relating to our new approach regarding settlement of the major problems outstanding between the Arab States and Israel, we hoped might lead, however slowly, to better relations in the area. But the fact that we have hostilities there today indicates that those efforts have failed.

For this reason we must frankly look now to some new means which, given the support of this body and the cooperation of the parties concerned, may at last achieve a final and a just peace in this part of the world.

The agency of this Assembly which has since 1948 been charged with the responsibility of working out arrangements for a final resolution of the problems outstanding between Israel and the Arab States is the Palestine Conciliation Commission. The United States is a member of that Commission and together with the other two members strove to fulfill its assignment. Through the 8 years of its existence the Commission has achieved some few things. It has clarified a number of issues between the Arab States and Israel which stood in the way of a settlement. It has achieved the unconditional release of Arab accounts blocked in Israel. The Commission has also done a tremendous amount of slow and exact work in attempting to estimate

and evaluate the amount of compensation due on Arab property left in Israel by those who are now Arab refugees. Despite this work, however, in its 15th progress report, dated October 4 of this year, the Commission reported,

The Commission must report again this year that in view of the unchanged attitudes of the parties and their failure to avail themselves of the Commission’s services, the Commission has had no opportunity to exercise its general function of conciliation with any prospect of success.

This, in the U.S. Government’s view, must be the final chapter of the Conciliation Commission’s efforts. We must try something new—something free of the technical and procedural problems which confronted the Commission—if we are to have any justifiable hope of progress toward the settlement of the major problems outstanding between the Arab States and Israel.

We can say this because we are a member of the Commission. The Commission has failed, and, while we should keep what it has achieved or is achieving, we must try something new. For this reason the United States is suggesting in its resolution the establishment of a new committee to be composed of five members of this General Assembly which will prepare recommendations after consultation with the parties to the General Armistice Agreements regarding a settlement of the major problems outstanding between them, with a view to establishing conditions of permanent peace and stability in the area. We propose that this committee submit its recommendations to the parties concerned and to the General Assembly. If necessary, or as appropriate, these proposals might be submitted to the Security Council. The purpose of this is to insure the chance that the parties themselves, the General Assembly, or if necessary the Security Council, may have an opportunity to accept and act upon them. Alternatively, through the responses which the parties may make, the committee may continue to seek a settlement satisfactory and just to all and thus solve this critical problem once and for all.

Two other things in this connection are important, and therefore we address our resolution to them. We think there have been no more selfless and devoted international servants of justice and peace than the Chief of Staff and the members of the United Nations Truce Supervision

---


Organization as they have sought to enforce the General Armistice Agreements and to act as the agents of the Security Council. It is not for this body to give them further suggestions or guidance. It is for this body to commend them for what they have done—for the diligence and the courage which they have shown—and to urge that those parties directly concerned cooperate fully with them as they carry out their presently imposed future tasks.

The second matter which warrants their concern is the plight of the Arab refugees. In the name of humanity it is important that through these critical and battle-torn days those most directly concerned should be certain that the Arab refugees are cared for and safe. To this end we make that recommendation and recommend further that all members of the United Nations consider and furnish that additional assistance to these refugees that may be necessary.

U.S. Resolution on Suez Canal

The second draft resolution, which the United States has introduced offers a means of finding a solution to the Suez Canal question. The Security Council has already made certain recommendations which could form the basis for a settlement, but recent events have linked this question with the hostilities now being waged in that part of the world.

The Security Council’s resolution of October 13 emerged after many weeks of study of the Suez question and represents the efforts of many nations and many people. It sets forth the six basic principles which it is believed are necessary for a settlement of the Suez Canal question. We attach great importance to these principles. That is why the United States draft resolution has endorsed the October 13th resolution in its entirety.

The draft resolution then refers to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on November 2, which, inter alia, took note of the interruption of traffic in the canal to the serious prejudice of many nations and urged that steps be taken to reopen the canal and to restore the freedom of navigation upon the conclusion of the cease-fire.

Recognizing that the permanent solution to the situation must be consistent with the principles of justice and international law, the sovereignty of Egypt, and the rights of the users of the canal as guaranteed by the convention of 1888, the draft resolution establishes a committee composed of three powers to assume the responsibility for:

(1) taking whatever measures are necessary for the immediate reopening of the canal as a secure international waterway, and

(2) drawing up a plan in consultation with the three nations most directly involved in the present problem for the purpose of operating and maintaining the canal and the freedom of passage through it in accordance with the convention of 1888 and the six requirements adopted by the Security Council on October 13, and

(3) adopting and putting such a plan into effect.

Finally, the draft resolution requests the committee to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate, invites the committee to make recommendations for a just and permanent solution to the Suez problem consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and requests the members of the United Nations to give the committee all appropriate assistance.

Mr. President, I urge this Assembly to seize this opportunity to make a start toward a solution of two of the gravest issues threatening world peace. The time to act is now, while the awful consequences of previous failures and delays are so clear.

Let us stop the futile process of patching up previous agreements and understandings which but serve to provide new pretexts for further provocations. Let us face up to our responsibilities under the charter to work together for a lasting settlement for what has become a dangerous threat to the peace of the world.

SECOND STATEMENT IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 3

U.S. delegation press release 2498

Let me thank the representative of Uruguay for yielding to me for just a moment. I did want to say that the United States likes the Canadian draft resolution very much. We are looking for something that will meet the immediate crisis that is in front of us, as well as something that will go to the causes and into the more long-range subjects.

---

We have presented two draft resolutions dealing with the long-range questions, and they obviously will require study and we are not pressing them to a vote tonight. We do think that this draft resolution of the Canadian Foreign Minister is one that should be acted on promptly, and we should like to see it given priority. We should like to see it acted on quickly this evening because it contains a real hope of meeting the very grave emergency that confronts the world.

STATEMENT IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 4

U.S. delegation press release 2503

In the very early hours of 2 November the General Assembly issued a clear call to the states engaged in hostilities in the Near East to agree on an immediate cease-fire and to withdraw their forces forthwith behind the armistice lines. That resolution of the Assembly was adopted by the vote of an overwhelming majority of members of the United Nations. I regret to say that the General Assembly had to take note last night of the fact that there had not yet been compliance with the terms of its resolution. Some of the parties to the hostilities addressed communications to the Secretary-General concerning their attitude toward a cease-fire and stating conditions upon which they were willing to heed the General Assembly's call, but the parties had not taken any effective steps to carry out the General Assembly recommendations.

Knowing full well the urgency of the situation in the face of human suffering and casualties, and realizing the need for international assistance to the parties in arranging for a cease-fire, the General Assembly last night [early morning, November 4] resolved, on the proposal of the delegation of India, that the Secretary-General should try to bring about the carrying out of the cease-fire by the parties and the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into that part of the world. The Assembly asked the Secretary-General to report to it within 12 hours on the compliance achieved.

At the same time, the General Assembly adopted a draft resolution which had been submitted by the delegation of Canada and which requested the Secretary-General to try to arrange for the withdrawal of forces behind the armistice lines and to submit to the General Assembly within 48 hours a plan for the setting up of an emergency international United Nations force to supervise the cessation of hostilities.

We have now heard the report requested of the Secretary-General on compliance by the parties with the United Nations call for a cease-fire. It is most discouraging that the parties have not yet agreed upon a cessation of hostilities and that they have not yet given orders to their armed forces accordingly. The Secretary-General is to be greatly commended for his selfless and unflagging efforts, and we earnestly hope that within a short time he will be able to report compliance.

The Assembly's call for a cease-fire was unconditional. The states concerned—and, above all, those engaged in attack—must stop their military operations. There must be an immediate and unconditional cessation of the fighting. This was true when the Assembly first met in emergency special session; it is true now. Silencing of the guns is the necessary prelude to the solution of any—I repeat, any—of the problems which beset the Middle East. We appeal to the states engaged in hostilities—and particularly to Israel, France, and the United Kingdom—to honor their obligations under the charter of the United Nations and, as loyal members of the organization, to heed the General Assembly's call to stop the fighting.

The Secretary-General has been asked to present to us by early Tuesday [November 6] his full plan for setting up an emergency international force, as called for in the draft resolution which was submitted by Canada. We should do well to suspend our debate on this matter for the present and to adopt the draft resolution introduced by Canada, Colombia, and Norway, which would establish a United Nations command, in accordance with the Canadian draft resolution adopted by the Assembly. We should take this step immediately to permit the Secretary-General and the governments with which he is consulting to proceed at full speed in making plans for the emergency international force.

The United States earnestly hopes that the Government of Israel will agree without delay to the prompt withdrawal of its armed forces behind the armistice lines and will cooperate fully in carrying out the plan now being negotiated by the

---

Secretary-General. We hope that France and the United Kingdom will accept the plan envisaged in the Canadian proposal. We trust that the Government of Egypt, for its part, will be prepared to accept the temporary stationing within its territory of elements of the United Nations force in order to preserve peace in that part of the world.

It is most important that this plan should be speedily carried out. To facilitate the success of its operation, the United States is prepared to help—and help in an important way—as regards airlifts, shipping, transport, and supplies.

We very much fear that time is getting short. We therefore move that the debate should be closed in order that we may proceed to an immediate vote on the draft resolution submitted by Canada, Colombia, and Norway.

STATEMENT IN SECURITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 5

U.S./U.N. press release 2505

Yesterday we learned of the butchery which Moscow was in the process of carrying out against the people of Hungary under cover of so-called "negotiations." Now we have the pending Soviet proposal. 11

I submit in all candor that it sets a somber record of cynicism and indifference to the values of international morality.

The Soviet draft resolution embodies an unthinkable suggestion—that Soviet military forces, together with those of the United States, should be sent into the fighting in Egypt unless the fighting stops within 12 hours. This would convert Egypt into a still larger battlefield.

The fact is that the United Nations, through the General Assembly, has acted and is acting on the situation in Egypt. It has ordered a cease-fire and the withdrawal of all forces from Egypt, and it has set up a United Nations Command for an emergency international force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities.

The Secretary-General is bending every effort to arrange a cease-fire, withdrawal of forces, and the setting up of the United Nations Command. His report to the Security Council this very night shows that he is making progress, and I understand that he hopes to make a further report tomorrow on compliance with the resolutions of the General Assembly.

The question of the hostilities in Egypt is being actively dealt with by the General Assembly and the Secretary-General. We here should lend every assistance. In the judgment of the United States the course proposed by the Soviet Government would run counter to everything the General Assembly and the Secretary-General are doing.

For these reasons, we cannot possibly support the proposal of the Soviet Union. 12

FIRST STATEMENT IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 7

U.S. delegation press release 2506

The second report of the Secretary-General 13 marks a definite turning point in our efforts to restore peace in the Middle East. Much remains to be done before we can even begin to relax our efforts. But it appears to us now that we have achieved our first objective, which was to bring about a cease-fire.

We must now turn immediately to our second objective, which is to arrange for the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel, France, and the United Kingdom from Egyptian territory. May I say that we think that there is no time to lose.

The United States welcomes the prompt action of the governments which have responded to the request to supply personnel for an emergency international force. This force must be brought to Egypt just as soon as possible. As we have already made clear, the United States stands ready to cooperate in furnishing assistance such as airlifts, shipping, transport, and supplies. And we are ready to give that assistance immediately. We are ready right at this moment.

The United States realizes that several points remain to be elaborated, both in the Secretary-General’s second report and in the plan embodied in the resolution now before us. 14 This is particularly true with regard to the nature and scope of the function of the international force and of the responsibilities imposed upon the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee.

But such elaborations should not be—must not be—a pretext for delay.

12 The Security Council refused to put the Soviet item on its agenda. The vote was 3 (Iran, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia) to 4 (Australia, France, U.K., U.S.), with 4 abstentions (Belgium, China, Cuba, Peru).


The United States has confidence in the Secretary-General and in the states which will comprise the Advisory Committee. We are certain that they will elaborate these points in the right way as fast as circumstances will permit. We know that they can be trusted to do their jobs with scrupulous regard for the principles laid down by this Assembly and for the interests of the states directly concerned.

If we are to accomplish our purpose, we must move quickly to carry out the plan embodied in the resolution contained in document A/3308 and sponsored by Argentina, Burma, Ceylon, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, and Sweden. We must not hesitate. We must not falter at the last moment and thus make possible new and even more serious complications. Speed is vital. I therefore hope we shall vote on this resolution just as soon as possible.

Mr. President, we should vote at the same time on the resolution just read by the representative of Ceylon. It is consistent with the resolutions which the General Assembly has already adopted, and the United States will vote in favor of it. We consider it important that there should be no delay on either of these resolutions.

Perhaps I can close by speaking of an essentially human matter, and that is the victims of the military actions which have been undertaken in Egypt. Our hearts go out to these sufferers as a result of the events of the last few days.

Nor, Mr. President, can I leave this rostrum without expressing once again our deep admiration for the competence, for the speed, intelligence, and the determination with which our Secretary-General is discharging the heavy responsibilities which we have laid upon him. Seldom in human history has a man had such responsibilities imposed upon him, and I believe that we here in this Assembly should, for our part, act with the same speed and with the same determination that we expect and that we know we shall receive from him.

SECOND STATEMENT IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 7

U.S. delegation press release 2507

I come to the rostrum just to say how gratified the United States is that these resolutions have now been adopted and that the United Nations force is about to come into being, and then to make one brief announcement on behalf of the United States Government.

I have just informed the Secretary-General that we are ready, subject to his wishes, and wherever possible, to transport first contingents of the United Nations force on their way from their bases to Egypt immediately.

Let me also say this. We understand that the withdrawal will be phased with the speedy arrival of the international United Nations force. We hope that this phased operation, as contemplated by the resolution, will begin as soon as possible—and the sooner the better.

STATEMENT IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 10

U.S. delegation press release 2512

Introduction of U.S. Resolution

The United States would like to introduce a short draft resolution, which reads as follows:

The General Assembly

1. Decides to place on the provisional agenda of the eleventh regular session as a matter of priority the question on the agenda of its first emergency special session;
2. Refers to its eleventh regular session for its consideration the records of the meetings and the documents of its first emergency special session, including the draft resolutions contained in documents A/3272 and A/3273;
3. Requests the General Assembly at its eleventh regular session to give urgent consideration to documents A/3272 and A/3273;
4. Decides that notwithstanding paragraph 1 above, the first emergency special session may continue to consider the question, if necessary, prior to the eleventh regular session of the Assembly.

Mr. President, the purpose of this resolution is to get consideration at an early date in the regular General Assembly of the two resolutions which we have sponsored, which aim at a long-range approach to the problems of Palestine and Suez. These two resolutions have been pending here for some time and I think everybody is familiar with them. They aim to get at the basic causes.

Now, we did not want to press for them at this special session because we did not want the actions that have been taken in this special session to be hampered. We wanted to be sure that those actions were in fact being carried out, that the cease-fire and the withdrawal and all those things were really well established.
Inasmuch as these two resolutions do deal with basic causes, we wanted all of the delegates to have time to study them and think about them and get instructions. We think it is important to get an equitable and a just solution of these problems which have caused the world so much anxiety. That is the whole purpose of this very short resolution, to see that these are transferred to the regular session for urgent consideration.

**Additional Statement**

I merely wanted to say that what we want to do is entirely consistent with what the representative of Egypt spoke about.

We do not want to get into the long-range factors in any way that will interfere with the cease-fire, the withdrawal of troops, and the entry of the international force. In fact, that is why we are not pressing these resolutions here in this special session today for that very reason.

We want to be sure that all of the decisions that the special session has taken concerning a cease-fire and the withdrawal and the entry of the international force are well established and being carried out before we go to this other matter.

Then, once that has happened, we do think that we should go into the basic causes and try to look for the underlying factors. What we want is to get consideration in the General Assembly after this phase that we are in now is finished.

In the interests of harmony and in order to meet everybody’s views as much as possible, I will be glad to delete paragraph 3. I am not trying to commit subsequent Assemblies. Mr. President, I understand I have the right to modify my own resolution, so I delete paragraph 3, and that will I think take care of the viewpoints that have been expressed here by the honorable delegates.

**TEXTS OF RESOLUTIONS**

**Resolution Requesting Plan for U.N. Force**

U.N. doc. A/Res/391

_The General Assembly,_

_Bearing in mind_ the urgent necessity of facilitating compliance with its resolution of 2 November 1956,

Requests, as a matter of priority, the Secretary-General to submit to it within forty-eight hours, a plan for the setting up, with the consent of the nations concerned, of an emergency international United Nations force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with all the terms of the aforementioned resolution.

**Second Cease-Fire Resolution**

U.N. doc. A/Res/392

_The General Assembly,_

_Notice_ with regret that not all the parties concerned have yet agreed to comply with the provisions of its resolution of 2 November 1956,

_Notice_ the special priority given in the resolution to an immediate cease-fire and as part thereof to the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into the area,

_Notice_ further that the resolution urged the parties to the Armistice Agreements promptly to withdraw all forces behind the armistice lines, to desist from raids across the armistice lines into neighbouring territory, and to observe scrupulously the provisions of the Armistice Agreements,

1. _Reaffirms_ its resolution of 2 November 1956 and once again calls upon the parties immediately to comply with the provisions of the said resolution;

2. _Authorizes_ the Secretary-General immediately to arrange with the parties concerned for the implementation of the cease-fire and the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into the area and requests him to report compliance forthwith and, in any case, not later than twelve hours from the time of adoption of the present resolution;

3. _Requests_ the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Chief of Staff and the members of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to obtain compliance of the withdrawal of all forces behind the armistice lines;

4. _Decides_ to meet again immediately on receipt of the Secretary-General’s report referred to in paragraph 2 of the present resolution.

**Resolution Establishing U.N. Command**

U.N. doc. A/Res/394

_The General Assembly,_

_Having requested_ the Secretary-General in its resolut-

---

17 Proposed by Canada (U.N. doc. A/3276); adopted by the General Assembly on Nov. 4 by a vote of 59 to 5 (Australia, France, Israel, New Zealand, U.K.), with 12 abstentions (Belgium, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Iceland, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Union of South Africa).

18 Proposed by Canada, Colombia, and Norway (U.N. doc. A/3290); adopted by the General Assembly on Nov. 5 by a vote of 57 to 0, with 19 abstentions (Soviet bloc, Australia, Egypt, France, Israel, Laos, New Zealand, Portugal, Turkey, Union of South Africa, U.K.).
tion adopted on 4 November 1956 to submit to it a plan for an emergency international United Nations force, for the purposes stated.

Noting with satisfaction the first report of the Secretary-General on the plan and having in mind particularly paragraph 4 of that report,

1. Establishes a United Nations Command for an emergency international force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with all the terms of the resolution of the General Assembly of 2 November 1956;

2. Appoints, on an emergency basis, the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, Major-General E. L. M. Burns, as Chief of the Command;

3. Authorizes the Chief of the Command immediately to recruit from the observer corps of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization a limited number of officers who shall be nationals of countries other than those having permanent membership in the Security Council, and further authorizes him, in consultation with the Secretary-General, to undertake the recruitment directly, from various Member States other than the permanent members of the Security Council, of the additional number of officers needed;

4. Invites the Secretary-General to take such administrative measures as may be necessary for the prompt execution of the actions envisaged in the present resolution.

Resolution Establishing Advisory Committee to U.N. Emergency Force


The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution of 2 November 1956, concerning the cease-fire, withdrawal of troops and other matters related to the military operations in Egyptian territory, as well as its resolution of 4 November 1956, concerning the request to the Secretary-General to submit a plan for an emergency international United Nations Force,

Having established in its resolution of 5 November 1956, a United Nations Command for an emergency international Force, having appointed the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization as Chief of the Command with authorization to him to begin recruitment of officers for the Command, and having invited the Secretary-General to take the administrative measures necessary for the prompt execution of that resolution,

Noting with appreciation the second and final report of the Secretary-General on the plan for an emergency international United Nations Force as requested in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 4 November 1956, and having examined that plan,

1. Expresses its approval of the guiding principles for the organization and functioning of the emergency international United Nations Force as expounded in paragraphs 6 to 9 of the Secretary-General’s report;

2. Concurs in the definition of the functions of the Force as stated in paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General’s report;

3. Invites the Secretary-General to continue discussions with Governments of Member States concerning offers of participation in the Force, toward the objective of its balanced composition;

4. Requests the Chief of the Command, in consultation with the Secretary-General as regards size and composition, to proceed forthwith with the full organization of the Force;

5. Approves, provisionally, the basic rule concerning the financing of the Force laid down in paragraph 15 of the Secretary-General’s report;

6. Establishes an Advisory Committee composed of one representative from each of the following countries: Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, India, Norway and Pakistan, and requests this Committee, whose Chairman shall be the Secretary-General, to undertake the development of those aspects of the plan for the Force and its operation not already dealt with by the General Assembly and which do not fall within the area of the direct responsibility of the Chief of the Command;

7. Authorizes the Secretary-General to issue all regulations and instructions which may be essential to the effective functioning of the Force, following consultation with the Advisory Committee aforementioned, and to take all other necessary administrative and executive actions;

8. Determines that, following the fulfilment of the immediate responsibilities defined for it in operative paragraphs 6 and 7 above, the Advisory Committee shall continue to assist the Secretary-General in the responsibilities falling to him under the present and other relevant resolutions;

9. Decides that the Advisory Committee, in the performance of its duties, shall be empowered to request, through the usual procedures, the convening of the General Assembly and to report to the Assembly whenever matters arise which, in its opinion, are of such urgency and importance as to require consideration by the General Assembly itself;

10. Requests all Member States to afford assistance as necessary to the United Nations Command in the performance of its functions, including arrangements for passage to and from the area involved.

Resolution Calling for Withdrawal of Israeli, British, and French Forces

U.N. doc. A/Res/396

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions adopted by overwhelming majorities on 2, 4 and 5 November 1956,

21 Proposed by Argentina, Burma, Ceylon, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, and Sweden (U.N. doc. A/3398); adopted, as amended, by the General Assembly on Nov. 7 by a vote of 64 to 0, with 12 abstentions (Soviet bloc, Egypt, Israel, Union of South Africa).


Noting in particular that the General Assembly, by its resolution of 5 November 1956, established a United Nations Command for an emergency international Force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with all the terms of its resolution of 2 November 1956,
1. Reaffirms the above-mentioned resolutions;
2. Calls once again upon Israel immediately to withdraw all its forces behind the armistice lines established by the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel of 24 February 1949; 
3. Calls once again upon the United Kingdom and France immediately to withdraw all their forces from Egyptian territory, consistently with the above-mentioned resolutions;
4. Urges the Secretary-General to communicate the present resolution to the parties concerned, and requests him promptly to report to the General Assembly on the compliance with this resolution.

Resolution Referring Middle East Question to 11th General Assembly
U.N. doc. A/Res/400

The General Assembly
1. Decides to place on the provisional agenda of its eleventh regular session, as a matter of priority, the question on the agenda of its first emergency special session;
2. Refers to its eleventh regular session for consideration the records of the meetings and the documents of its first emergency special session;
3. Decides that, notwithstanding paragraph 1 above, the first emergency special session may continue to consider the question, if necessary, prior to the eleventh regular session of the Assembly.

U.S. Rejects Soviet Proposal To Use Force in Egypt; Urges U.S.S.R. To Withdraw Troops From Hungary

Following are texts of a White House statement, a letter from President Eisenhower to Nikolai A. Bulganin, Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers, and a letter to the President from the Soviet Premier. The White House statement and President Eisenhower's letter were released to the press on November 5.

WHITE HOUSE STATEMENT, NOVEMBER 5

The President has just received a letter from Chairman Bulganin which had been previously released to the press in Moscow. This letter—in an obvious attempt to divert world attention from the Hungarian tragedy—makes the unthinkable suggestion that the United States join with the Soviet Union in a bipartite employment of their military forces to stop the fighting in Egypt.

The Middle East question—in which there has been much provocation on all sides—is now before the United Nations. That world body has called for a cease-fire, a withdrawal of foreign armed forces, and the entry of a United Nations force to stabilize the situation pending a settlement. In this connection, it is to be regretted that the Soviet Union did not vote last night in favor of the organization of this United Nations force. All
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Soviet Union is, therefore, at this moment in defiance of a decision of the United Nations, taken to secure peace and justice in the world.

Under these circumstances, it is clear that the first and most important step that should be taken to insure world peace and security is for the Soviet Union to observe the United Nations resolution to cease its military repression of the Hungarian people and withdraw its troops. Only then would it be seemly for the Soviet Union to suggest further steps that can be taken toward world peace.

Since Chairman Bulganin has already released his letter to the President, it is proper now to release a letter written by the President yesterday to the Chairman about the situation in Hungary.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PREMIER BULGANIN, NOVEMBER 4

I have noted with profound distress the reports which have reached me today from Hungary.

The Declaration of the Soviet Government of October 30, 1956, which restated the policy of non-intervention in internal affairs of other states, was generally understood as promising the early withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary. Indeed, in that statement, the Soviet Union said that “it considered the further presence of Soviet Army units in Hungary can serve as a cause for an even greater deterioration of the situation.” This pronouncement was regarded by the United States Government and myself as an act of high statesmanship. It was followed by the express request of the Hungarian Government for the withdrawal of Soviet forces.

Consequently, we have been inexpressibly shocked by the apparent reversal of this policy. It is especially shocking that this renewed application of force against the Hungarian Government and people took place while negotiations were going on between your representatives and those of the Hungarian Government for the withdrawal of Soviet forces.

As you know, the Security Council of the United Nations has been engaged in an emergency examination of this problem. As late as yesterday afternoon the Council was led to believe by your representative that the negotiations then in progress in Budapest were leading to agreement which would result in the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary as requested by the government of that country. It was on that basis that the Security Council recessed its consideration of this matter.

I urge in the name of humanity and in the cause of peace that the Soviet Union take action to withdraw Soviet forces from Hungary immediately and to permit the Hungarian people to enjoy and exercise the human rights and fundamental freedoms affirmed for all peoples in the United Nations Charter.

The General Assembly of the United Nations is meeting in emergency session this afternoon in New York to consider this tragic situation. It is my hope that your representative will be in a position to announce at the session today that the Soviet Union is preparing to withdraw its forces from that country and to allow the Hungarian people to enjoy the right to a government of their own choice.

Dwight D. Eisenhower

LETTER FROM PREMIER BULGANIN TO THE PRESIDENT, NOVEMBER 5

[Unofficial translation]

Esteemed Mr. President: In this troubled and responsible moment for the cause of universal peace, I approach you on behalf of the Soviet Government. One week has passed already since the armed forces of Britain, France, and—in obedience to the will of external forces—Israel, without any reason attacked Egypt, bringing in their wake death and destruction. Inhuman bombardment by the British and French Air Forces against Egyptian airfields, ports, installations, towns, and inhabited localities is taking place. Anglo-French troops have landed on Egyptian territory. From the invaders’ fire tremendous values created by the hands of the Egyptian people are perishing and the toll of human life is mounting every day.

An aggressive war against Egypt, against the Arab peoples whose sole fault is that they upheld their freedom and independence, is unfolding before the eyes of the entire world. The situation in Egypt calls for immediate and resolute action on the part of the U.N. Organization. In the event such action is not undertaken, the U.N. Organization will lose its prestige in the eyes of mankind and will fall apart.

The Soviet Union and the United States are permanent members of the Security Council and the two great powers which possess all modern types of arms, including atomic and hydrogen weapons. We bear particular responsibility for stopping war and reestablishing peace and calm in the area of the Near and Middle East. We are convinced that if the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and the United States will firmly declare their will to insure peace and oppose aggression, the aggression will be put down and there will be no war.
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Mr. President, at this threatening hour, when the loftiest moral principles and the foundations and aims of the United Nations are being put to the test, the Soviet Government approaches the Government of the United States with a proposal of close cooperation in order to put an end to aggression and to stop any further bloodshed.

The United States has a strong navy in the zone of the Mediterranean. The Soviet Union also has a strong navy and a powerful air force. The joint and immediate use of these means by the United States and the Soviet Union according to a decision of the United Nations would be a sure guaranty of ending the aggression against the Egyptian people, against the people of the Arab East.

The Soviet Government turns to the U.S. Government with an appeal to join their forces in the United Nations for the adoption of decisive measures to put an end to the aggression. The Soviet Government has already turned to the Security Council and the special extraordinary session of the General Assembly with suitable proposals. Such joint steps of the United States and the Soviet Union do not threaten the interests of Britain and France. The popular masses of Britain and France do not want war. They, like our people, desire the maintenance of peace. Many other states also, together with Britain and France, are interested in the immediate pacification and resumption of the normal functioning of the Suez Canal, interrupted by the military operations.

The aggression against Egypt has not been committed for the sake of free navigation along the Suez Canal, which was safeguarded. The practical war was launched with the aim of restoring colonial order in the East, an order which had been overthrown by the people. If this war is not stopped it carries the danger of turning into a third world war.

If the Soviet Union and the United States will support the victim of the aggression, then other states, members of the United Nations, will join us in these efforts. By this the authority of the United Nations will be considerably enhanced and peace will be restored and strengthened.

The Soviet Government is ready to enter into immediate negotiations with the Government of the United States on the practical realization of the above-mentioned proposals, so that effective action in the interests of peace might be undertaken within the next hours.

At this tense moment of history, when the fate of the entire Arab East is being decided, and at the same time the fate of the world, I await your favorable reply.

With sincere respect,

BULganin

Letters of Credence

Great Britain

The newly appointed Ambassador of Great Britain, Sir Harold Anthony Caccia, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on November 9. For the text of the Ambassador’s remarks and the text of the President’s reply, see Department of State press release 577.

Israel Urged To Withdraw Armed Forces From Egypt

White House press release dated November 8

Following are texts of messages exchanged by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion of Israel.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PRIME MINISTER BEN-GURION, NOVEMBER 7

Dear Mr. Prime Minister: As you know, the General Assembly of the United Nations has arranged a cease-fire in Egypt to which Egypt, France, the United Kingdom and Israel have agreed. There is being dispatched to Egypt a United Nations force in accordance with pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly. That body has urged that all other foreign forces be withdrawn from Egyptian territory, and specifically, that Israeli forces be withdrawn to the General Armistice line. The resolution covering the cease-fire and withdrawal was introduced by the United States and received the overwhelming vote of the Assembly.

Statements attributed to your Government to the effect that Israel does not intend to withdraw from Egyptian territory, as requested by the United Nations, have been called to my attention. I must say frankly, Mr. Prime Minister, that the United States views these reports, if true, with deep concern. Any such decision by the Government of Israel would seriously undermine the urgent efforts being made by the United Nations to restore peace in the Middle East, and could not but bring about the condemnation of Israel as a violator of the principles as well as the directives of the United Nations.

It is our belief that as a matter of highest priority peace should be restored and foreign troops, except for United Nations forces, withdrawn from Egypt, after which new and energetic steps should be undertaken within the framework of the United Nations to solve the basic problems which have given rise to the present difficulty. The United States has tabled in the General Assembly two resolutions designed to accomplish the latter purposes [U.N. docs. A/3272 and 3273], and hopes that they will be acted upon favorably as soon as the present emergency has been dealt with.

I need not assure you of the deep interest which the United States has in your country, nor recall
the various elements of our policy of support to Israel in so many ways. It is in this context that I urge you to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly dealing with the current crisis and to make your decision known immediately. It would be a matter of the greatest regret to all my countrymen if Israeli policy on a matter of such grave concern to the world should in any way impair the friendly cooperation between our two countries.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

PRIME MINISTER BEN-GURION TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, NOVEMBER 8

Dear Mr. President: I have only this afternoon received your message which was delayed in transmission owing to a breakdown in communications between the Department of State and the United States Embassy in Tel Aviv.

Your statement that a United Nations force is being dispatched to Egypt in accordance with pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly is welcomed by us. We have never planned to annex the Sinai Desert. In view of the United Nations Resolutions regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from Egypt and the creation of an international force, we will, upon conclusion of satisfactory arrangements with the United Nations in connection with this international force entering the Suez Canal area, willingly withdraw our forces.

Although an important part of our aim has been achieved by the destruction, as a result of the Sinai operation, of Fedayeen gangs and of the bases from which they were planned and directed, we must repeat our urgent request to the United Nations to call upon Egypt, which has consistently maintained that it is in a state of war with Israel, to renounce this position, to abandon its policy of boycott and blockade, to cease the incursions into Israel territory of murder gangs and, in accordance with its obligations under the United Nations Charter, to live at peace with member states, to enter into direct peace negotiations with Israel.

On behalf of my government I wish to express to you our gratification at your reference to the deep interest of the United States in Israel and its policy of support for our country. I know these words of friendship stem from the depths of your heart and I wish to assure you that you will always find Israel ready to make its noble contribution at the side of the United States in its efforts to strengthen justice and peace in the world.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

David Ben-Gurion

Evacuation of Americans From Middle East

Press release 578 dated November 9

The Department announced on November 9 that approximately 2,600 Americans had left the Middle East as the result of the warning by the United States issued on October 28.1 The great bulk of the Americans, together with an estimated 600 foreign nationals who had requested assistance, were evacuated on ships and planes of the U.S. Navy and Air Force. Nearly all the evacuees were removed to safehavens in Italy, Lebanon, and Greece.

Information available to the Department of State indicates that approximately 2,500 U.S. citizens in the four countries evacuated declined to leave. Some of these are missionaries, but most have close family ties or business interests which they are unwilling to sever under present circumstances.

The American Embassy is now assisting evacuees in Rome to obtain housing and onward transportation if desired. Persons desiring to communicate with friends or relatives still remaining in the Middle East should utilize regular communications as in the past. Inquiries regarding evacuees should be addressed to the Office of Special Consular Services, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C. (telephone: REpublic 7–7500, extension 2239).

The U.S. Government's warning was directed to Americans in Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria. Evacuation of each of these countries was carried out under the direction of the U.S. Ambassador. The largest single movement was from Cairo, where more than 1,200 U.S. citizens, together with some 500 foreign nationals, traveled overland in

---
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motor convoys 100 miles to Alexandria, where they boarded U.S. Navy ships.

The evacuation of Cairo was carried out while fighting was in progress between Anglo-French forces and the Egyptians. A bomb blasted a check point on the Cairo-Alexandria road a few minutes after the motor convoy had passed, and in Alexandria harbor Egyptian warships fired on Anglo-French aircraft while the evacuees were boarding ships. There are no reports of injuries to evacuees. The Commander of the Sixth Fleet, Vice Adm. Charles R. Brown, reported “all have reached safety without a single injury or a hair out of line.”

All military assistance in the evacuation, including some 40 aircraft of the U.S. Air Force, was under the direction of Adm. Walter F. Boone, Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean, the top American commander in the area. Air Force planes were used principally in the evacuation from Israel, airlifting approximately 475 persons to Athens and later assisting in a shuttle of evacuees from Athens to Rome. Navy ships evacuated another 106 persons through the port of Haifa.

Both Trans World Airlines and Pan American Airways promptly offered assistance in the emergency. Pan American flew evacuees from Beirut, Lebanon, to Rome, and TWA participated in the shuttle air service between Athens and Rome. Prior to the arrival of U.S. Navy ships in Alexandria, an American Export Line ship, the S.S. Exochorda, transported approximately 300 evacuees from Egypt to Naples.

The total of evacuees from both Syria and Jordan, including foreign nationals assisted by the United States, was 390. They were evacuated to Beirut, Lebanon, principally in motor vehicles or by chartered planes of Air Jordan and Arab Airways. A U.S. Air Force C-119 also aided in the Syrian evacuation.

Overall coordination of the evacuation was centered in the American Embassy in Rome. In constant touch with the Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean and the U.S. Sixth Fleet, a special Embassy team worked round-the-clock until the evacuation was completed. The elapsed time from the first warning until all evacuees reached safety was 8 days. The MSTS transport, the USNS General Patch, delivered the last of the evacuees to Naples November 6. The Patch had rendezvoused 2 days earlier with ships of the Sixth Fleet in Suda Bay, Crete, taking on all evacuees from Alexandria and Haifa and bringing them to Naples.

U.S. Law Concerning Service in Armed Forces of Foreign States
Press release 579 dated November 10

In view of the current situation in the Near East the Department of State desires to bring to the attention of all American citizens the provisions of section 349 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

This section of the act provides that American citizens shall lose their citizenship by entering or serving in the armed forces of a foreign state unless, prior to such entry or service, the entry or service is specifically authorized in writing by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. Authorization has not so far been granted in any individual case and there is no intention of departing from this policy.

The Department refers in addition to its announcement of November 2, 1956, regarding the issuance of an order invalidating all outstanding passports for travel to Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria, except those of persons remaining in those countries and of Government officials and their families en route to or stationed there. Passports of persons within any of these four countries will become invalid for return thereto when they proceed to a country other than Aden, Bahrein, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Muscat and Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria, or Yemen. Passports invalidated for travel to or in Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria will remain invalid for travel there unless specifically endorsed for travel to or in one or more of these countries or until the order is revoked.
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The Hungarian Question Before the General Assembly

Following are texts of statements made by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., U.S. Representative to the United Nations, and by James J. Wadsworth, Deputy U.S. Representative, before the second emergency special session of the General Assembly, together with texts of five resolutions adopted during the special session.¹

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, NOVEMBER 4

U.S. delegation press release 2501

At dawn this morning Soviet troops in Hungary opened fire in Budapest and throughout the country. We learn from Vienna that the Soviet artillery were firing incendiary phosphorus shells at centers of civilian population. These are the shells which set fire to buildings and which burn the flesh of women and children and other civilian noncombatants whom they encounter. Prime Minister Nagy has appealed to the United Nations for help, and I must say we can understand it.

After several days of ominous reports the situation in Hungary has become all too clear. What is revealed is a sickening picture of duplicity and doubledealing. While this wholesale brutality by the Soviet Government was being perpetrated, the Soviet representative here in this hall was praising peace and praising nonaggression and raising his hands in horror against bloodshed in the Near East. All of us who are striving with every fiber of our being for peace in the Near East can never forget this unutterable cynicism.

¹ The session was called under the Uniting-for-Peace resolution, pursuant to a request by Ambassador Lodge made during an early-morning meeting of the Security Council on Nov. 4, at which the U.S.S.R. had vetoed a U.S. proposal on the situation in Hungary. For texts of the vetoed proposal and of Ambassador Lodge's statements in the Security Council, see Bulletin of Nov. 12, 1956, p. 757.

For the last few days Soviet movements into Hungary have been reported. These reports have been accompanied by Soviet assurances to the United Nations and to the Hungarian Government that Soviet troops in Hungary had not and would not be reenforced. The reported movements were pictured as the redeployment of Soviet forces stationed in the country.

As late as 10 o'clock last night Soviet representatives began negotiations—or what was described as negotiations—with Hungarian representatives ostensibly for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary pursuant to Hungary's decision to renounce its membership in the Warsaw Pact.

The Soviet Union has made little pretense lately of its urge to dominate Hungary by the power of its military machine. It talked about a new relationship with its satellites based on sovereign equality and independence and nonintervention in internal affairs. It spoke of negotiations under the Warsaw Pact for the withdrawal of its troops from some of these countries, particularly Hungary, where it admitted that the further presence of its army units could "serve as a cause for an even greater deterioration of the situation"—a deterioration which has, of course, so tragically occurred.

What a picture of deception we have had!

When Prime Minister Nagy formed his government, this was how Pravda itself, the Soviet Government organ, described the Nagy government on October 28th:

Today Budapest radio announced the formation of a new national government of the Hungarian People's Republic on a broad democratic basis led by Comrade Imre Nagy. The new government immediately took up its duties. The Hungarian Government, guided by a desire to insure that no one of the honest but misled people should be punished, declared an amnesty for "all who voluntarily laid down their arms."
On October 30 Moscow radio which, of course, as in all totalitarian states is the official government radio station—something which we haven’t got here—was telling its listeners in Europe that: “fortunately under the leadership of Imre Nagy’s government... life is gradually returning to normal,” and on the same day Moscow radio told its own people: “The Hungarian working people have welcomed with satisfaction the statement made yesterday by Imre Nagy which was approved by the Hungarian Workers’ Party and which announced the program of action of the Government.” That is what Moscow radio and Pravda said then.

Today Pravda called erstwhile “Comrade” Nagy “an accomplice of reactionary forces.”

Others nearby, who can judge well the meaning of Hungary’s fight, also spoke of the Nagy government. Here are some instances:

The Polish Communist United Workers’ Party published a statement on October 29 in which it lauded the program of Nagy’s new government, saying it corresponded “to the aspirations of the Hungarian people and the entire cause of peace.” Tribuna Ludu, the Polish Communist newspaper, on the same day, proclaimed Poland’s “deep solidarity” for Hungary’s new leadership and support for its program. This program, said the Polish paper, is “similar to our own and, like our own program, corresponds to the deepest desire of the masses.” That is from one surrounding Communist country.

On October 29 President Tito sent a letter to the Hungarians in which he expressed the confidence that “under the new leadership” they would overcome all difficulties. He spoke of profound admiration for all those “progressive men in neighboring Hungary who in these days have made great efforts to turn this tragic struggle into an era of renaissance.” The Yugoslav public, President Tito said, “unanimously hails the establishment of the new state and political leadership and the declaration of the Hungarian Government of October 28.” President Tito concluded by wishing Nagy “success in his efforts.”

On October 29 the Czechoslovak Government, too, sent a message to the Nagy government in which it “sincerely welcomed” the great efforts made by the Hungarian Government to establish peace in the country, efforts which they said “are in accordance with the fundamental interests of the entire Hungarian people. The Czechoslovak Government expressed its firm confidence that the Hungarian Government, backed by the support of the people and by the power of socialist democracy, will successfully insure the fulfillment of the great tasks ahead.”

On October 29 the Czechoslovak Communist Party sent a message to the Hungarian Communists—it will be recalled that Prime Minister Nagy himself was a Communist who sought to lead his country to freedom from Soviet enslavement—in which it expressed its support for Nagy’s efforts to “achieve progress” and to “deepen Socialist democracy.” That is what they were saying on October 28th and 29th.

Now, what could have changed the situation in so short a time? The desire of Prime Minister Nagy to govern Hungary for the Hungarians? Did the Soviet Union fear this? Constant deceitful reinforcements of the Soviet troops in Hungary during these fateful days say that they do.

It is now reliably reported, Mr. President, that Soviet forces have occupied the Parliament building in Budapest. Prime Minister Nagy and other members of his government are now under arrest. Pal Maleter, the Minister of Defense and heroic defender of the Maria Theresa Barracks against Soviet assault, who only yesterday was engaged in negotiations with Soviet military representatives for troop withdrawal, is also under arrest. A Soviet ultimatum was issued calling for capitulation of Budapest by noon and threatening the bombing of the city if it did not capitulate.

**Views of Cardinal Mindszenty**

As I announced at the Security Council meeting at 4 o’clock this morning,² Cardinal Mindszenty and his secretary have sought refuge at the U.S. Legation in Budapest. I think that makes it appropriate to quote a recent broadcast only yesterday which Cardinal Mindszenty recorded on Radio Budapest, and I would like to quote a passage because these are the last public words spoken by Cardinal Mindszenty that we have:

A national feeling should never again be a source of fighting between countries but the pledge of justice and peaceful cooperation. Let the feeling of nationality flourish in the whole world in the field of common culture. Thus, the progress of one country will carry along to the other country, between nations, which according to the laws of nature are more and more reliant upon each other. We Hungarians want to live and act as the

standard bearers of the family of peoples of the European nations. Let cooperation be the base, which means true friendship between the nations. And looking toward ever more distant parts, we, the little nation, desire to live in friendship and mutual respect with the great American United States and with the mighty Russian empire alike, in good neighborly relations with Prague, Bucharest, Warsaw, and in this respect I must mention, for the brotherly understanding in our present suffering, every Hungarian has embraced to his heart Austria.

That, Mr. President, is what could in all solemn truth be called a spirit of peaceful coexistence, as uttered by Cardinal Mindszenty, in the best sense of the word if Soviet hypocrisy had not robbed that phrase of all honest meaning.

Let us not be deceived by this cynical and wanton act of aggression against the Hungarian people and its Government. A small group of Soviet straw men announced their own formation as a government at the moment Soviet troops began their attack. We have seen no passage of governmental authority from one Hungarian government to another, but only the creation of a puppet clique and the overthrow of a liberal socialist government responsive to popular will in their desire to see these troops go. Two hours after the attack began, the new puppet group appealed to the Soviet Union to come to its assistance. It cannot be maintained, therefore, that the Soviet action is undertaken in response to any request for assistance. The “assistance,” and I put that in quotes, arrived long before the call.

This is how General Janos Kadar, the Communist puppet installed by Soviet military intervention this morning, spoke of Prime Minister Nagy when the Prime Minister first took over the government: “I am in wholehearted agreement with Nagy, an acquaintance and friend of mine, my esteemed and respected compatriot.” Wonderful friend—he was with him up to the hilt.

We must take drastic and decisive action here in this Assembly to answer the appeal of the Hungarian Government. The United States delegation therefore is submitting a draft resolution which we believe should be promptly put to the vote. I would now like to read the resolution:

[Here Ambassador Lodge read the U.S. draft (U.N. doc. A/3286).]

That is our resolution. It is aimed at securing speedy action to cope with the grave situation. We do not believe that it is sufficient only to call upon the Soviet Union to desist from any further inter-

vention in the internal affairs of Hungary and to withdraw all its troops without delay.

We urge also that the Secretary-General directly investigate the situation in Hungary without delay and report to the Assembly as soon as possible. We call upon the Soviet Union and Hungary to admit representatives of the Secretary-General to Hungarian territory, and if there is nothing to hide they have nothing to fear from the visit of impartial observers.

Principles Adopted at Bandung

In this connection, let me remind the Soviet representative that the Soviet Union professes to support certain basic principles which 29 countries meeting in April 1955 at Bandung in Indonesia adopted as precepts for international conduct. There were 10 principles set forth as the basis for developing friendly cooperation among nations. These, I understand, include five principles of so-called peaceful coexistence, in support of which the Soviet Union has been talking but not acting. Those principles, subsequently endorsed specifically by leaders of the Soviet Union on the occasion of their visit to various countries in Asia, are relevant to the situation in Hungary. What the Soviet Union has done these past hours in Hungary demonstrates how hollow are the Soviet statements praising the Bandung declaration.

Let us ask the members of this Assembly:

Has the Soviet Union shown “respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations” in its action in Hungary?

Has it shown “respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations”?

Has it abstained from “intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country”?

Has it refrained “from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country”?

I have used the language of Bandung in these questions, and the facts speak for themselves.

We cannot stand idly by while the Hungarians are dragged bodily back into servitude even as they were reemerging into independence and freedom. The principles set forth in the charter of the United Nations are at stake. The basic and fundamental right of self-determination which so many in this hall have endorsed time and again is in grave danger. If we fail to act, it will consti-
tute a base betrayal of the people of Hungary, who have appealed to us for aid.

The Hungarian people can be sure that the United Nations will accept their cause as its own. They can also be sure that the United Nations will mobilize its resources to assure that the Hungarian people, who have fought so fiercely for their independence and freedom in these anguished days, will find a willing response from the . . .

[At this point a message was handed to Ambassador Lodge.]

I have just received a message from President Eisenhower, which I would like to read now. It is very short.

I feel that world opinion, which was so uplifted only a few days ago by the news that the Soviet Union intended to withdraw its forces from Hungary, has now suffered corresponding shock and dismay at the Soviet attack on the peoples and Government of Hungary.

I met today with the Secretary of State at Walter Reed Hospital and later with the Acting Secretary of State . . . to discuss the ways and means available to the United States which would result in:

1. Withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary.

I have sent an urgent message to Premier Bulganin on these points. [See p. 706.]

There was likewise a thorough review of the Middle East situation and the measures now under way in the United Nations to restore peace in that area and to lay the groundwork for constructive solutions of its problems.

Mr. President, let us so conduct ourselves here this afternoon that the United Nations will mobilize its resources to insure that the Hungarian people, who have fought so fiercely for their independence and freedom in these anguished days, will find a willing response from the people of nations blessed in having these priceless treasures to give them material aid and comfort in the alleviation of their suffering and distress.

Recalling that the enjoyment of human rights and of fundamental freedom in Hungary was specifically guaranteed by the Peace Treaty between Hungary and the Allied and Associated Powers signed at Paris on 10 February 1947 and that the general principle of these rights and this freedom is affirmed for all peoples in the Charter of the United Nations,

Convinced that recent events in Hungary manifest clearly the desire of the Hungarian people to exercise and to enjoy fully their fundamental rights, freedom and independence,

Condemning the use of Soviet military forces to suppress the efforts of the Hungarian people to reassert their rights,

Noting moreover the declaration by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of 30 October 1956, of its avowed policy of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States,

Noting the communication of 1 November 1956 of the Government of Hungary to the Secretary-General regarding demands made by that Government to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the instant and immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces,

Noting further the communication of 2 November 1956 from the Government of Hungary to the Secretary-General asking the Security Council to instruct the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of Hungary to start the negotiations immediately on withdrawal of Soviet forces,

Noting that the intervention of Soviet military forces in Hungary has resulted in grave loss of life and widespread bloodshed among the Hungarian people,

Taking note of the radio appeal of Prime Minister Imre Nagy of 4 November 1956,

1. Calls upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to desist forthwith from all armed attack on the peoples of Hungary and from any form of intervention, in particular armed intervention, in the internal affairs of Hungary;
2. Calls upon the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to cease the introduction of additional armed forces into Hungary and to withdraw all of its forces without delay from Hungarian territory;
3. Affirms the right of the Hungarian people to a government responsive to its national aspirations and dedicated to its independence and well-being;
4. Requests the Secretary-General to investigate the situation caused by foreign intervention in Hungary, to observe the situation directly through representatives named by him, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at the earliest moment, and as soon as possible suggest methods to bring an end to the foreign intervention in Hungary in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations;
5. Calls upon the Government of Hungary and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to permit observers designated by the Secretary-General to enter the territory of Hungary, to travel freely therein, and to report their findings to the Secretary-General;

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 4 4

U.N. doc. A/Res/393

The General Assembly,

Considering that the United Nations is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members,

Submitted by the U.S. (U.N. doc. A/3286) ; adopted, as amended, by a vote of 50 to 8, with 15 abstentions.

November 19, 1956


6. Calls upon all Members of the United Nations to co-operate with the Secretary-General and his representatives in the execution of his functions;

7. Requests the Secretary-General in consultation with the heads of appropriate specialized agencies to inquire, on an urgent basis, into the needs of the Hungarian people for food, medicine and other similar supplies, and to report to the General Assembly as soon as possible;

8. Requests all Members of the United Nations, and invites national and international humanitarian organizations to co-operate in making available such supplies as may be required by the Hungarian people.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, NOVEMBER 9

It is some measure of the deep sadness which is in our hearts that the speeches here have had some of the quality of funeral orations. I say "some" because, however sad we are, we cannot believe that this is in fact the end of Hungarian independence. We refuse to admit that the glorious dead of these past weeks have died in vain.

The Soviet Union has already paid an immense price for this bullying of a defenseless people. In Western Europe the newspapers tell us people are leaving the Communist Party in droves. Communist headquarters are being burned; angry crowds of working people are parading and demonstrating against these 1956 models of totalitarian imperialism.

We must, therefore, not let the memory of this outrage die. Let the world never forget that the Soviet Union is in open defiance of the General Assembly call to desist from armed attack on the peoples of Hungary. Let it also be remembered that, since the resolution was passed, the Soviet Union has actually stepped up its attack.

The Hungarian people have been fighting with small arms, pitchforks, and bare hands against massive formations of Soviet tanks. We hear that Soviet tanks have taken over bridges and roads, blocking all movement, even the movement of food and medical supplies. Hospitals are ablaze. Red Cross units, on their missions of mercy, have been attacked. Other legitimate Red Cross activities have been halted on Soviet orders. Such interference with the flow of medical aid—of all things—is proof of a horrifying callousness to human suffering.

All reports of the fighting of the past few days in the streets of Budapest use the word "savage" in describing the fury and speed of the Russian Army's attack against the people of Hungary, and even now, when resistance is broken, there are reports of heavy shellings still going on. Pathetic appeals for help were coming even yesterday from radio stations remaining in the hands of the Hungarian people.

The Hungarian people—unlike the young man [Janos Szabo] who claims to represent them here at the United Nations—are asking: When will the United Nations observers come?

Nothing can blot from human memory the sickening spectacle of Soviet tanks firing upon a literally unarmed population. Nothing can wipe out the black memory of military assaults on hospitals. Nothing can cleanse the stain of indiscriminate mass arrests or violent vengeance against a whole population.

The action of the Soviet Government on the one hand in speaking of sending food to Hungary, while on the other taking military action aimed at starving out the citizens of Budapest, is utterly revolting.

We have heard with interest the Secretary-General's report on the initial steps he has undertaken pursuant to the Assembly's resolution on November 4. We hope he will press forward with his work. We want to know at the earliest possible moment the response of the Soviet Union and of the present Government of Hungary to his cable. We ask: Will the Soviet Union, and the government it has put in power in Hungary, comply with the expressed wishes of the Assembly and cooperate with the Secretary-General in the execution of his responsibilities under the resolution?

Pending the outcome of the further efforts of the Secretary-General, this Assembly can appropriately address itself to the plight of the unfortunate people of Hungary. We now hear of repressive measures against whole segments of the population and of mass deportations. There is widespread hunger, misery, and suffering. There are also the thousands of Hungarian refugees who have fled across Hungary's borders to the West. These are cogent reasons why it is important not only to obtain a firsthand account of events in Hungary, as contemplated by the Assembly resolution, but also to take immediate further steps to meet the urgent problems facing the gallant Hungarian people.

The United States has proposed, in a resolution which is now before the Assembly, to help meet their immediate needs, and I should like to read the text of that resolution:

[See p. 807.]
We urge every member to do all in its power to aid in this vital humanitarian task. It is gratifying to know that, in response to the emergency appeal by the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, five states have already offered to help—Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden, the Netherlands, and France. In the meantime, Austria has given generously of its resources to care for the refugees in the first hours of their escape. All honor to these countries for this noble effort.

Last night President Eisenhower announced that the United States Government would take all possible measures to permit 5,000 refugees from Hungary to come into this country. 7

The United States resolution is aimed at immediate needs, and we believe it should be adopted and carried out in the shortest possible time. The resolution submitted by the delegations of Cuba, Ireland, Italy, Pakistan, and Peru deals with longer-range objectives. We shall vote for it also.

The Assembly has already called for the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, where they remain clearly against the will of the people of that unhappy nation—people whose only crime was their desire for basic human rights, rights which in many of our countries are taken for granted. Only a week ago, a declaration by the Soviet Union explicitly promised withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary. 8 That declaration lent an air of credibility to the claim, which is now proved to have been infamously deceitful, that negotiations on withdrawal were in fact actually under way.

We need action on the part of the Soviet Union in conformity with the expressed will of this Assembly. In the light of the attitude of the Soviet Union we can consider what further United Nations action can be undertaken which is both constructive and feasible.

Let us see how much support the Soviet Union is prepared to give to the words in the United Nations Charter which pledge all members to respect "fundamental human rights" and "the dignity and worth of the human person." Let us see what the force of world opinion, supported by our United Nations observers, can do to achieve the objectives of this Assembly.

We have set machinery in motion. Let us give it a chance to work. If the desired results are not achieved, then, of course, we must reappraise the situation and determine our future action. We will not let this heart-breaking tragedy drop. We will not forget.

SECOND STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, NOVEMBER 9

U.S. delegation press release 2510

I am sorry that I am constrained to differ on this particular question with the distinguished representatives of Ceylon, India, and Indonesia as regards their amendments to the U.S. draft resolution. I appreciate the courteous frankness with which they disclose their views, and I shall try to be equally frank and I may say equally courteous.

It seems to me that we would be making a great mistake if we were to strike out these various phrases which it is desired that we strike out. I would like to read what these phrases are.

One is the "military authorities of the U.S.S.R. are interfering in the transportation and distribution of food and medical supplies...." Well, we know it to be a fact that they are. Do we want to go on record as voting that a thing is not a fact when we know that it is a fact?

The next amendment would strike out the words "Calls upon the U.S.S.R. to cease immediately actions against the Hungarian population which are in violation of the accepted standards and principles of international law, justice and morality." We have absolutely firsthand information—we in the United States from our own Legation and many in this hall from many other sources—that that is precisely what is happening. Do we want to vote that that is not happening when we know that it is happening?

Then the words "Calls upon" would be stricken out and the word "Requests" would be inserted concerning paragraph 2 which reads, "Calls upon the Hungarian authorities to facilitate." And "the U.S.S.R. not to interfere with" would be stricken out. Well, the same objection holds to that amendment, and to the other places where the U.S.S.R. would be struck out.

Then, in section B 9 of the resolution, these words would be stricken: "as a result of the harsh and repressive action of the Soviet armed forces, increasingly...." Then they would strike out

---

1 See p. 807.
"being obliged to leave . . . and seek asylum in neighboring countries." Well, that is what is going on. That is what is going on, Mr. President. We have heard from a number of countries who are volunteering to take as many as a thousand of these refugees in each country. President Eisenhower is moving to take 5,000 of them here. There is no use in saying that these dreadful things are not happening, unpleasant and tragic though they are, when they are happening.

Now, we have no interest in propaganda. We have no interest in revenge. But we do not see that there is a distinction that can be drawn between the intent of these words that would be stricken out and the other passages relating to medicines and food. We think that both of these provisions are humanitarian. We think that it is humanitarian to take a step which may free a man from being oppressed. We think it is just as humanitarian to take steps to provide people with international law, justice, and morality as it is to take steps which will put food in their stomachs and give them medicines to cure their illnesses.

The fact is, Mr. President—and we sometimes forget it—that the United Nations is a moral organization. The United Nations has a moral standard. The United Nations Charter does distinguish between right and wrong. The United Nations was never intended to be a mere sordid cockpit in which the values of the criminal and the values of the law-abiding were indiscriminately scrambled up. It is not that, and it should not become so.

Now, that being true, this follows: that there cannot be a double standard of international morality in the world. If discrimination is bad in one part of the world, as it is, then it is bad in another part of the world. If we deplore injustice here, we must deplore injustice there. If we are against prejudice in one area, we should be against prejudice in another area. If we resist brutality in one region, we must resist brutality in the other. If we are going to raise our voices against oppression, if we are going to raise our voices against occupation by foreign troops in one part of the world, then we must be equally steadfast, we must be equally stalwart in the other parts of the world.

In that spirit and for that reason, Mr. President, I hope that the amendments offered by my distinguished friends from Ceylon, India, and Indonesia will not prevail and that our resolution will be adopted as written.

**STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR WADSWORTH, NOVEMBER 9**

U.S. delegation press release 2511

I ask for the floor not for an explanation of vote but to make a very brief announcement which we believe should come at this time, since it has to do at least with two of the resolutions which have just been passed by this Assembly.

In answer to the last operative paragraph, both of the United States resolution and of the Austrian resolution, I am authorized to announce that the United States Government is making available at once $1 million to the Secretary-General for immediate use through appropriate channels for assistance to Hungarian refugees. We hope by this action to emphasize the urgency of this vital task which has become the responsibility of the world community.

**RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 9**

**Five-Power Proposal**

U.N. doc. A/Res/397

_The General Assembly,_

_Notwithstanding the deep concern that the provisions of its resolution of 4 November 1956 have not yet been carried out and that the violent repression by the Soviet forces of the efforts of the Hungarian people to achieve freedom and independence continues,—_ 

_Convinced_ that the recent events in Hungary manifest clearly the desire of the Hungarian people to exercise and to enjoy fully their fundamental rights, freedom and independence,_

_Considering_ that foreign intervention in Hungary is an intolerable attempt to deny to the Hungarian people the exercise and the enjoyment of such rights, freedom and independence, and in particular to deny to the Hungarian people the right to a government freely elected and representing their national aspirations,_

_Considering_ that the repression undertaken by the Soviet forces in Hungary constitutes a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Peace Treaty between Hungary and the Allied and Associated Powers,—_ 

—_Calls upon the Government of the United Nations to withdraw its forces from Hungary without any further delay;_
2. Considers that free elections should be held in Hungary under United Nations auspices, as soon as law and order have been restored, to enable the people of Hungary to determine for themselves the form of government they wish to establish in their country;

3. Reaffirms its request to the Secretary-General to continue to investigate, through representatives named by him, the situation caused by foreign intervention in Hungary and to report at the earliest possible moment to the General Assembly;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to report in the shortest possible time to the General Assembly on compliance herewith.

**U.S. Proposal**

U.N. doc. A/Res/398

The General Assembly,

I

Considering that the military authorities of the U.S.S.R. are interfering with the transportation and distribution of food and medical supplies urgently needed by the civilian population in Hungary,

1. Calls upon the U.S.S.R. to cease immediately actions against the Hungarian population which are in violation of the accepted standards and principles of international law, justice and morality;

2. Calls upon the Hungarian authorities to facilitate, and the U.S.S.R. not to interfere with, the receipt and distribution of food and medical supplies to the Hungarian people and to co-operate fully with the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as well as other international organizations such as the International Red Cross, to provide humanitarian assistance to the people of Hungary;

3. Urges the U.S.S.R. and the Hungarian authorities to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General and his duly appointed representatives in the carrying out of the tasks referred to above.

II

Considering that, as a result of the harsh and repressive action of the Soviet armed forces, increasingly large numbers of refugees are being obliged to leave Hungary and to seek asylum in neighbouring countries,

1. Requests the Secretary-General to call upon the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to consult with other appropriate international agencies and interested Governments with a view to making speedy and effective arrangements for emergency assistance to refugees from Hungary;

2. Urges Member States to make special contributions for this purpose.

**Austrian Proposal**

U.N. doc. A/Res/399

The General Assembly,

Considering the extreme suffering to which the Hungarian people are subjected,

Urgently wishing effectively to eliminate this suffering,

Convinced that humanitarian duties can be fulfilled most effectively through the international co-operation stipulated in Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Resolves to undertake on a large scale immediate aid for the affected territories by furnishing medical supplies, foodstuffs and clothes;

2. Calls upon all Member States to participate to the greatest extent possible in this relief action;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to undertake immediately the necessary measures;

4. Urgently appeals to all countries concerned to give full assistance to the Secretary-General in the implementation of this task.

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON NOVEMBER 10**

U.N. doc. A/Res/401

The General Assembly

1. Decides to place on the provisional agenda of its eleventh regular session, as a matter of priority, the question on the agenda of its second emergency special session;

2. Refers to its eleventh regular session for consideration the records of the meetings and the documents of its second emergency special session;

3. Decides that, notwithstanding paragraph 1 above, the second emergency special session may continue to consider the question, if necessary, prior to the eleventh regular session of the Assembly.

**Need for Nationwide Effort To Admit Hungarian Refugees**

*Statement by the President*

White House press release dated November 8

Few events of recent times have so stirred the American people as the tragic effort of Hungarian men and women to gain freedom for themselves and for their children. The brutal purge of liberty which followed their heroic struggle will be long and sorrowfully remembered, not only by those directly suffering from that brutality but also by all humans who believe in the dignity of man.

Our immediate concern must be for those whose suffering we, the members of the free world, can effectively alleviate. These are the thousands of escapees who have successfully made their way out of Hungary during the past week. They are older...
people; they are women; they are children—and many of them are suffering wounds inflicted by the guns of imperialist communism.

It is heartening to witness the speed with which free nations have opened their doors to these most recent refugees from tyranny. In this humanitarian effort our own nation must play its part. I have therefore directed the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act to process as many as 5,000 Hungarian refugees as expeditiously as possible. This effort requires the most active help of the great voluntary agencies and other humanitarian organizations, of State and local governments, and of individuals everywhere. I know that the American people will rally wholeheartedly to this great cause.

The Role of Economic Cooperation and Technical Assistance in Our Foreign Policy

by Ben H. Thibodeaux
Director, Office of International Trade and Resources

This annual conference on agricultural services to other countries illustrates the change that has occurred in the attitude of the American people regarding our relations with other countries. The changed public attitude is reflected in our official relations with other countries, as expressed in the foreign policy of the United States. In my comments today I shall try to explain how and why.

Let me begin by venturing the statement that only a few years ago many in this room would have been surprised—perhaps "startled"—would be a better word—if the United States Department of Agriculture had sponsored a nationwide conference on how best to furnish agricultural technical assistance, largely at the American taxpayers' expense, to other countries. Today it is taken for granted that such a conference should be held, that it should be held in cooperation with the International Cooperation Administration and our land-grant colleges, and that it should involve the participation of farmer organizations, private philanthropic groups, and many of our friends from other countries.

Until the early 1940's we were still almost completely preoccupied with the development of our own agriculture. Our efforts almost entirely were to grow at least a better blade of grass if not two blades where one grew before, to sell our farm products at remunerative prices, and to make possible an even better living for our farm families.

Certainly these objectives continue in the forefront of our work as essential conditions for the continued well-being of American farm people. But in recent years there has come a general recognition that continuing American agricultural prosperity and security, like American prosperity and security generally, are dependent in large degree upon the existence of favorable economic and political conditions in other countries of the free world. And in many of these countries favorable conditions are possible only if their agriculture can be made better.

From recognition of these facts came action. The scientific and administrative skills that brought American agriculture and American farm living to such high levels are now being shared with others. Today it is my pleasure to participate in your discussions on how best to do that job.

Wide Range of Technical Assistance Programs

Agriculture, of course, is only one of many fields in which we share our know-how. The technical
assistance of the United States to other countries ranges widely, as you know, to include industrial production, mineral development, medicine and public health, education, and other areas of modern knowledge and practice that contribute to the well-being of people. For economic cooperation with other countries, including technical assistance, has become part and parcel of the foreign policy of the United States, with the approval of the American people and with the participation of many nongovernmental groups such as those we have with us in this meeting.

There is nothing new, of course, about international economic cooperation and technical assistance. We have not developed anything new or bizarre. It has been said that technical assistance began when the man who invented the wheel told somebody about it. Through the centuries, by one means or another, science and technology have spread as they became known, although the process at times has been exceedingly slow. Nor can it be said that there is anything new about international loans or grants of money, either from private sources or by governments.

What is new about our program of economic cooperation and technical assistance is the tremendous scale upon which our Government and our people are engaged in them. You are familiar with the record, beginning even before the Marshall plan.

Why do we share our resources and our skills as a deliberate national policy? What do we get out of it? The answer, simply put, is greater assurance for our economic well-being and our national security. Let us see why.

As a starting point I believe we can accept the truism that we cannot be prosperous and secure in an impoverished and insecure world. Still, that was the kind of world in which we found ourselves at the end of World War II. And since then there has risen in intensified form an expanded and aggressive campaign to extend Communist domination throughout the world. Let us take a quick look at some of the conditions we faced after the war. Most of them are still with us.

Postwar Conditions

Western Europe, the dominant economic and intellectual force of the world for over 2,000 years, emerged from the war impoverished, in rubble, in debt, and in danger of being engulfed by the seep-

age if not the surface flow of communism from the East.

Communist Russia had become a major world power and was engaged in an aggressive campaign to spread its system everywhere, by direct means or by subversion.

When Communist military ventures were arrested by the united action of the free world, the Soviet drive was transmuted into the more subtle form of economic penetration. And in this drive a special target has been the less developed countries. Here huge populations have recently gained their independence, along with aspirations for improved levels of living far beyond their immediate productive capabilities. And here are pressures upon governments by populations, frequently goaded by want, who insist upon a quick improvement in their situation. Governments in such countries find it difficult to retain the adherence of their people unless they can show some progress toward fulfilling their aspirations. It is in these conditions that the Soviets push hardest with trade inducements and liberal loans—all, of course, to the usual propaganda tune that a better living for all men is possible only through the blessings of the Communist system.

In this postwar situation was also the fact of the colossal economic power of the United States and the question as to the role that we would occupy in world affairs. There is no need for me to recite here the detailed statistics of our economic strength. Our per capita income is five times higher than the world average, and the benefits of our great output are widely spread among all of our people. The gross output of our 168 million people is three times that of the 200 million people in Soviet Russia. These facts we know, and most of the world knows them, despite the hackneyed Marxist theme, reiterated for over a hundred years, that our capitalistic system is on the verge of collapse.

Decision To Cooperate

These, in broad summary, were some of the major elements in the assessment of American foreign policy in the postwar period. The choice of a course was analyzed, debated, and finally made by the American people through their elected representatives. The decision was that the United States could not go it alone in world affairs, however great its economic strength.
Militarily, it was recognized that we must have friends and allies, that they must be strong, and that our relations with them must be on the basis of mutual interest and understanding. It was recognized also that political and military ties, however well intentioned, are likely to be brittle unless based upon strong economic foundations and upon the common-sense principle of live and let live in economic affairs.

From this overall decision came our policy of close cooperation with other countries of the free world in economic and military as well as political affairs. For the first time in its peacetime history the United States is now joined with other countries in a number of formal international alliances and arrangements. In the military sector, our mutual defense alliances with other countries extend around the world. On the political side, our participation in the United Nations is a sharp departure from our unwillingness to join in the League of Nations a generation ago.

Our economic cooperation with other countries includes far more than what is usually referred to as economic aid in terms of financial assistance. Perhaps of more continuing significance in the long run are the measures of cooperative self-help we are taking with other countries. Our cooperative technical-assistance programs have a multiplier effect in implanted skills that will continue to bear fruit indefinitely. Other measures of cooperation in self-help are our participation in trade and financial arrangements with other countries to facilitate the expansion of production and the exchange of goods and services.

Our international trade arrangements, chiefly in our joint participation with 34 other countries in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, are directed toward the expansion of trade on a mutually beneficial basis. Our memberships in the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Finance Corporation are contributing to better financial and investment conditions in the world. Our participation in the United Nations, involving financial contributions for technical assistance to other countries, helps to promote improved economic and social conditions in the world as an important element in the maintenance of peace among nations. And among the agencies of the United Nations is the Food and Agriculture Organization and its specialized work in the field of agriculture. We have also contributed to the work of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Colombo Plan for economic cooperation in Asia, and the Organization of American States.

Encouraging Private Investment Abroad

In addition to our participation in international arrangements such as these, the United States is endeavoring to expand the flow of private investment funds to other countries as a preferred alternative to Government loans, grants, and other assistance. American private investments in themselves do much to strengthen the economies of other countries through the introduction of new skills and needed capital. American private investments in foreign countries amount to approximately $20 billion, and some 7,500 branches and subsidiaries of American firms are located abroad.

To encourage further expansion our Government offers convertibility and expropriation guaranties on American private investments abroad and Congress has been requested to reduce by 14 percentage points the Federal tax on earnings of corporate overseas investments. Another important factor in facilitating American private enterprise and investments abroad is the treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation that we have negotiated with a number of other countries. These treaties are in the nature of codes of fair treatment for our citizens who wish to trade, or invest in or run a business enterprise in a foreign country.

Foreign policy, of course, covers many other economic matters that I will not attempt to describe or even to enumerate. But perhaps I have said enough to show that our policy of economic cooperation with other countries is being carried out on a large scale and on many fronts. It is a policy that would be in our interest regardless of the Communist threat, because a high level of international trade is imperative for our continued economic growth and foreign trade is profitable for us only to the extent that other countries can trade with us and can pay in earned dollars for what they want to buy from us.

But the fact of a Communist threat gives political urgency to our foreign economic policies. To the extent that these policies serve to strengthen our own country and other countries of the free world, they also serve collaterally to defeat the spread of communism.
Agricultural Programs

Among the successes we have achieved in our foreign economic policies, special commendation is due to the agricultural technical assistance that we have given to other countries. I say this from personal observation of the results obtained in a number of countries. An absolute must for the rehabilitation of Western Europe was the recovery of agriculture, and this was done with the help of our agricultural specialists and the active participation of our major farm organizations. A crippled Greece was helped back toward economic health by our technical assistance in restoring food production and work in blighted areas where people otherwise would have had no means of living. The story of war rehabilitation could be repeated for many areas.

In other places, where there was no physical war damage, the story is one of improved practices. In many countries the stick plow is being replaced by more modern equipment, and farmers who formerly produced barely enough for their subsistence are now able to lift their heads and become members of the economic community. New and more efficient farm methods have followed in the wake of our technologists, and the seed of continued improvement through self-help has been sown in the many countries that now emulate the American county-agent system, our 4-H Clubs, and our Future Farmers of America. The names may differ, but the principle of agricultural extension is now widely practiced in countries where our agricultural specialists have worked.

"Ambassadors in Shirt Sleeves"

In agricultural technical assistance, perhaps more than in most other fields, our people work directly with large groups abroad. These person-to-person relationships give an opportunity for better understanding by foreigners of the United States and its intentions and an opportunity for us to gain an understanding of the foreigner, his ways, and his problems. This kind of understanding is the substance of good relations among peoples, and it can be one of the major end products of a technical-assistance program carried out by competent workers. This kind of understanding is the essence, if you will, of international cooperation. It is small wonder that some of our people in technical-assistance work have been called "ambassadors in shirt sleeves."

Let me illustrate this with what happened in the valley of Tui-Hoa in central Viet-Nam, as told me by one of our returning officials who worked in that country. The Communists, before their expulsion, had destroyed the irrigation system of the valley. Without irrigation water, 100,000 people were unable to work to feed themselves. The outlook was nothing but misery. The newly established anti-Communist Government of Viet-Nam, with the help of the United States, went to work. A job that normally would have required 3 years was completed in 6 months, and the people of Tui-Hoa once again were able to earn their living in freedom.

The people in the valley understood the significance of the cooperative restoration of what had been destroyed by the Communists. Here was positive evidence of what the new government was doing to help its people to live from their own work. Here also was material evidence of the results of cooperation among free nations, with no thought of domination or exploitation of a weak country by the stronger one. The people of Tui-Hoa made their own assessment of the Communist propaganda and distortions during the 9 years of their occupation by Communist forces. At the celebration marking the opening of the reconstructed irrigation works huge banners along the route to the new dam were emblazoned "Long Live President Diem—Long Live Hosmer." Mr. Orville Hosmer was the American irrigation engineer who had been made available by the United States Government to furnish technical assistance in the reconstruction of the irrigation works. The people of Tui-Hoa, in their gratitude, expressed their appreciation in a solid way to the United States by presenting Mr. Hosmer with a baby elephant! (Let me add, parenthetically, that I do not believe the choice of an elephant instead of a donkey implied that the people of Tui-Hoa were intervening in the domestic affairs of the United States.)

And now I should like to raise a question that I am sure you have heard before. When we help other countries to produce better, are we not helping them to compete with us and are we not thereby decreasing our own exports?

I think I have already answered that question when I said that we cannot continue to be prosperous in an impoverished world and we cannot sell unless others can buy. Let me give more substance to that answer. We know that in the
United States we sell more farm and industrial products at higher returns when our business conditions generally are good. The same thing is true in international trade. With economic recovery and improvement in Western Europe and other parts of the world our foreign trade boomed. Our exports this year, excluding military aid, are running at an annual rate of $17 billion, an all-time high.

**Agricultural Surpluses**

But how reconcile our agricultural technical assistance to other countries with the $8 billion of agricultural surpluses owned by or pledged as collateral to the United States Government and the efforts we are making to dispose of these surpluses abroad at subsidized prices, through sales for foreign currencies, through barter, and by outright gifts to the needy? There are several separate although interrelated aspects to that question. Let me try to deal with some of them.

We are the largest importer of agricultural commodities in the world. These imports consist mainly of items that we do not produce or which supplement our own production, such as coffee, sugar, special types of tobacco, cocoa, rubber, and bananas. For commodities that fall in this category it is generally admitted that it makes good sense to help others to produce them better, or at lower cost.

But what about commodities already in burdensome supply here and abroad? For such commodities it can be argued that the United States would ill serve itself and other countries by aiding in a further expansion of production for export, thereby contributing to further decreases in world prices to the detriment of ourselves and of other exporting countries. Still, there are situations where people are unable to pay for imports, and unless they can produce for themselves they must do without or with very little.

Perhaps I can also illustrate this with the situation at Tui-Hoa. The irrigation system of Tui-Hoa was restored, enabling the people to grow rice. Suppose it had not been restored. Would this have created a market for commercial exports of rice from the United States, or from any other source? No, because, being unable to buy, the people of Tui-Hoa would have done without rice except to the extent that they were given charity. In time they probably would have reconstructed their irrigation system without outside aid, but it would have taken longer and life in the meantime would have been difficult. In these conditions I leave it to you to judge what the reaction of the people of Tui-Hoa might have been and whether their faith in their new government and its cooperation with the United States could have been sustained.

And now briefly to another aspect of agricultural technical assistance, namely, our own domestic agricultural surpluses and our disposal of them abroad. Certainly here, if we wished, we could easily make come true the Communist propaganda that our surpluses are being used to crush agricultural production in other countries through our disruption of markets. But we have not wished it, nor have we done it. In Public Law 450, relating to the disposal of agricultural surpluses abroad, it is expressly stipulated that reasonable precautions must be taken to assure that export sales for foreign currencies must be conducted without undue disruption of world prices. The President in turn issued a policy instruction that our products will be offered at competitive prices but that our agricultural surpluses under Public Law 480 will not be used to impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries by disrupting world prices. Accordingly, the surplus disposal program has been carefully administered with a view to the least possible interference with normal commercial sales. This we have done. Moreover, a large part of the proceeds from our sales for local currencies abroad is being used for the economic development of the recipient countries.

And now, finally, I should like to sum up what I have said by leaving this thought with you: We are living in a world transformed, a world that is different from the one in which you and I grew up. In the world of today a foreign policy consistent with our own best interests is a policy of close cooperation with other countries of the free world, and this cooperation must include cooperation in economic affairs. That is the policy we have. And in that policy an important element is the technical-assistance program that has shown itself to be so eminently successful.

---

3 For a recent progress report on the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, see ibid., Aug. 6, 1956, p. 230.
International Atomic Energy Agency Established

The International Atomic Energy Agency was established on October 26 at U. N. Headquarters in New York, when 70 nations signed a statute at the conclusion of a conference in which 81 nations participated. Following are the texts of a letter from President Eisenhower to João Carlos Muniz, president of the conference; a statement by President Eisenhower read at the closing session by Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; a statement by Ambassador James J. Wadsworth in the Main Committee of the conference on October 15; a statement by Ambassador Wadsworth at the closing session; and the statute.

LETTER AND STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

White House press release dated October 26
President Eisenhower to President Muniz

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I beg to acknowledge your gracious invitation to address the closing session of the Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency on October the twenty-sixth.

This invitation has been a source of gratification to me personally and to the people of the United States. It had been my earnest hope to appear at this historic Conference, at which the largest number of nations in history are met together. But it is now clear that the special circumstances of my present life—which add inescapable political engagements to my official duties—oblige me to deny myself the honor and privilege of accepting your great courtesy. It will be necessary for me to be present in Washington on Friday of this week.

May I hope, Mr. President, that you will express my sincere regrets to the assembled Delegates, and transmit to them some considerations which I had wished to present in person at the Conference's concluding session and which I am enclosing with this letter.

Sincerely, Dwight D. Eisenhower

Statement at Closing Session

Mr. President and Delegates to the Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

Almost three years have passed since I was honored by an invitation to speak to the General Assembly of the United Nations. On that occasion, I proposed in behalf of the United States that atomic power—the greatest force science ever placed in man’s hand—be put to work for peace.

Specifically, my proposal was: first, that governments begin, and continue, to make from their atomic materials stockpiled for war joint contributions to an International Agency; and, second, that this Agency be responsible for finding methods to apply these atomic materials to the needs of agriculture, medicine, and other peaceful pursuits of mankind.

The United States then pledged its entire heart and mind to finding how the miraculous inventiveness of man should be dedicated, not to his death, but consecrated to his life.

The atom was regarded, in 1953, as a terrible weapon for war. Since the first explosion in 1945, man had fearfully multiplied its destructiveness. People knew that a single airgroup could carry a more devastating cargo than all the bombs that fell on Britain in World War II. Several nations...
had learned to make atomic weapons and swiftly transport them across oceans and continents. To many people the doom of civilization in a nuclear war seemed inevitable. When they looked ahead, they saw no hope for a peaceful future.

The proposal made in 1953 by the United States offered: for apathy, action; for despair, hope; for the whirlpool of general war, a channel to the harbor of future peace.

From the time that proposal was made, I watched with ardent expectation the outcome of all the work done by the sponsoring powers and the working groups, and the debates in the General Assembly and at this culminating Conference. The planning and framing of the International Atomic Energy Agency has required many months of patience and intelligent effort. These labors have now been completed by the Conference's approval of the Statute.

I congratulate the Conference for what it has accomplished. The Statute, and the International Agency for which it provides, hold out to the world a fresh hope for peace.

Since the United States made its proposal in 1953, the intensity of the atom's destructiveness has again been greatly multiplied. For their own salvation, men are under a compulsion that must not be denied to turn this furious, mighty power from the devastation of war to the constructive purposes and practices of peace.

That is why the world needs fresh hope—a new chance for man working with man to root out past frustration and past hopelessness.

That is why the United States will never cease from seeking trustworthy agreements under which all nations will cooperate to disarm the atom.

To spur the coming of such a day, the peace-loving nations have pressed forward with benign uses of the atom for man's well-being and welfare. As increased knowledge makes more terrible the atom's might, it also brings closer the realization of its potential for good.

Peace can come from nations working together. When they have a common cause and a common interest, they are drawn together by this bond.

We—as one of the peace-loving nations—have sought to share our atomic skills and materials.

Last February, we offered to make available to friendly nations, for peaceful use, 20,000 kilograms of nuclear materials—an amount equal to that allocated for like use within the United States. And we have entered into agreements with thirty-seven nations represented at the Conference—and are negotiating with fourteen more—to cooperate in building in their hands atomic reactors, of all types and sizes, for peaceful works.

People have shown their hunger to learn the intricate mysteries of the new atomic science. We have tried to satisfy that hunger, to break open doors that sealed off the knowledge they sought—through initiating great scientific congresses and by providing libraries and training courses and schools. We have been happy to offer our knowledge of ways to use the atom for peace, of ways to use the atomic isotope in medical care and cure and in agriculture and industry. Because science is without boundaries, a common knowledge of the peaceful application of this new science can help us all to a better understanding of each other.

In all those things that we do as a government, the United States does not seek for domination or control or profit. Nor shall we as a government ever do so.

It is now for nations assembled at this Conference formally to adopt the Statute.

Here is what I, in behalf of the United States, propose.

First: It shall be my care, when our Congress reassembles, to present the Statute for official ratification by our Senate in accordance with our Constitution, and to request appropriate Congressional authority to transfer special nuclear materials to the International Atomic Energy Agency. I wish my country to be among the first to recognize by official action what you at this Conference have accomplished.

Second: To enable the International Atomic Energy Agency—upon its establishment by appropriate governmental actions—to start atomic research and power programs without delay, the United States will make available to the International Agency, on terms to be agreed with the Agency, 5,000 kilograms of the nuclear fuel uranium 235 from the 20,000 kilograms of such material allocated last February by the United States for peaceful uses by friendly nations.

Third: In addition to the above-mentioned initial 5,000 kilograms of uranium 235, the United States will continue to make available to the International Atomic Energy Agency nuclear materials that will match in amount the sum of all quantities of such materials made similarly available by all other members of the International Agency,
and on comparable terms, for the period between
the establishment of the Agency and July 1, 1960.
The United States will deliver these nuclear ma-
terials to the International Agency as they are re-
quired for Agency-approved projects.

Assuming that all nations represented at the
Conference undertake parallel steps,—within
their capabilities,—together we can overcome the
obstacles that lie ahead and prove to each other
that international controls are not only feasible
but generally acceptable as a way to achieve peace.

The prompt and successful functioning of the
Agency can begin to translate the myriad uses of
atomic energy into better living: in our homes, at
our work, during our travel and our rest.

At present, we see only the first fruits of this
atomic growth. Atomic-fueled plants, which are
being planned or built in this and several coun-
tries, will in a few years be producing power for
civilian uses: to turn the wheels of factories—
to light the darkness in countless homes.

We will not lead people to expect the advent
overnight of an atomic millennium. In many
countries, long and patient scientific experimenta-
tion and trial must precede the generation from
atomic sources of electric power that can com-
pete with that produced by using available coal,
oil, gas, or water power. But, in the meantime,
this International Agency will be encouraging
those scientific labors and research to hasten the
looked-for day.

The benefits of our daily living which will re-
sult from putting the atom to work for peace—
more abundant and cheaper power and light, irri-
gation of arid lands, less costly transportation, the
opening to industry of territories hitherto de-
nied—may come to us more slowly than we would
wish. But there is something more important
than these material benefits. I mean those high-
ways that lead to a settled tranquillity among
nations.

People have long been seeking a channel for
peaceful discussion. The International Atomic
Energy Agency offers one such channel. During
the last three years of deliberations upon its estab-
lishment and functioning, this channel has been
kept open. It shall be the purpose of the United
States to broaden this channel and to encourage its
general use.

Some day, we fervently hope, sanity will over-
come man's propensity to destroy himself. Then,
the world can beat its swords into ploughshares.

Ambassador Wadsworth Appointed
to IAEA Preparatory Commission

Press release 557 dated October 25

Secretary Dulles on October 25 appointed Ambas-
sador James J. Wadsworth to be the United States
Representative on the Preparatory Commission
of the International Atomic Energy Agency.
The Commission will carry out the steps neces-
sary to bring the agency into being. Ambassador
Wadsworth has served as the United States Repre-
sentative to the conference which approved the
statute for the International Atomic Energy Agency.
Since January 1956 he has carried forward the
statute negotiations on behalf of the United States
which have now been brought to a successful con-
clusion.

Ambassador Wadsworth is the Permanent Deputy
United States Representative to the United Nations,
a position he has held since 1953. He has been a
member of the United States delegation to the
United Nations General Assembly for the past 4
years.

All nations can turn their plants that make nuclear
fuel to an exclusively civilian use, and the fuel
in their stockpiled nuclear weapons can also be
put to work for man's health and welfare. In
that happy time, the giant of atomic energy can
become, not a frightening image of destructive
war, but an obedient servant in a prosperous and
peaceful world.

The real vision of the atomic future rests not
in the material abundance which it should eventu-
ally bring for man's convenience and comfort in
living. It lies in finding at last, through the
common use of such abundance, a way to make the
nations of the world friendly neighbors on the
same street.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR WADSWORTH,
OCTOBER 15

U.S./U.N. press release 2473 dated October 17

I wish only to make some general comments on
the present draft of article XII. I do not pro-
due to discuss at this time any of the amendments
which have been submitted. Some of those
amendments are under discussion among several
delegations, including my delegation, and it is my
fervent hope that compromises may be achieved
which will make some of the amendments accept-
able to my delegation as well as to other dele-
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gations that have spoken on this subject at the past several meetings.

I do believe, however, that there has been a certain amount of misunderstanding about some of the provisions of the draft, and I should like to try to clarify some of these misunderstandings. I have listened with great attention to the statements that have been made by those who feel that these controls are too onerous or too rigid. However, I fail to discern from any of the statements that any representative here advances the proposition that there should be no controls. I believe that we can safely say that all delegations recognize the need for controls. Further than that, I think we can safely say that all delegations recognize the need for relevant controls. The only differences of opinion lie in what might be interpreted as being relevant and what might be interpreted as being irrelevant and too harsh.

I would submit that an interpretation similar to that which we heard from other delegations here, notably the Brazilian delegation and most recently the Brazilian delegation, is a very simple and easy way of coming to a determination as to just what this article of the statute means. In fact, in my opinion it is the only way of reaching such a determination.

The high aims of the agency which we are striving to set up are well stated in article II, which has already been approved by the committee. The representative of South Africa has just referred to this point. Article II states:

The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contributions of atomic energy to peace, health, and prosperity throughout the world. It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.

The 11 articles which we have discussed and passed in this committee, with no negative votes to my recollection and with only one or two abstentions, provide a solid framework for realization of the agency’s first objective, namely, to put the atom to work for the benefit of the world. There is no objective more worthy of every nation’s wholehearted support, and I know of none to which the United States is prepared to give greater devotion. It would be unthinkable, however, to move ahead toward that great objective without adequate provision for the second objective set forth in article II, namely the assurance of nondiversion to military purposes.

In the view of the United States delegation, the system of safeguards provided for in article XII is of basic importance. We believe that the deletion of any fundamental feature from it would create a danger of diversions from agency projects to nonpeaceful uses. At the same time, it is designed to respect the rights and interests of those to whom it applies to the maximum degree consistent with effective application. We are confident that members availing themselves of the agency’s support will not find the application of article XII onerous in any way. What is perhaps more important in view of the situation obtaining in the world today, members will be reassured by the knowledge that the agency, in applying these safeguards to all its projects without favor, will not be assisting any of their neighbors to make atomic weapons.

I propose to run quickly through the provisions to show that they fully confirm the comments which I have just made on the adequacy of the system of safeguards there set forth, its reasonableness, and its fairness toward those to whom it applies. Before doing that, I should like to make a brief comment responsive to some fundamental questions on safeguards which arose in the course of the general debate at the beginning of this conference and in recent debate on this article.

**Fundamental Questions on Safeguards**

One may properly start with one of the most elementary questions: Why are safeguards necessary at all? The answer that immediately comes to mind seems to be sufficient. Small amounts of material used or produced in the course of agency-supported peaceful projects can be adapted for use in weapons of a destructive force almost beyond comparison with the most powerful weapons of the preatomic era, and more important still is the possibility that the explosion of only one such weapon in a local conflict might be enough to set off a worldwide conflagration. Granting that a sound system of safeguards could prevent the diversion of agency-provided elements to such ends, why is it worth the trouble, as long as there are atomic energy programs unrelated to the agency, and therefore not subject to its safeguards, which can produce the very weapons that agency-supported operations must stay away from completely? The existence of the agency and its safeguards would be no barrier to countries which already have the materials and the know-how for
making atomic weapons, or can get them from a source which does not insist upon safeguards.

The capacity, existing or potential, to make atomic weapons is a fact. It is a fact for which the agency is not responsible and which the agency cannot assume the primary responsibility to correct. But the agency must assume the responsibility of seeing that its activities do not make the existing situation worse. If the agency were to make the materials and information for peaceful development of atomic energy available throughout the world without full assurance that they cannot be used to produce weapons, it would be adding to a problem which, difficult as it is, is sufficiently confined to keep up the world's hope for a solution.

As I stated at the very beginning of this conference, the United States has made, and will continue to make, unremitting efforts to solve that problem. We are gratified that this conference has taken a first step to permit this agency to contribute to the solution by authorizing it to apply its safeguards on request to national, bilateral, and multilateral activities otherwise outside its scope. True, the agency cannot be expected to cope with the whole world problem of atomic weapons; but it can and must be sure that its own activities do not complicate that problem beyond solution.

Determining Relevancy

Turning now to the specific provisions of article XII, we note that the introductory words of paragraph A make the safeguards there listed applicable "to the extent relevant to the project or arrangement" in question. The phrase "to the extent relevant" establishes a rule of reason at the very beginning of the safeguards article. Thus, if an agency project were to involve only the supplying to a member of radioisotopes for medical diagnosis, for example, there would be no occasion and no need for approving the design of specialized equipment, to require the maintenance of operating records, to make any provision for disposition of fissionable byproducts, or to send any inspectors into the territory of the recipient state.

A similar case might be the supplying under a project agreement of a radioactive source not capable of contributing to the production of significant amounts of special fissionable material for the purpose of inducing chemical reactions in some industrial process, or for medical therapy, or for biological or agricultural research. In such a case, it might well be that none of the listed safeguards, except those relating to the protection of health and safety, could be regarded as relevant.

We can, of course, agree with the principle that the Board of Governors should exercise judgment and moderation in determining the relevancy of safeguards to be applied. Surely the Board must be responsive to the general conference, and the general conference will be made up in large measure of those states which have been characterized during this debate as the underdeveloped countries. Specifically, the controls applied to source materials before irradiation should be the minimum necessary and should not and will not be of the same order as those which will have to be applied to byproduct fissionable materials. And it will be my Government's position, if we serve on this Board, that this principle shall be applied in the management of the agency. I think I might add that never since the drafts of this article were started, never since I have had anything to do with this matter, beginning in Washington last February, has there been any thought that the maximum safeguards would be applied regardless of the importance of the project. Perhaps it is not completely understood, but it should be, that, when we talk about including source materials, we are not talking about ore in the ground; we are not talking about mining operations; we are not talking about anything except the point where that source material mining operations; we are not talking about anything except the point where that source material approaches and actively enters the project concerning which it should be controlled.

Thus, if we run down the list of safeguards specified in article XII, paragraph A, it will be seen that, in situations where the safeguards are relevant, they are not likely to be unduly burdensome. As has been pointed out by other representatives, the right to approve the design of any specified equipment and facilities, for example, does not impose an unlimited obligation on the member concerned to lay every detail of its facilities before the agency. The agency's approval is based only on the considerations suggested by article XII itself; that is, whether the design in question would permit effective application of the enumerated safeguards and insure that the project will not further any military purpose. There is no intention to extend the agency's right to approve or disapprove under article XII the design where it is not relevant to the problem of safe-
guarding or to base the agency's decision on any criterion unrelated to safeguards.

As for the second listed safeguard, requiring observance of health and safety measures prescribed by the agency, I cannot imagine that any member would regard this provision, aimed at the protection of its own citizens and their property, as an undesirable burden.

The third and fourth safeguards, dealing with the maintenance of operating records to provide accountability for source and special fissionable materials, and with progress reports, could not be regarded as burdensome even if they were not as indispensable as they are in assuring against diversion to military purposes. We submit that sound management alone, without regard to the problem of safeguards, would dictate the maintenance of accurate accountability for as valuable an asset as source and special fissionable materials, and no well-run enterprise could long continue without the equivalent of progress reports.

**Disposition of Byproducts**

The fifth listed safeguard is the most crucial of all and, as we all know, provides, first, that the means used for chemical processing of materials irradiated in a project must be approved by the agency. Because of the possibilities of diversion at the stage of chemical processing, investing the agency with this right is indispensable. This subparagraph also gives the agency the right to specify disposition of any special fissionable materials recovered or produced as a byproduct of the project or arrangement in question. Since it is precisely the special fissionable materials recovered or produced as a byproduct which are the elements most readily susceptible of diversion to military use and most dangerous to health and safety, it is essential, in our opinion, to insure that these materials cannot be diverted for military purposes. This subparagraph also provides the basis for preventing the accumulation of stockpiles of special fissionable materials recovered or produced as a byproduct of a project or arrangement. All such materials are to be deposited with the agency, except for quantities authorized by the agency to be retained for specified nonmilitary use under continuing agency safeguards.

As was pointed out by the representative of Canada on Friday [October 12]—and we would willingly support the clarification he suggested—this does not mean that the country producing such materials will not be permitted to retain them merely because the agency is dissatisfied on technical or economic grounds with the use to which the materials are to be put. But it does mean, and it is meant to mean, that the retention must be for use and not merely for accumulation in a stockpile. Elsewhere it is also provided that in its activities the agency must guard against the undue amassing or collecting of dangerous amounts of special fissionable material. This is one of the cases in point. Since a stockpile honestly intended for future peaceful use is indistinguishable from one intended for future military use and, in fact, might be quickly turned to military use, the agency cannot permit the accumulation of any stockpiles of fissionable materials derived from agency-supported projects other than stockpiles under agency control.

It is important to emphasize here again that this safeguard is not onerous in its application. The fact that a nation producing byproduct fissionable materials in an agency-supported project cannot stockpile them itself does not mean that it cannot make full use of them for any peaceful purpose it may choose, under continuing agency safeguards. If this use is not immediate and there must be a period of deposit with the agency, it is not unlikely that the costs of storage in agency facilities could be less than they would be if numerous small storage facilities had to be set up in each recipient country for the needs of each individual project.

We now come to subparagraph 6, which gives the agency the right to send inspectors into the territory of the recipient states for the purpose of verifying compliance with the applicable safeguards. Without such a provision, the safeguarding machinery of the agency would, in our view, be meaningless. I point out that the inspectors under the agency system of safeguards are members of the staff of the agency, and we sincerely trust that they will be drawn from all members of the agency. Therefore they are selected according to the high standards set forth in article VII, which we have recently approved. I point out also that they are to be designated after consultation with the state or states concerned. They are to be given access at all times to all places, persons, and data necessary to account for the source and special fissionable materials involved in the project and to determine whether there is compliance with the other applicable safeguards.
It is important to emphasize that, although the inspectors are given access to all places, persons, and data, this is subject to the limitation contained in the words "necessary to account for," and so forth. It always lies within the power of the inspected member to keep the inspection from becoming burdensome by directing the inspectors to such places, persons, and data as will fully account for the source and special fissionable materials involved and will clearly show compliance with the other safeguards.

The seventh subparagraph provides that the agency may suspend or terminate assistance in the event of noncompliance. It is to be noted here that the state in question is to be given a reasonable time in which to take corrective steps before any sanctions are to be applied.

Paragraph B provides for the establishment of a staff of inspectors and gives the inspectors the responsibility of examining all operations conducted by the agency itself to assure that the agency's activities comply with the safeguarding measures equally as do the recipient countries.

Paragraph C states the responsibilities of the inspectors in administering the safeguards listed in paragraph A. It also spells out the procedures by which sanctions are to be brought to bear in the event of noncompliance. Note that the inspectors report noncompliance to the Director General, who in turn transmits the report to the Board of Governors. It is only the Board of Governors which may apply sanctions, and here, too, it is only after it has called upon the state in question to take corrective action and has given it a reasonable time to do so. In this respect, paragraph C is a spelling out in some detail of what was stated summarily as a right and responsibility in paragraph A-7.

In conclusion, I should like to repeat that my remarks today are directed toward the article as it is now written. They do not preclude the acceptance by my delegation of reasonable amendments, which are, as I say, under discussion at this time. I pledge the efforts of my delegation to this end because I agree thoroughly with the representative of Afghanistan in his statement that the statute which we produce here must be acceptable to the largest possible number of nations. As far as I am concerned, I have always held that to be the basic tenet of our position. It must be acceptable to the largest possible number of all of us here, always with the understanding that the changes that are made must not be such as to endanger the support of this agency by those countries that are expected to support it.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR WADSWORTH, OCTOBER 23

U.S./U.N. press release 2476 dated October 23

In my opening remarks to this conference—only some 5 weeks ago—I expressed the hope that at the end of our conference we would be able to say to our fellow men: We have done something here that makes it more likely that we and our children will live out our lives in peace—we have done something, in the words of the United Nations Charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."1

I sincerely believe that our conference has accomplished this objective. In large measure, Mr. President [João Carlos Muniiz of Brazil], our success can be attributed to the outstanding statesmanship with which you have guided our deliberations. Our discussions have required constant tact, resourcefulness, and determination from you, sir. Our achievement represents yet another distinguished accomplishment in your already distinguished career.

We are grateful to our Vice President, Dr. [Pavel] Winkler [of Czechoslovakia], for the consistently fair, able, and effective way he has handled our discussions when he has been in the chair. We wish also to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General and particularly to Dr. Ralph Bunche [Under-Secretary] for his valuable advice and collaboration in the work of this conference. To the entire secretariat may I express our appreciation for the excellent service they have rendered.

Yet, fellow delegates, leadership even of the highest quality cannot do the whole job. I want to express my personal thanks to each and every delegate here—and my pride in being part of this historic undertaking. The spirit of harmony and good will which has characterized this meeting, Mr. President, augurs well for the success of the new agency.

It is not always easy to recognize a turning point in history, but I have often wondered during our deliberations if the creation of this agency might

not represent such an occasion. Not tomorrow, perhaps not next year, but in the years to come the promise of atomic energy for bettering life on this planet challenges the imagination. Science has given us the knowledge. Diplomacy has developed the instrument. May we have the wisdom to use both for the benefit of all mankind!

STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

ARTICLE I

Establishment of the Agency

The Parties hereto establish an International Atomic Energy Agency (hereinafter referred to as "the Agency") upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE II

Objectives

The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.

ARTICLE III

Functions

A. The Agency is authorized:

1. to encourage and assist research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful uses throughout the world; and, if requested to do so, to act as an intermediary for the purposes of securing the performance of services or the supplying of materials, equipment, or facilities by one member of the Agency for another; and to perform any operation or service useful in research on, or development or practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes;

2. to make provision, in accordance with this Statute, for materials, services, equipment, and facilities to meet the needs of research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes, including the production of electric power, with due consideration for the needs of the under-developed areas of the world;

3. to foster the exchange of scientific and technical information on peaceful uses of atomic energy;

4. to encourage the exchange and training of scientists and experts in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy;

5. to establish and administer safeguards designed to ensure that special fissionable and other materials, services, equipment, facilities, and information made available by the Agency or at its request or under its supervision or control are not used in such a way as to further any military purpose; and to apply safeguards, at the request of the parties, to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, or, at the request of a State, to any of that State's activities in the field of atomic energy;

6. to establish or adopt, in consultation and, where appropriate, in collaboration with the competent organs of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies concerned, standards of safety for protection of health and minimization of danger to life and property (including such standards for labour conditions), and to provide for the application of these standards to its own operations as well as to the operations making use of materials, services, equipment, facilities, and information made available by the Agency or at its request or under its control or supervision; and to provide for the application of these standards, at the request of the parties, to operations under any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, or, at the request of a State, to any of that State's activities in the field of atomic energy;

7. to acquire or establish any facilities, plant and equipment useful in carrying out its authorized functions, whenever the facilities, plant, and equipment otherwise available to it in the area concerned are inadequate or available only on terms it deems unsatisfactory.

B. In carrying out its functions, the Agency shall:

1. conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations to promote peace and international co-operation, and in conformity with policies of the United Nations furthering the establishment of safeguarded world-wide disarmament and in conformity with any international agreements entered into pursuant to such policies;

2. establish control over the use of special fissionable materials received by the Agency, in order to ensure that these materials are used only for peaceful purposes;

3. allocate its resources in such a manner as to secure efficient utilization and the greatest possible general benefit in all areas of the world, bearing in mind the special needs of the under-developed areas of the world;

4. submit reports on its activities annually to the General Assembly of the United Nations and, when appropriate, to the Security Council; if in connexion with the activities of the Agency there should arise questions that are within the competence of the Security Council, the Agency shall notify the Security Council, as the organ bearing the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and may also take the measures open to it under this Statute, including those provided in paragraph C of article XII;

5. submit reports to the Economic and Social Council and other organs of the United Nations on matters within the competence of these organs.

C. In carrying out its functions, the Agency shall not make assistance to members subject to any political, economic, military, or other conditions incompatible with the provisions of this Statute.

D. Subject to the provisions of this Statute and to the terms of agreements concluded between a State or a
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group of States and the Agency which shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Statute, the activities of the Agency shall be carried out with due observance of the sovereign rights of States.

**Article IV**

**Membership**

A. The initial members of the Agency shall be those States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies which shall have signed this Statute within ninety days after it is opened for signature and shall have deposited an instrument of ratification.

B. Other members of the Agency shall be those States, whether or not Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies, which deposit an instrument of acceptance of this Statute after their membership has been approved by the General Conference upon the recommendation of the Board of Governors. In recommending and approving a State for membership, the Board of Governors and the General Conference shall determine that the State is able and willing to carry out the obligations of membership in the Agency, giving due consideration to its ability and willingness to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

C. The Agency is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members, and all members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with this Statute.

**Article V**

**General Conference**

A. A General Conference consisting of representatives of all members shall meet in regular annual session and in such special sessions as shall be convened by the Director General at the request of the Board of Governors or of a majority of members. The sessions shall take place at the headquarters of the Agency unless otherwise determined by the General Conference.

B. At such sessions, each member shall be represented by one delegate who may be accompanied by alternates and by advisers. The cost of attendance of any delegation shall be borne by the member concerned.

C. The General Conference shall elect a President and such other officers as may be required at the beginning of each session. They shall hold office for the duration of the session. The General Conference, subject to the provisions of this Statute, shall adopt its own rules of procedure. Each member shall have one vote. Decisions pursuant to paragraph H of article XIV, paragraph C of article XVIII and paragraph B of article XIX shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional questions or categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting. A majority of members shall constitute a quorum.

D. The General Conference may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of this Statute or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in this Statute, and may make recommendations to the membership of the Agency or to the Board of Governors or to both on any such questions or matters.

E. The General Conference shall:

1. elect members of the Board of Governors in accordance with article VI;
2. approve States for membership in accordance with article IV;
3. suspend a member from the privileges and rights of membership in accordance with article XIX;
4. consider the annual report of the Board;
5. in accordance with article XIV, approve the budget of the Agency recommended by the Board or return it with recommendations as to its entirety or parts to the Board, for resubmission to the General Conference;
6. approve reports to be submitted to the United Nations as required by the relationship agreement between the Agency and the United Nations, except reports referred to in paragraph C of article XII, or return them to the Board with its recommendations;
7. approve any agreement or agreements between the Agency and the United Nations and other organizations as provided in article XVI or return such agreements with its recommendations to the Board, for resubmission to the General Conference;
8. approve rules and limitations regarding the exercise of borrowing powers by the Board, in accordance with paragraph G of article XIV; approve rules regarding the acceptance of voluntary contributions to the Agency; and approve, in accordance with paragraph F of article XIV, the manner in which the general fund referred to in that paragraph may be used;
9. approve amendments to this Statute in accordance with paragraph C of article XVIII;
10. approve the appointment of the Director General in accordance with paragraph A of article VII.

F. The General Conference shall have the authority:

1. to take decisions on any matters specifically referred to the General Conference for this purpose by the Board;
2. to propose matters for consideration by the Board and request from the Board reports on any matter relating to the functions of the Agency.

**Article VI**

**Board of Governors**

A. The Board of Governors shall be composed as follows:

1. The outgoing Board of Governors (or in the case of the first Board, the Preparatory Commission referred to in Annex 1) shall designate for membership on the Board the five members most advanced in the technology of atomic energy including the production of source materials and the member most advanced in the technology of atomic energy including the production of source materials in each of the following areas not represented by the aforesaid five:
   (1) North America
   (2) Latin America
   (3) Western Europe

November 19, 1956
(4) Eastern Europe
(5) Africa and the Middle East
(6) South Asia
(7) South East Asia and the Pacific
(8) Far East.

2. The outgoing Board of Governors (or in the case of the first Board, the Preparatory Commission referred to in Annex 1) shall designate for membership on the Board two members from among the following other producers of source materials: Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Portugal; and shall also designate for membership on the Board one other member as a supplier of technical assistance. No member in this category in any one year will be eligible for redesignation in the same category for the following year.

3. The General Conference shall elect ten members to membership on the Board of Governors, with due regard to equitable representation on the Board as a whole of the members in the areas listed in sub-paragraph A-1 of this article, so that the Board shall at all times include in this category a representative of each of those areas except North America. Except for the five members chosen for a term of one year in accordance with paragraph D of this article, no member in this category in any one term of office will be eligible for re-election in the same category for the following term of office.

B. The designations provided for in sub-paragraphs A-1 and A-2 of this article shall take place not less than sixty days before each regular annual session of the General Conference. The elections provided for in sub-paragraph A-3 of this article shall take place at regular annual sessions of the General Conference.

C. Members represented on the Board of Governors in accordance with sub-paragraphs A-1 and A-2 of this article shall hold office from the end of the next regular annual session of the General Conference after their designation until the end of the following regular annual session of the General Conference.

D. Members represented on the Board of Governors in accordance with sub-paragraph A-3 of this article shall hold office from the end of the regular annual session of the General Conference at which they are elected until the end of the second regular annual session of the General Conference thereafter. In the election of these members for the first Board, however, five shall be chosen for a term of one year.

E. Each member of the Board of Governors shall have one vote. Decisions on the amount of the Agency's budget shall be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting, as provided in paragraph II of article XIV. Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional questions or categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of those present and voting. Two-thirds of all members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

F. The Board of Governors shall have authority to carry out the functions of the Agency in accordance with this Statute, subject to its responsibilities to the General Conference as provided in this Statute.

G. The Board of Governors shall meet at such times as it may determine. The meetings shall take place at the headquarters of the Agency unless otherwise determined by the Board.

H. The Board of Governors shall elect a Chairman and other officers from among its members and, subject to the provisions of this Statute, shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

I. The Board of Governors may establish such committees as it deems advisable. The Board may appoint persons to represent it in its relations with other organizations.

J. The Board of Governors shall prepare an annual report to the General Conference concerning the affairs of the Agency and any projects approved by the Agency. The Board shall also prepare for submission to the General Conference such reports as the Agency is or may be required to make to the United Nations or to any other organization the work of which is related to that of the Agency. These reports, along with the annual reports, shall be submitted to members of the Agency at least one month before the regular annual session of the General Conference.

ARTICLE VII

Staff

A. The staff of the Agency shall be headed by a Director General. The Director General shall be appointed by the Board of Governors with the approval of the General Conference for a term of four years. He shall be the chief administrative officer of the Agency.

B. The Director General shall be responsible for the appointment, organization, and functioning of the staff and shall be under the authority of and subject to the control of the Board of Governors. He shall perform his duties in accordance with regulations adopted by the Board.

C. The staff shall include such qualified scientific and technical and other personnel as may be required to fulfill the objectives and functions of the Agency. The Agency shall be guided by the principle that its permanent staff shall be kept to a minimum.

D. The paramount consideration in the recruitment and employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be to secure employees of the highest standards of efficiency, technical competence, and integrity. Subject to this consideration, due regard shall be paid to the contributions of members to the Agency and to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

E. The terms and conditions on which the staff shall be appointed, remunerated, and dismissed shall be in accordance with regulations made by the Board of Governors, subject to the provisions of this Statute and to general rules approved by the General Conference on the recommendation of the Board.

F. In the performance of their duties, the Director General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any source external to the Agency. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as officials of the Agency; subject to their responsibilities to the Agency, they shall not disclose any industrial secret or other confidential information coming to their knowledge by reason of their official duties.
for the Agency. Each member undertakes to respect
the international character of the responsibilities of the
Director General and the staff and shall not seek to
influence them in the discharge of their duties.

G. In this article the term "staff" includes guards.

**ARTICLE VIII**

*Exchange of information*

A. Each member shall make available such information
as would, in the judgement of the member, be helpful to
the Agency.

B. Each member shall make available to the Agency
all scientific information developed as a result of assistance
extended by the Agency pursuant to article XI.

C. The Agency shall assemble and make available in an
accessible form the information made available to it
under paragraphs A and B of this article. It shall take
positive steps to encourage the exchange among its mem-
bers of information relating to the nature and peaceful
uses of atomic energy and shall serve as an intermedi-
ary among its members for this purpose.

**ARTICLE IX**

*Supplying of materials*

A. Members may make available to the Agency such
quantities of special fissionable materials as they deem
advisable and on such terms as shall be agreed with the
Agency. The materials made available to the Agency
at the discretion of the member making them available,
be stored either by the member concerned or, with
the agreement of the Agency, in the Agency's depots.

B. Members may also make available to the Agency
source materials as defined in article XX and other
materials. The Board of Governors shall determine the
quantities of such materials which the Agency will accept
under agreements provided for in article XIII.

C. Each member shall notify the Agency of the quanti-
ties, form, and composition of special fissionable materials,
source materials, and other materials which that member is prepared, in conformity with its laws, to make
available immediately or during a period specified by
the Board of Governors.

D. On request of the Agency a member shall, from the
materials which it has made available, without delay
deliver to another member or group of members such
quantities of such materials as the Agency may specify,
and shall without delay deliver to the Agency itself such
quantities of such materials as are really necessary for
operations and scientific research in the facilities of the
Agency.

E. The quantities, form and composition of materials
made available by any member may be changed at any
time by the member with the approval of the Board of
Governors.

F. An initial notification in accordance with paragraph
C of this article shall be made within three months of the
entry into force of this Statute with respect to the mem-
ber concerned. In the absence of a contrary decision of
the Board of Governors, the materials initially made
available shall be for the period of the calendar year
succeeding the year when this Statute takes effect with
respect to the member concerned. Subsequent notifica-
tions shall likewise, in the absence of a contrary action
by the Board, relate to the period of the calendar year fol-
lowing the notification and shall be made no later than
the first day of November of each year.

G. The Agency shall specify the place and method of
delivery and, where appropriate, the form and composi-
tion, of materials which it has requested a member to
deliver from the amounts which that member has notified
the Agency it is prepared to make available. The Agency
shall also verify the quantities of materials delivered
and shall report those quantities periodically to the mem-
bers.

H. The Agency shall be responsible for storing and
protecting materials in its possession. The Agency shall
ensure that these materials shall be safeguarded against
(1) hazards of the weather, (2) unauthorized removal or
diversion, (3) damage or destruction, including sabotage,
and (4) forcible seizure. In storing special fissible materials in its possession, the Agency shall en-
sure the geographical distribution of these materials in
such a way as not to allow concentration of large amounts
of such materials in any one country or region of the
world.

1. The Agency shall as soon as practicable establish or
acquire such of the following as may be necessary:

   1. plant, equipment, and facilities for the receipt,
      storage, and issue of materials;
   2. physical safeguards;
   3. adequate health and safety measures;
   4. control laboratories for the analysis and verifica-
      tion of materials received;
   5. housing and administrative facilities for any staff
      required for the foregoing.

J. The materials made available pursuant to this arti-
cle shall be used as determined by the Board of Governors
in accordance with the provisions of this Statute. No
member shall have the right to require that the materials
it makes available to the Agency be kept separately by
the Agency or to designate the specific project in which
they must be used.

**ARTICLE X**

*Services, equipment, and facilities*

Members may make available to the Agency services,
equipment, and facilities which may be of assistance in
fulfilling the Agency's objectives and functions.

**ARTICLE XI**

*Agency projects*

A. Any member or group of members of the Agency de-
siring to set up any project for research on, or develop-
ment or practical application of, atomic energy for peace-
ful purposes may request the assistance of the Agency
in securing special fissible and other materials, services,
equipment, and facilities necessary for this purpose.
Any such request shall be accompanied by an explana-
tion of the purpose and extent of the project and shall
be considered by the Board of Governors.

B. Upon request, the Agency may also assist any mem-
ber or group of members to make arrangements to secure
necessary financing from outside sources to carry out such projects. In extending this assistance, the Agency will not be required to provide any guarantees or to assume any financial responsibility for the project.

C. The Agency may arrange for the supplying of any materials, services, equipment, and facilities necessary for the project by one or more members or may itself undertake to provide any or all of these directly, taking into consideration the wishes of the member or members making the request.

D. For the purpose of considering the request, the Agency may send into the territory of the member or group of members making the request a person or persons qualified to examine the project. For this purpose the Agency may, with the approval of the member or group of members making the request, use members of its own staff or employ suitably qualified nationals of any member.

E. Before approving a project under this article, the Board of Governors shall give due consideration to:

1. the usefulness of the project, including its scientific and technical feasibility;
2. the adequacy of plans, funds, and technical personnel to assure the effective execution of the project;
3. the adequacy of proposed health and safety standards for handling and storing materials and for operating facilities;
4. the inability of the member or group of members making the request to secure the necessary finances, materials, facilities, equipment, and services;
5. the equitable distribution of materials and other resources available to the Agency;
6. the special needs of the under-developed areas of the world; and
7. such other matters as may be relevant.

F. Upon approving a project, the Agency shall enter into an agreement with the member or group of members submitting the project, which agreement shall:

1. provide for allocation to the project of any required special fissionable or other materials;
2. provide for transfer of special fissionable materials from their then place of custody, whether the materials be in the custody of the Agency or of the member making them available for use in Agency projects, to the member or group of members submitting the project, under conditions which ensure the safety of any shipment required and meet applicable health and safety standards;
3. set forth the terms and conditions, including charges, on which any materials, services, equipment, and facilities are to be provided by the Agency itself, and, if any such materials, services, equipment, and facilities are to be provided by a member, the terms and conditions as arranged for by the member or group of members submitting the project and the supplying member;
4. include undertakings by the member or group of members submitting the project (a) that the assistance provided shall not be used in such a way as to further any military purpose; and (b) that the project shall be subject to the safeguards provided for in article XII, the relevant safeguards being specified in the agreement;
5. make appropriate provision regarding the rights and interests of the Agency and the member or members concerned in any inventions or discoveries, or any patents therein, arising from the project;
6. make appropriate provision regarding settlement of disputes;
7. include such other provisions as may be appropriate.

G. The provisions of this article shall also apply where appropriate to a request for materials, services, facilities, or equipment in connexion with an existing project.

**Article XII**

**Agency safeguards**

A. With respect to any Agency project, or other arrangement where the Agency is requested by the parties concerned to apply safeguards, the Agency shall have the following rights and responsibilities to the extent relevant to the project or arrangement:

1. to examine the design of specialized equipment and facilities, including nuclear reactors, and to approve it only from the viewpoint of assuring that it will not further any military purpose, that it complies with applicable health and safety standards, and that it will permit effective application of the safeguards provided for in this article;
2. to require the observance of any health and safety measures prescribed by the Agency;
3. to require the maintenance and production of operating records to assist in ensuring accountability for source and special fissionable materials used or produced in the project or arrangement;
4. to call for and receive progress reports;
5. to approve the means to be used for the chemical processing of irradiated materials solely to ensure that this chemical processing will not lend itself to diversion of materials for military purposes and will comply with applicable health and safety standards; to require that special fissionable materials recovered or produced as a by-product be used for peaceful purposes under continuing Agency safeguards for research or in reactors, existing or under construction, specified by the member or members concerned; and to require deposit with the Agency of any excess of any special fissionable materials recovered or produced as a by-product over what is needed for the above-stated uses in order to prevent stockpiling of these materials, provided that thereafter at the request of the member or members concerned special fissionable materials so deposited with the Agency shall be returned promptly to the member or members concerned for use under the same provisions as stated above;
6. to send into the territory of the recipient State or States inspectors, designated by the Agency after consultation with the State or States concerned, who shall have access at all times to all places and data and to any person who by reason of his occupation deals with materials, equipment, or facilities which are required by this Statute to be safeguarded, as necessary to account for source and special fissionable materials supplied and fissionable products and to determine whether there is compliance with the undertaking against use in furtherance.
of any military purpose referred to in sub-paragraph F–4 of article XI, with the health and safety measures referred to in sub-paragraph A–2 of this article, and with any other conditions prescribed in the agreement between the Agency and the State or States concerned. Inspectors designated by the Agency shall be accompanied by representatives of the authorities of the State concerned, if that State so requests, provided that the inspectors shall not thereby be delayed or otherwise impeded in the exercise of their functions;

7. in the event of non-compliance and failure by the recipient State or States to take requested corrective steps within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate assistance and withdraw any materials and equipment made available by the Agency or a member in furtherance of the project.

B. The Agency shall, as necessary, establish a staff of inspectors. The staff of inspectors shall have the responsibility of examining all operations conducted by the Agency itself to determine whether the Agency is complying with the health and safety measures prescribed by it for application to projects subject to its approval, supervision or control, and whether the Agency is taking adequate measures to prevent the source and special fissionable materials in its custody or used or produced by its own operations from being used in furtherance of any military purpose. The Agency shall take remedial action forthwith to correct any non-compliance or failure to take adequate measures.

C. The staff of inspectors shall also have the responsibility of obtaining and verifying the accounting referred to in sub-paragraph A–6 of this article and of determining whether there is compliance with the undertaking referred to in sub-paragraph F–4 of article XI, with the measures referred to in sub-paragraph A–2 of this article, and with all other conditions of the project prescribed in the agreement between the Agency and the State or States concerned. The inspectors shall report any non-compliance to the Director General who shall thereupon transmit the report to the Board of Governors. The Board shall call upon the recipient State or States to remedy forthwith any non-compliance which it finds to have occurred. The Board shall report the non-compliance to all members and to the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations. In the event of failure of the recipient State or States to take fully corrective action within a reasonable time, the Board may take one or both of the following measures: direct curtailment or suspension of assistance being provided by the Agency or by a member, and call for the return of materials and equipment made available to the recipient member or group of members. The Agency may also, in accordance with article XIX, suspend any non-complying member from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership.

**Article XIII**

**Reimbursement of members**

Unless otherwise agreed upon between the Board of Governors and the member furnishing to the Agency materials, services, equipment, or facilities, the Board shall enter into an agreement with such member providing for reimbursement for the items furnished.

**Article XIV**

**Finance**

A. The Board of Governors shall submit to the General Conference the annual budget estimates for the expenses of the Agency. To facilitate the work of the Board in this regard, the Director General shall initially prepare the budget estimates. If the General Conference does not approve the estimates, it shall return them together with its recommendations to the Board. The Board shall then submit further estimates to the General Conference for its approval.

B. Expenditures of the Agency shall be classified under the following categories:

1. Administrative expenses: these shall include:

   (a) costs of the staff of the Agency other than the staff employed in connexion with materials, services, equipment, and facilities referred to in sub-paragraph B–2 below; costs of meetings; and expenditures required for the preparation of Agency projects and for the distribution of information;

   (b) costs of implementing the safeguards referred to in article XII in relation to Agency projects or, under sub-paragraph A–5 of article III, in relation to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, together with the costs of handling and storage of special fissionable material by the Agency other than the storage and handling charges referred to in paragraph E below;

2. Expenses, other than those included in sub-paragraph 1 of this paragraph, in connexion with any materials, facilities, plant, and equipment acquired or established by the Agency in carrying out its authorized functions, and the costs of materials, services, equipment, and facilities provided by it under agreements with one or more members.

C. In fixing the expenditures under sub-paragraph B–1 (b) above, the Board of Governors shall deduct such amounts as are recoverable under agreements regarding the application of safeguards between the Agency and parties to bilateral or multilateral arrangements.

D. The Board of Governors shall apportion the expenses referred to in sub-paragraph B–1 above, among members in accordance with a scale to be fixed by the General Conference. In fixing the scale the General Conference shall be guided by the principles adopted by the United Nations in assessing contributions of Member States to the regular budget of the United Nations.

E. The Board of Governors shall establish periodically a scale of charges, including reasonable uniform storage and handling charges, for materials, services, equipment, and facilities furnished to members by the Agency. The scale shall be designed to produce revenues for the Agency adequate to meet the expenses and costs referred to in sub-paragraph B–2 above, less any voluntary contributions which the Board of Governors may, in accordance with paragraph F, apply for this purpose. The proceeds of such charges shall be placed in a separate fund which shall be used to pay members for any materials, services, equipment, or facilities furnished by them and to meet other expenses referred to in sub-paragraph B–2 above which may be incurred by the Agency itself.
F. Any excess of revenues referred to in paragraph E over the expenses and costs there referred to, and any voluntary contributions to the Agency, shall be placed in a general fund which may be used as the Board of Governors, with the approval of the General Conference, may determine.

G. Subject to rules and limitations approved by the General Conference, the Board of Governors shall have the authority to exercise borrowing powers on behalf of the Agency without, however, imposing on members of the Agency any liability in respect of loans entered into pursuant to this authority, and to accept voluntary contributions made to the Agency.

H. Decisions of the General Conference on financial questions and of the Board of Governors on the amount of the Agency's budget shall require a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

**Article XV**

Privileges and immunities

A. The Agency shall enjoy in the territory of each member such legal capacity and such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the exercise of its functions.

B. Delegates of members together with their alternates and advisers, Governors appointed to the Board together with their alternates and advisers, and the Director General and the staff of the Agency, shall enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary in the independent exercise of their functions in connexion with the Agency.

C. The legal capacity, privileges, and immunities referred to in this article shall be defined in a separate agreement or agreements between the Agency, represented for this purpose by the Director General acting under instructions of the Board of Governors, and the members.

**Article XVI**

Relationship with other organizations

A. The Board of Governors, with the approval of the General Conference, is authorized to enter into an agreement or agreements establishing an appropriate relationship between the Agency and the United Nations and any other organizations the work of which is related to that of the Agency.

B. The agreement or agreements establishing the relationship of the Agency and the United Nations shall provide for:

1. Submission by the Agency of reports as provided for in sub-paragraphs B-4 and B-5 of article III;

2. Consideration by the Agency of resolutions relating to it adopted by the General Assembly or any of the Councils of the United Nations and the submission of reports, when requested, to the appropriate organ of the United Nations on the action taken by the Agency or by its members in accordance with this Statute as a result of such consideration.

**Article XVII**

Settlement of disputes

A. Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Statute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to the International Court of Justice in conformity with the Statute of the Court, unless the parties concerned agree on another mode of settlement.

B. The General Conference and the Board of Governors are separately empowered, subject to authorization from the General Assembly of the United Nations, to request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question arising within the scope of the Agency's activities.

**Article XVIII**

Amendments and withdrawals

A. Amendments to this Statute may be proposed by any member. Certified copies of the text of any amendment proposed shall be prepared by the Director General and communicated by him to all members at least ninety days in advance of its consideration by the General Conference.

B. At the fifth annual session of the General Conference following the coming into force of this Statute, the question of a general review of the provisions of this Statute shall be placed on the agenda of that session. On approval by a majority of the members present and voting, the review will take place at the following General Conference. Thereafter, proposals on the question of a general review of this Statute may be submitted for decision by the General Conference under the same procedure.

C. Amendments shall come into force for all members when:

(i) approved by the General Conference by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting after consideration of observations submitted by the Board of Governors on each proposed amendment, and

(ii) accepted by two-thirds of all the members in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. Acceptance by a member shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the depositary Government referred to in paragraph C of article XXI.

D. At any time after five years from the date when this Statute shall take effect in accordance with paragraph E of article XXI or whenever a member is unwilling to accept an amendment to this Statute, it may withdraw from the Agency by notice in writing to that effect given to the depositary Government referred to in paragraph C of article XXI, which shall promptly inform the Board of Governors and all members.

E. Withdrawal by a member from the Agency shall not affect its contractual obligations entered into pursuant to article XI or its budgetary obligations for the year in which it withdraws.

**Article XIX**

Suspension of privileges

A. A member of the Agency which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Agency shall have no vote in the Agency if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two years. The General Conference may, nevertheless, permit such a member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member.

B. A member which has persistently violated the provisions of this Statute or of any agreement entered into...
by it pursuant to this Statute may be suspended from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership by the General Conference acting by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting upon recommendation by the Board of Governors.

ARTICLE XX

Definitions

As used in this Statute:

1. The term "special fissionable material" means plutonium-239; uranium-233; uranium enriched in the isotopes 235 or 233; any material containing one or more of the foregoing; and such other fissionable material as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine; but the term "special fissionable material" does not include source material.

2. The term "uranium enriched in the isotopes 235 or 233" means uranium containing the isotopes 235 or 233 or both in an amount such that the abundance ratio of the sum of these isotopes to the isotope 238 is greater than the ratio of the isotope 235 to the isotope 238 occurring in nature.

3. The term "source material" means uranium containing the mixture of isotopes occurring in nature; uranium depleted in the isotope 235; thorium; any of the foregoing in the form of metal, alloy, chemical compound, or concentrate; any other material containing one or more of the foregoing in such concentration as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine; and such other material as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine.

ARTICLE XXI

Signature, acceptance, and entry into force

A. This Statute shall be open for signature on 26 October 1956 by all States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies and shall remain open for signature by those States for a period of ninety days.

B. The signatory States shall become parties to this Statute by deposit of an instrument of ratification.

C. Instruments of ratification by signatory States and instruments of acceptance by States whose membership has been approved under paragraph B of article IV of this Statute shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, hereby designated as depository Government.

D. Ratification or acceptance of this Statute shall be effected by States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

E. This Statute, apart from the Annex, shall come into force when eighteen States have deposited instruments of ratification in accordance with paragraph B of this article, provided that such eighteen States shall include at least three of the following States: Canada, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. Instruments of ratification and instruments of acceptance deposited thereafter shall take effect on the date of their receipt.

F. The depository Government shall promptly inform all States signatory to this Statute of the date of each deposit of ratification and the date of entry into force of the Statute. The depository Government shall promptly inform all signatories and members of the dates on which States subsequently become parties thereto.

G. The Annex to this Statute shall come into force on the first day this Statute is open for signature.

ARTICLE XXII

Registration with the United Nations

A. This Statute shall be registered by the depository Government pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

B. Agreements between the Agency and any member or members, agreements between the Agency and any other organization or organizations, and agreements between members subject to approval of the Agency, shall be registered with the Agency. Such agreements shall be registered by the Agency with the United Nations if registration is required under Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XXIII

Authentic texts and certified copies

This Statute, done in the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish languages, each being equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the depository Government. Duly certified copies of this Statute shall be transmitted by the depository Government to the Governments of the other signatory States and to the Governments of States admitted to membership under paragraph B of article IV.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Statute.

Done at the Headquarters of the United Nations, this twenty-sixth day of October, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-six. 3

ANNEX I

Preparatory Commission

A. A Preparatory Commission shall come into existence on the first day this Statute is open for signature. It shall be composed of one representative each of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Portugal, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America, and one representative each of six other States to be chosen by the International Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Preparatory Commission shall remain in existence until this Statute comes into force and thereafter until the General Conference has convened and a Board of Governors has been selected in accordance with article VI.

B. The expenses of the Preparatory Commission may be met by a loan provided by the United Nations and for this purpose the Preparatory Commission shall make the necessary arrangements with the appropriate authorities.

of the United Nations, including arrangements for repayment of the loan by the Agency. Should these funds be insufficient, the Preparatory Commission may accept advances from Governments. Such advances may be set off against the contributions of the Governments concerned to the Agency.

C. The Preparatory Commission shall:

1. elect its own officers, adopt its own rules of procedure, meet as often as necessary, determine its own place of meeting and establish such committees as it deems necessary;
2. appoint an executive secretary and staff as shall be necessary, who shall exercise such powers and perform such duties as the Commission may determine;
3. make arrangements for the first session of the General Conference, including the preparation of a provisional agenda and draft rules of procedure, such session to be held as soon as possible after the entry into force of this Statute;
4. make designations for membership on the first Board of Governors in accordance with sub-paragraphs A-1 and A-2 and paragraph B of article VI;
5. make studies, reports, and recommendations for the first session of the General Conference and for the first meeting of the Board of Governors on subjects of concern to the Agency requiring immediate attention, including (a) the financing of the Agency; (b) the programmes and budget for the first year of the Agency; (c) technical problems relevant to advance planning of Agency operations; (d) the establishment of a permanent Agency staff; and (e) the location of the permanent headquarters of the Agency;
6. make recommendations for the first meeting of the Board of Governors concerning the provisions of a headquarters agreement defining the status of the Agency and the rights and obligations which will exist in the relationship between the Agency and the host Government;
7. (a) enter into negotiations with the United Nations with a view to the preparation of a draft agreement in accordance with article XVI of this Statute, such draft agreement to be submitted to the first session of the General Conference and to the first meeting of the Board of Governors; and (b) make recommendations to the first session of the General Conference and to the first meeting of the Board of Governors concerning the relationship of the Agency to other international organizations as contemplated in article XVI of this Statute.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

UNESCO General Conference

The Department of State announced on November 5 (press release 570) the U.S. delegation to the ninth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco). The session will be held at New Delhi, India, November 5 to December 5. Delegates from most of the 77 member states of this specialized agency of the United Nations will attend the General Conference.

The U.S. Government will be represented by the following delegation:

U.S. Representatives
Stanley C. Allyn, Chairman, President, National Cash Register Company, Dayton, Ohio
Athelstan F. Spilhaus, Vice Chairman, Dean, Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota
Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger, Wayzata, Minn.
Helen C. Russell, San Francisco, Calif.
Asa T. Spaulding, Vice President, North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company, Durham, N.C.

Alternate U.S. Representatives
Herold C. Hunt, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Robert A. McClintock, American Ambassador to Cambodia

Congressional Adviser
Hugh Scott, House of Representatives

Special Assistant to the Chairman
Robert S. Oelman, Executive Vice President, National Cash Register Company, Dayton, Ohio

Advisers
Frank L. Fernbach, Research Department, American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.
Willard Givens, Washington, D.C.
Graham Hall, American Embassy, New Delhi
Ralph Hardy, Vice President, Columbia Broadcasting System, Washington, D.C.

Henry Hope, Chairman, Fine Arts Department, University of Indiana
Henry J. Kellermann, American Embassy, Paris
Carol C. Laise, American Embassy, New Delhi
Guy A. Lee, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State

Max McCullough, Director, UNESCO Relations Staff, Department of State
Donald Marquis, Chairman, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan
Mrs. Florence B. Shaw, New York, N.Y.
James Simensarian, Office of Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State
Frank G. Siscoe, Division of Research for U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, Department of State
Edward G. Trueblood, American Embassy, Paris

Secretary of Delegation
Millard L. Kenestrick, Chief, Administrative Staff, Office of International Conferences, Department of State
Administrative Officer
Frank England, Office of International Conferences, Department of State
The General Conference, which is the governing body of UNESCO, convenes at 2-year intervals. The forthcoming meeting will be devoted largely to an examination of the program and budget for the calendar years 1957 and 1958 proposed by the Director General, a discussion of organizational problems, and a review of the activities which have taken place since the eighth session at Montevideo, November 12–December 10, 1954.

The conference will also consider the organization’s programs in education, cultural activities, the social sciences, mass communication, and the natural sciences, as well as three proposed major projects devoted to (1) free and compulsory education for children in Latin America, (2) arid-zone research, and (3) mutual appreciation of Asian and Western cultural values.

ICAO Special Caribbean Regional Air Navigation Meeting

The Department of State announced on November 8 (press release 574) that the U.S. Government will be represented by the following delegation at the Special Caribbean Regional Air Navigation Meeting, to be convened by the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization at Antigua, Guatemala, on November 13, 1956:

Delegate
Hugh H. McFarlane, Chairman, Chief, International Standards Branch, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce

Advisers
Reuben H. Clinkscales, Flight Operations Specialist, Air Carrier Division, Civil Aeronautics Board
Thomas A. Kouchnerkavich, Electronics Engineer, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce
Robert M. Nye, Lt. Col., USAF, Directorate of Plans, Policy Division, Civil Air Branch, Department of the Air Force
Clifford W. Walker, Aviation Safety Adviser, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, Miami, Fla.

The purpose of this meeting is to prepare a complete radio-navigation aids plan, providing full position-fixing coverage for all air routes within the Caribbean region. The provision of adequate radio air-navigation aids, both for the navigation of individual aircraft and for air-traffic control purposes, is urgently needed in order to meet the increasing air-navigation require-

Governing Body of the International Labor Office

The Department of State announced on November 8 (press release 575) that the U.S. Government will be represented at the 133d session of the Governing Body of the International Labor Office, to be convened at Geneva, Switzerland, from November 20 to 24, 1956, by the following delegation:

Representative
J. Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor

Substitute Representative
Arnold L. Zempel, Executive Director, Office of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor

Advisers
Otis E. Mulliken, Deputy Director, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State
B. Allen Rowland, Special Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce
George Tobias, Labor Attaché, American Consulate General, Geneva

The full session will be preceded by meetings of various committees of the Governing Body beginning on November 14.

The Governing Body usually meets three times a year to receive reports on activities of the International Labor Office, outline future work of the Office, examine and recommend the annual budget, and prepare agenda for the annual sessions of the International Labor Conference.

TRETY INFORMATION
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Bills of Lading

\(^1\) Additional information.
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Morocco
Signatures: Belgium, France, Italy, Morocco, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Trade and Commerce
Signature: Japan, October 24, 1956.
Entry into force: October 24, 1956, for those provisions which relate to parts II and III of the General Agreement.

Wheat
Acceptances deposited: Israel, November 2, 1956; Switzerland, November 6, 1956.
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Argentina

Ecuador

United Kingdom

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases
For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

A publication containing the texts of documents relating to the creation, membership, by-laws, rules of procedure, etc., of the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

A report of the first 5 years of operation of the program of educational exchange between the United States and Finland.

The Quest for Peace. Pub. 6391. General Foreign Policy Series 111. 35 pp. 40c.
Quotations from President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles highlighting the major steps in the search for peace through the security and unity of the free world.

A collection of documents relating to the purported nationalization of the Suez Canal, including agreement reached at the conferences in London, England, and texts of treaties of the past century which have an important bearing upon the present legal status of the canal.

A pamphlet containing the notice of intention of the United States Government to participate in limited trade agreement negotiations with the Government of Cuba, supplemental to negotiations conducted at Geneva, Switzerland, earlier in the year.


International Sanitary Regulations—World Health Organization Regulations No. 2. TIAS 3625. 127 pp. 70c.
Adopted by the Fourth World Health Assembly at Geneva May 25, 1951. Entered into force October 1, 1952.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Designations
Robert G. McGregor as Deputy Director of the Office of Dependent Area Affairs, effective October 7, 1956.
Olcott H. Deming as Special Assistant, Office of the Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, effective October 21, 1956.
Edward J. Rowell as Officer in Charge of Social Affairs, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, effective October 21, 1956.
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Check List of Department of State Press Releases: November 5-11

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.
Press release issued prior to November 5 which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 537 of October 25.

No. Date Subject
570 11/5 Delegation to UNESCO (rewrite).
571 11/5 Exchange agreement with Argentina.
572 11/6 Hoover; death of Ambassador Nuffer.
573 11/7 Atoms-for-peace team to visit Latin America.
574 11/8 Delegation to ICAO (rewrite).
575 11/8 Delegation to ILO (rewrite).
577 11/9 U.K. credentials (rewrite).
578 11/9 Evacuation of Americans from Middle East.
579 11/10 Law regarding service in foreign armed forces.

*Not printed.
†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1956
The Suez Canal Problem

In this documentary volume is printed a considerable collection of documents pertaining to events from the purported nationalization of the Universal Suez Maritime Canal Company by the Egyptian Government on July 26, 1956, through the Second London Conference on the Suez Canal, September 19–21. Texts of those agreements and treaties of the past century which have a particularly important bearing on the present legal status of the Suez Canal are included. Also in the publication are key documents on the "nationalization" of the canal and on the Western reaction; all the substantive statements of the 22-power London Conference; published papers of the Five-Power Suez Committee and of the Second London Conference on the Suez Canal; and significant public statements of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles on the Suez Canal problem throughout the period from the "nationalization" of the Universal Suez Canal Company to the action at London to establish a Canal Users Association.

Copies of The Suez Canal Problem, July 26–September 22, 1956 may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for $1.25 each.

Publication 6392

$1.25

Order Form
Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

(cash, check, or money order).

Please send me ......... copies of The Suez Canal Problem.

Name: __________________________________________________________

Street Address: __________________________________________________

City, Zone, and State: _____________________________________________
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The Tasks of the 11th General Assembly

Address by Acting Secretary Hoover

Secretary Dulles has asked me to express to you his deep regret that he could not be here to deliver this message himself. May I also convey Mr. Dulles' congratulations to the new President of the Assembly, our distinguished friend from Thailand [Prince Wan Waithayakon].

The U.N. and the Present Crisis

This General Assembly meets at a time when the world community is beset with many problems. Some of them are of the greatest gravity. In a short space of weeks we have been confronted with two challenges to world peace.

The United Nations has played a vigorous role in the critical events of the past few weeks in Europe and in the Near East. It has responded rapidly to focus world opinion on the issues involved. It made just and practical proposals for peaceful solutions. The world cannot but heed the moral force for peace that it has demonstrated during these recent weeks. The United Nations has shown its dedication to the principles of its charter and its ability to move swiftly to the defense of those principles.

As President Eisenhower said in his address to the people of the United States on October 31: 1

As I review the march of world events in recent years, I am more deeply convinced that the processes of the United Nations represent the soundest hope for peace in the world.

The basic purpose of the charter is peace with justice. The United States is convinced that the United Nations is the best instrument for achieving this end. Peace alone is not enough. For, without justice, peace is illusory and temporary. On the other hand, without peace, justice would be submerged by the limitless injustices of war.

In the past few weeks the United Nations has acted promptly to preserve peace with justice. But its efforts cannot be judged merely by its resolutions. The test is compliance with its resolutions.

In Eastern Europe, the United Nations actions to deal with the tragic situation in Hungary are still unheeded. Soviet forces have not been withdrawn. We now hear shocking reports that the barbarism of mass deportation is being inflicted on the Hungarian people.

We cannot remain silent while Hungarian men, women, and children are forcibly deported because they dared to express their patriotic feelings in defiance of their Soviet oppressors. That is why the United States believes that the Assembly must take an immediate initiative to meet this tragic situation.

Mr. President, this matter requires the urgent attention of the Assembly. The United States will support such changes in the Assembly's schedule as may be necessary to permit this vital matter to be considered as a matter of priority.

The Secretary-General's request for admission of United Nations observers into Hungary has been rejected. This means that we must redouble our support of his efforts. At the same time, we must give urgent consideration to the next steps the United Nations can take. The brutal suppression of freedom by alien domination will leave an indelible mark on the conscience of the world.

In the Middle East, we welcome the statements of cooperation which have been made in response.
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1 Made before the U.N. General Assembly on Nov. 16 (press release 586).
to the call of the United Nations to cease military operations, to withdraw armed forces, and to implement the United Nations force.

There have, however, been suggestions of introducing so-called "volunteers" into the Near East. Such action would be clearly contrary to the resolution passed on November 2, which was supported by 64 members of this Assembly. It is the clear duty of all, including those who engaged in hostilities, to refrain from introducing forces into the area of recent hostilities, other than those of the United Nations Emergency Force.

Certainly, no state should compound the difficulties of the United Nations in restoring the peace. Introduction of external forces into the area of hostilities would clearly hamper the efforts that are now being made and in fact would be a threat to the United Nations forces now entering the area. The United Nations would be obligated to take appropriate action. President Eisenhower has announced that the United States would fully support such action.

When the United States introduced its "cease-fire" resolution on November 1, Secretary Dulles, speaking here, said that a mere cease-fire and a return to the prior state of affairs would not be good enough. He pointed out that the violence had arisen from a highly disturbed and in many respects provocative situation, both in relation to the Suez Canal and the Palestine armistice. He emphasized that, unless we could do better than go back to the old and troubled state of affairs, neither peace nor justice could be assured.

The United Nations demonstrated its capacity to rally world sentiment against the use of force. It is much harder to rally the same amount of sentiment in favor of remedying the injustices which breed the resort to force. Yet, unless we can get at the fundamental causes of these frictions, we can make only limited progress toward solving the problems of a lasting peace.

For this reason, the United States on November 3 submitted to the emergency Assembly session two resolutions designed to come to grips with the causes of unrest in the Near East. The first has to do with the Suez Canal (U.N. doc. A/3273). The Security Council on October 13 adopted a resolution containing six governing principles designed to furnish a framework for a solution that will assure both international confidence and effective operation. Nothing has happened to change the basic proposition that, with due respect for the sovereignty of Egypt, the users of the canal must be given the assurance of free and nondiscriminatory passage, under reliable and predictable conditions, insulated from the polities of any country.

What is now needed is to give effect to these fundamental principles. We therefore proposed a resolution to work out measures to reopen the canal; to prepare a plan, in consultation with the countries concerned, for its operation and maintenance; and assure free passage through it in accordance with the 1888 convention. We believe such a committee should be established promptly and begin its work as soon as possible.

The United States also submitted a resolution that would provide for the establishment of a committee to consult with the parties to the armistice agreements and make recommendations regarding a settlement of the major problems outstanding between the Arab States and Israel [U.N. doc. A/3272].

We have acted promptly to deal with the emergency created by the outbreak of hostilities. The arrival of the first contingents of the United Nations force should now make it possible to implement without delay the remaining recommendations of this Assembly, particularly those relating to the withdrawal of forces.

We must now act with equal promptness and unity to facilitate a settlement of the problems which gave rise to this emergency.

New efforts are also needed to resolve the economic and social problems in this area. The crisis there has diverted our efforts from the tasks of building for the future. There are many things that can be done to help the peoples of that troubled region toward the standard of economic and social life to which they so deeply aspire.

We do not have to wait for the ultimate settlements. Indeed, we would be mistaken to wait. Cooperation on such problems as water, irrigation, and trade, and on well-planned development and modernization programs, can all help to build the foundations for peace.

We have a chance for a fresh start. Our aim should be to establish the foundations of a durable peace and stability in the area.
In August of last year Secretary Dulles described some of the things which would be needed. He mentioned several specific things that should be done. He said, "If doing that involves some burdens, they are burdens which the United States would share." I can now here reaffirm the willingness of the United States to do its full share in support of a sound program.

Other Problems of the 11th Session

I also should like to speak briefly of two of the other items which will come before this session of the Assembly.

The first is the International Atomic Energy Agency. We can be heartened that the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, signed in this hall a few weeks ago by 70 nations, has reached the stage of ratification. This has been a major advance for the international community, which has been accomplished by a process of discussion and negotiation. It brings closer the day that the atom can be put to work as a truly international servant of humanity.

The United States believes a committee of this Assembly should negotiate with the new agency a draft agreement bringing it into appropriate relationship with the United Nations.

Secondly, the problem of disarmament will come before the General Assembly when the Disarmament Commission submits its progress report.

Prevention of nuclear warfare is the concern of every nation and every human being. Yet the production of nuclear weapons continues and the terrible threat of nuclear warfare still hangs over mankind.

The failure to reach agreement is not a failure directly chargeable to the United Nations. Neither is this failure any reason to give up hope or slacken our efforts. We must seek to make progress on any front we can. The United States will continue to seize every opportunity for reaching a genuine accord. But we must not be trapped into confusing tempting promises with genuine proposals.

The core of the problem continues to be the question of establishing an effective inspection and control mechanism. Any disarmament plan is unsatisfactory unless it is accompanied by means of verifying that the parties are in fact living up to their promises. The Soviet Union, so far, has avoided committing itself to an effective system of inspection and control. The United States has agreed to such a system. Those states that possess the potential of nuclear warfare have heavy responsibility to bring this threat to an end within the authority of the United Nations. Mr. President, the United States here rededicates itself to that great task.

The Challenge

The tasks that lie ahead of the United Nations are momentous. In seeking peace with justice it must find means of providing for peaceful change.

The United Nations must assist legitimate changes to take place. But it must also strive to prevent these changes from shattering the peace or from harming the legitimate interests of others.

The increasing interdependence of nations is as much a fact of international existence as is the pressure for change. It is the task of statesmanship to guide change into channels which are both peaceful and just.

In striving to reconcile conflicting claims and interests, we may sometimes have to make progress slowly. In some cases, we may have to adopt partial or temporary solutions. We should not become discouraged when, for the time being, the best we can achieve is a truce or an armistice. We must look at our problems with a sense of the possible and a determination to find it.

The Growing Strength of the U.N.

The United Nations faces the challenge of these tasks with growing strength and vigor. The recent admission of 19 new members has given our organization new vitality and scope. I particularly welcome the representatives of Morocco, Tunisia, and the Sudan, who have most recently joined us here.

There are other nations, however, particularly in the Far East, who are qualified and should be here. Japan has been excluded by the vote of a single state. We hope that speedy action may now be taken to pave the way for Japan's entry at the earliest possible moment. The Republics of Korea and of Viet-Nam are also fully deserving of admission and should be brought in without further delay.
The United States continues to oppose the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime, which stands indicted for aggression by the United Nations, has demonstrated on many occasions its contempt for this organization, and has otherwise acted in defiance of the charter.

The growth of the organization from 51 to 79 members has not been reflected in the size of such important bodies as the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

In the Security Council, the Asian countries have never been adequately represented. Now, with the addition of six new Asian members, this defect must be remedied without further delay. Likewise, the 10 new European members would justify more representation for the European region. In the circumstances it would seem desirable to add two nonpermanent seats in the Security Council. It is also reasonable to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council, perhaps by four seats.

The last year has also seen a major growth in the role of the Secretary-General. By steady and devoted effort, he has contributed in many ways toward resolving serious issues. The part he has been playing, especially in the Middle East, shows how much the Secretary-General can contribute to world peace. The United States wants to record its thanks and congratulations to Mr. Hammarskjold, both for his devotion to his task and his personal competence as a man of peace.

In recent weeks the United Nations has also shown its vitality in creating new instruments for peace. A historic step has been taken in forming a United Nations Emergency Force to secure and supervise the ending of hostilities in the Near East. This United Nations force has had to be speedily improvised. The experience in forming and operating it will be invaluable for the future. But it emphasizes the need to develop the collective machinery essential to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The growth of the United Nations in response to concrete challenges has shown its vigor as an institution. The task of improving its capacity to settle disputes peacefully and to facilitate just change by peaceful means is never ending. We certainly have not exhausted the resources of the charter for these purposes.

For example, there is ample machinery available to adjudicate international legal disputes. Yet this machinery is seldom used. Only 33 states have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Other countries have generally refused to adjudicate their disputes when asked to do so. If the rule of law is to be established, we must not only have the law and the tribunals; we must also establish the habit and custom of being bound by law according to the judgment of an independent tribunal.

Making the U.N. Succeed

Mr. President, these are grave times. They call for exercise of the utmost restraint and judgment on the part of all nations. They call for imaginative new approaches to the ancient problems of just and lasting peace.

Our goal must be a world in which nations and peoples can live side by side, whatever their internal political, economic, and social systems, without fear and with real hope for self-fulfillment. The United Nations can be an agency of inestimable value in helping to work toward this goal. We cannot ask if it will succeed in its job. We must make it succeed.

Nothing could be clearer than the fact that a more effective United Nations serves the interest of every nation. We must strive to develop institutions through which the rights of all nations can be respected and justice can be secured in peaceful ways. Let us join together here to build a bridge from the past to the future, across which we can walk together in a new spirit of confidence.

I assure you that the United States will be untiring in this task.

The Influence of the United Nations in the Near East

Statement by Secretary Dulles

The doctors tell me that I am making an excellent recovery. I am deeply grateful for their expert surgery and the fine nursing care given me at Walter Reed Hospital. After a couple of weeks of sunshine at Key West I expect to be back at work.

I am proud of the way in which the State De-

1 Made at Washington, D.C., on Nov. 18 at the time of his departure from Walter Reed Hospital (press release 590).
department is functioning during my absence. Its problems are particularly difficult; but they are being met in a superb manner by the loyal and dedicated effort of all workers, at all levels, under the fine leadership of the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Hoover.

As regards the Near East, we are, I think, on the right track. If the countries concerned show respect, as they have promised, for the opinions of mankind as expressed through the General Assembly of the United Nations, that will give reason for hope for further progress toward stable peace in that troubled part of the world. It would, however, be a great mistake to believe that stability and tranquillity can be permanently established merely by emergency measures to stop the fighting. It is necessary to attack the basic problems of the area. The many nations which want peace must also be prepared to struggle for the conditions necessary for a just and durable peace.

In contrast to the positive influence of the United Nations in the Near East stands the conduct of the Soviet rulers. In defiance of United Nations resolutions, they engaged in war against Hungary, with promiscuous slaughter. In relation to Near East affairs, they have tried to substitute themselves for the United Nations instead of acting as a cooperative member.

The free nations cannot relax their vigilance in the face of such arrogance and such violations of human principle.

Swiss Proposal for Meeting of Five Chiefs of Government

The President of Switzerland, Markus Feldmann, on November 6 sent telegrams to President Eisenhower and the Heads of State of France, India, the U.S.S.R., and the United Kingdom inviting them to hold a conference in Switzerland. Following is an unofficial translation of the invitation, together with President Eisenhower's reply.

Text of Invitation, November 6

The threat of a third World War and a new trial by force with all their tragic consequences weighs upon humanity.

However, peace can and must still be saved.

To this end, the Swiss Federal Council addresses an urgent appeal for a conference to take place without delay of the four Chiefs of Government who met at Geneva in July 1955, namely, of the United States, France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, to whom might be added the Chief of the Indian Government as the representative of the Bandung Conference powers. This conference could be held on the territory of the Swiss Confederation. The Federal Council offers its good offices for the organization of the conference.

President Eisenhower's Reply, November 10

The Federal Council's suggestion for a meeting in Switzerland of the five Chiefs of Government has received urgent and sympathetic consideration here. I appreciate the sincerity of the Swiss proposal and share the concern for the preservation of peace which inspired it. However, the United Nations is actively seized with the various problems posing a threat to world peace and I believe that the interests of all will be best served by carrying these initiatives through to a successful conclusion.

Meeting of ANZUS Council

Press release 589 dated November 17

The Anzus Council met in Washington November 17. The Right Honorable Richard G. Casey, Minister for External Affairs, represented Australia; the Honorable Thomas L. Macdonald, Minister for External Affairs, represented New Zealand; and the Honorable Herbert Hoover, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, represented the United States.

The Anzus Council was established under the 1951 Security Treaty between Australia, New Zealand and the United States. This Treaty aimed at strengthening the fabric of peace, particularly in the Pacific area, by mutual action in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

The Anzus Council provides a forum in which the Foreign Ministers of the three Governments meet in private discussion at least once a year on means of promoting, in the existing situation, the objectives of the Treaty and strengthening the already close association between their countries.

The Ministers reviewed the work that has been done under the aegis of Anzus since the Council
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1 For text, see Bulletin of July 23, 1951, p. 148.
last met in September 1955 and noted that, in addition to meetings of the Anzus Military Representatives and Staff Planners, agreements with the United States have been signed by both Australia and New Zealand for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The Ministers expressed the conviction that SEATO, to which all three nations adhere, had contributed substantially, over the past year to the welfare and security of Southeast Asia.

The delegation for Australia also included: Mr. F. J. Blakeney, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the Embassy of Australia in the United States; Mr. K. H. Bailey, Solicitor General; Mr. James Plimsoll, Assistant Secretary, Department of External Affairs; and Air Marshal Sir John P. J. McCauley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. For New Zealand: His Excellency Sir Leslie Munro, Ambassador to the United States; Mr. Lloyd White, Counselor; and Brigadier W. S. McKinnon, Armed Forces Attaché; and for the United States: the Honorable Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; the Honorable Douglas MacArthur, Counselor of the Department of State; the Honorable Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of Defense; and Admiral Felix B. Stump, Commander-in-Chief Pacific and Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet.

**Polish Housing Experts To Visit United States**

Press release 581 dated November 13

The Department of State announced on November 13 that on November 18 a delegation of five Polish housing officials headed by Deputy Minister of Construction Czeslaw Babiniski will arrive in the United States for a 30-day nationwide tour. The tour has been arranged and will be conducted by the National Association of Home Builders at the suggestion of the Department of State. It will include visits to the following cities: New York, N.Y.; Washington, D.C.; Dayton, Ohio; Lafayette, Ind.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Portland, Oreg.; Sacramento, Calif.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Little Rock, Ark.; Memphis, Tenn.; Atlanta, Ga.; Miami, Fla.

The Polish visit is in accordance with an agreement reached between the Department and the Polish Embassy to exchange delegations of housing experts. It is anticipated that a reciprocal U.S. delegation will visit Poland next spring.

**Greek Prime Minister Meets With Acting Secretary Hoover**

Press release 584 dated November 15

Prime Minister Constantine Karamanlis of Greece met on November 15 with Acting Secretary Hoover and other U.S. officials at the Department of State. Conversations with the Greek Prime Minister covered a wide range of matters in which Greece and the United States have mutual interests and included an exchange of views on recent developments in the Middle East.

Among the U.S. officials participating in the conversations were Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy, Assistant Secretary of State William M. Rountree, Acting Assistant Secretary of State C. Burke Elbrick, Assistant Secretary of Defense Gordon Gray, and the Director of the Near East and South Asian Division of the International Cooperation Administration, Cedric H. Seager.

Prime Minister Karamanlis is visiting the United States in connection with the 11th session of the United Nations General Assembly.

**High Commissioner of Pacific Islands Trust Territory**

The White House announced on November 3 that on that day the President had appointed Delmas H. Nucker to be High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.
International Conference on the Status of Tangier

Following is the text of opening remarks made at the Conference on the Status of Tangier by Cavendish W. Cannon, U.S. Ambassador to Morocco, who served as head of the U.S. delegation to the conference, together with the text of the final declaration and protocol adopted by the conference on October 29.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR CANNON

As head of the delegation of the United States of America I wish to express my appreciation for the invitation of the Government of Morocco to this most interesting conference to negotiate the problems raised by the reintegration of Tangier into the Sherifian Empire and to study economic and financial questions, and for the many courtesies already shown me both at Fedala on Monday and here in Tangier today. The atmosphere for a most successful conference already exists.

My country has maintained a representative at Tangier continuously since 1791—or almost from the very beginning of the existence of our Republic. Already in the late 18th century the United States took part in the work of the Sanitary Council, which had the mission of maintaining the public health in Tangier and of which the United States became a member in 1797. In fact, the United States was the last member of the Sanitary Council, and the American Consulate General here still has the custody of the old archives of the Council. So my Government has long been associated with the historic city of Tangier.

Following the Tangier Conference in August 1945, the United States Government accepted the invitation extended to it by the French and British Governments to participate in the administration created by the agreement of August 31, 1945. Since that time my Government has participated actively in the work of the Committee of Control and has cooperated with the other interested powers to assure the well-being of the inhabitants of the zone. At the same time my Government continued to recognize the sovereignty of His Majesty and the integrity of his domains by maintaining at Tangier a diplomatic agent accredited to His Majesty for the whole of Morocco.

My Government is prepared now to show further evidence of its good will and its respect for the sovereignty and independence of Morocco by working, at this conference, toward the complete reintegration of Tangier, politically and administratively, into the Sherifian Empire. It is also prepared to contribute to the future development of Tangier, which, in turn, will redound to the benefit of Morocco as a whole.

The number of American citizens and enterprises in Tangier is not as great as that of some of the other powers represented here. But the United States Government and private American companies have established at Tangier large radio-communication installations, containing the most advanced technical equipment, which represent a very substantial investment and which make a real contribution to the local economy. My Government is anxious to maintain these facilities and other American enterprises here, in agreement with the Moroccan Government, and to expand them for the benefit of both nations.

I am fully persuaded that by working in a spirit of friendly cooperation, which I am sure we will do, we can conclude an agreement for a mutually beneficial administration for Tangier within a fully sovereign and unified Morocco.

I am convinced that our work here will be completely successful. Indeed, it is important that it
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should succeed. With so much discord in the world today, we here in Tangier have the opportunity to provide to the peoples of the world the comforting demonstration that nine powers with diverse interests can sit down at a conference table and reach an agreement that will stand the test of time.

I look forward to the future of Tangier with confidence.

TEXT OF FINAL DECLARATION AND PROTOCOL

[Translation]

Final Declaration of the International Conference in Tangier

At the invitation of His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco, an international conference was held in Fedala and Tangier from October 8 to October 29, 1956, under the presidency of His Excellency the Minister of Foreign Affairs, representing His Majesty the Sultan, for the purpose of settling the questions raised by the abolition of the special régime of the Tangier Zone.

The Governments of:

Belgium Morocco
Spain Netherlands
United States of America Portugal
France United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,
represented by their undersigned plenipotentiaries;

Desiring to establish the principles of the independence of Morocco and the unity and integrity of its territory,

Have agreed to recognize the abolition of the international régime of the Tangier Zone and hereby declare abrogated, in so far as they have participated therein, all acts, agreements, and conventions concerning the said régime;

Recognize, in consequence, that His Sherifian Majesty has been reinstated in all His powers and capacities in this part of the Sherifian Empire, which shall henceforth be under His entire and sole sovereignty, and that this gives Him the unrestricted right to determine the future régime of Tangier.

Considering the deep concern affirmed by His Sherifian Majesty in respect of the private interests created under the former régime of Tangier and His earnest desire to ensure their security in the present and to promote their development in the future;

Being desirous of settling the questions arising out of the abolition of the international régime of Tangier according to the principles of justice and equity and in the spirit of understanding and friendship that has always prevailed in the relations of Morocco with the other Powers signatory to the present Declaration,

Have drawn up by mutual agreement the provisions contained in the Protocol attached hereto.

This Declaration and the said Protocol shall come into force on the date of their signature.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, authorized for this purpose by their respective Governments, have hereunto affixed their signatures.

Done at Tangier, in nine copies, on October 29, 1956.

For Belgium: M. Stéphane Halot
For Spain: M. Cristobal del Castillo
For the United States of America: M. Cavendish W. Cannon
For France: M. le Baron Robert de Boisseson
For Italy: M. Alberto Faveri Fontana
For Morocco: M. Ahmed Balafrêj
For the Netherlands: M. H. H. Dingemans
For Portugal: M. Manel Homem de Mello
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: M. Geoffrey Meade

Annexed Protocol

With a view to settling the questions raised by the abrogation of the Special Statute of the Tangier Zone, the signatories of the Declaration of October 29, 1956 have unanimously adopted the provisions that form the subject of the present Protocol.

CHAPTER 1

LEGISLATION AND DOMAIN

Article 1. The abolition of the special régime of Tangier terminates the general and permanent authority conferred on the International Administration by the Dahir of February 16, 1924. In consequence, the International Administration will cease to exercise the administrative powers that had been vested in it.

Article 2. The Moroccan State, which recovers possession of the public and private domain entrusted to the International Administration by virtue of the Dahir of February 16, 1924, receives the latter’s property as constituted under Article 43 of the aforesaid Dahir. Subject to the provisions relating to the concessions, leases, and authorizations mentioned in Chapter IV, the Moroccan State will take over the debts and obligations duly contracted by the International Administration within the limits of the authority delegated to it by His Majesty the Sultan.

Article 3. The laws and regulations in force in the Tangier Zone on the date of signature of this Protocol shall continue in effect so long as they shall not have been amended or abrogated.

Article 4. The situation of persons practicing a liberal profession in Tangier on the date of signature of this Protocol shall be respected. Nevertheless, the Moroccan Government reserves the right to verify the regularity of the conditions under which they have been permitted to practice their professions and to make them subject to Moroccan legislation concerning the practice of their professional activities.

Article 5. In the event that the extension to Tangier of the legislation in force in Morocco should bring into question the operation of banking or financial companies or establishments, the Moroccan Government would take
into consideration the situation of the persons concerned and would grant them a reasonable period within which to comply with the provisions of such legislation.

CHAPTER II

THE CIVIL SERVICE

Article 6. Within a maximum period of six months from the coming into force of the present Protocol, the Moroccan Government will notify each civil servant of the International Administration of its intention to keep him or not to keep him in its service and will inform those whom it wishes to keep of the employment conditions offered them.

Article 7. In the case of personnel whom the Moroccan Government does not wish to keep in its service, the aforesaid notice will mark the beginning of a period of thirty days at the expiration of which the said personnel will be definitely dropped from the roll and will cease to receive a salary.

Article 8. Personnel whom the Moroccan Government wishes to keep in its service must inform it, within a month of the notification of the offer made to them, whether they accept them. In case of refusal, they shall be discharged and definitively dropped from the roll.

Article 9. Personnel dropped from the roll pursuant to Articles 7 and 8 shall be entitled to:

(a) The allowance provided for by the Law of March 20, 1950 organizing the Welfare Fund of the International Administration;
(b) The agreed compensation for moving and installation expenses as fixed in Article 34 of the Law of August 17, 1950 for personnel recruited outside the former Zone, provided they move to a place outside the said Zone within a maximum period of eighteen months from the termination of their duties;
(c) The salary for the days of leave to which they may be entitled at the time of their removal from the roll, in conformity with Article 36 of the Law of August 17, 1950;
(d) Severance pay calculated as follows:

1. Personnel belonging to an administration of the country of which they are nationals shall receive compensation equal to six months’ salary in base pay and allowances;
2. Personnel not belonging to an administration of the country of which they are nationals shall receive:
   - Compensation equal to six months’ salary in base pay and allowances when they are dropped from the roll after their refusal to accept the employment conditions offered them; or
   - Compensation equal to one year’s salary in base pay and allowances when they are dropped from the roll without having been offered re-employment by the Moroccan Administration.

The foregoing provisions are applicable to the personnel provided by the Statute and to judicial personnel, as well as to the administrative personnel.

Article 10. If, at the expiration of the six months’ period stipulated in Article 6, the Moroccan Government delays for more than three months the disclosure of its intentions with regard to a civil servant, the latter may at any time be removed from the roll at his request, and he shall then, according to the category to which he belongs, receive the compensation provided for in Article 9.

Article 11. Personnel whom the Moroccan Government keeps in its service may, at their request, obtain payment of the allowance due to them from the Welfare Fund.

Article 12. Until the expiration of the period fixed in Article 7 for personnel who are not retained by the Moroccan Administration, or until the expiration of their employment contract in the case of personnel continued in service, the relations between the personnel concerned and the Moroccan Administration shall continue to be governed, as regards their respective rights and obligations, particularly in the matter of remuneration, discipline, and duties, by the texts that fixed the status of civil servants under the legislation of the Zone and subject to any changes that might be made because of the abolition of former organizations and disciplinary authorities.

CHAPTER III

CULTURAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND HOSPITAL INSTITUTIONS

Article 13. Cultural, scientific, and hospital institutions existing in Tangier on the date of signature of the present Protocol shall be maintained. However, the Moroccan Government reserves the right to make them subject to the laws that will govern the operation of such establishments, account being taken of the stipulations of the bilateral cultural conventions to be concluded. A reasonable period will be granted to the institutions concerned for the application of the said laws.

CHAPTER IV

CONCESSIONS, LEASES, AND AUTHORIZATIONS

Article 14. In the matter of concessions, leases, and authorizations, the abolition of the special régime of Tangier and its consequent incorporation into the Sherifian Empire involves, in this part of the territory, the application of Moroccan laws under the conditions mentioned in the articles of the present chapter.

Article 15. Concessions properly acquired and duly approved by Dahir of His Majesty the Sultan, before or after the promulgation of the Statute, shall be respected in so far as they conform to Article 45 of the Statute and on condition that they are subject to the laws in force in Morocco.

Article 16. His Majesty the Sultan will take under advisement, for the earliest possible settlement in accordance with the principle of justice and equity, concessions granted by the International Administration for a period beyond that of the Statute.

Article 17. His Majesty the Sultan will take under advisement, for the earliest possible settlement in accordance with the principle of justice and equity, additional arrangements obtained in good faith from the International Administration, when the said arrangements were not granted within the limits of the competence of the Administration or were not expressly approved by His Majesty the Sultan.

Article 18. Leases and authorizations obtained under the authority conferred on the International Administration by the Statute shall be respected.
Article 19. His Majesty the Sultan will take under advisement, for the earliest possible settlement in accordance with the principle of justice and equity, leases and authorizations granted by the International Administration under conditions not in conformity with its authority under the Statute or with the provisions of the laws in force.

CHAPTER V

POST, TELEGRAPH, TELEPHONE, RADIOBROADCASTING, AND RADIOTELECOMMUNICATION

Article 20. The abolition of the special régime of the Tangier Zone involves the extension to that part of the territory of the Post, Telegraph, and Telephone, the Radiobroadcasting, and the Radiotelecommunication monopoly belonging to the Moroccan State. In observance of this principle, of Moroccan public policy, and of the provisions of the legislation in force, the Post, Telegraph, and Telephone, the Radiobroadcasting, and the Radiotelecommunication establishments may continue to operate during a reasonable period to permit the Governments and companies concerned to:

(a) Enter into special arrangements with the Moroccan Government concerning their establishments, for which account will be taken of the provisions of Chapter IV of this Protocol; or,

(b) If necessary, to request sufficient time to enable them to take measures suited to their situation.

Done at Tangier, in nine copies, on October 20, 1956.

For Belgium: M. Stéphane Halot
For Spain: M. Cristobal del Castillo
For the United States of America: M. Cavendish W. Cannon
For France: M. le Baron Robert de Boisseson
For Italy: M. Alberto Paveri Fontana
For Morocco: M. Ahmed Balafrej
For the Netherlands: M. H. H. Dingemans
For Portugal: M. Manuel Homem de Mello
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: M. Geoffrey Meade

U.S. Consular Jurisdiction in Morocco Relinquished

Following is the text of a note from Cavendish W. Cannon, U.S. Ambassador to Morocco, which was delivered to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Sherifian Empire at Rabat on October 6 concerning the relinquishment by the U.S. Government of its consular jurisdiction in Morocco. The note was addressed to Ahmed Balafrej, Moroccan Minister of Foreign Affairs.

RABAT, October 6, 1956

Excellency: I have the honor to refer to the statement issued by the Department of State on January 26, 1956, announcing the intention of the United States Government to relinquish its consular jurisdiction in Morocco at the appropriate time in keeping with the desire to modernize this aspect of the treaty relationship between Morocco and the United States.

It is the decision of my Government to relinquish this day these consular jurisdictions which were accorded to the United States of America in a Treaty of Peace and Friendship first concluded with Morocco in 1787 and renewed in 1836 and in the Act of Algeciras signed in 1906; as well as to cease to exercise jurisdiction over subjects of Morocco or others who may be designated as proteges under the Convention of Madrid signed in 1880. It is my understanding, however, that American proteges will have access to the same local courts as American citizens in accordance with the procedures followed in the past when capitulations have been relinquished.

It affords me great satisfaction at the outset of my mission to convey to Your Excellency my Government's decision in this regard.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

U.S. To Sell Turkey Agricultural Surplus Products

Press release 580 dated November 13

Turkey signed an agreement with the United States at Ankara on November 12 to purchase U.S. agricultural surplus commodities during the next few months. The agreement was signed under title I of U.S. Public Law 480 and provides for the financing of $46.3 million worth of agricultural commodities, including certain ocean transport costs.

The agreement calls for the sale to Turkey of up to $31.6 million worth of wheat (approximately 500,000 metric tons), $600,000 worth of corn (approximately 10,000 metric tons), $3.3 million worth of inedible tallow (approximately 15,000 metric tons), and $4.4 million worth of frozen beef (approximately 8,000 metric tons). Payment by Turkey will be made in Turkish liras, thereby avoiding a drain on Turkey's foreign exchange.

Under the terms of the agreement, a substantial

1 Bulletin of Feb. 6, 1956, p. 204.
portion of the lira proceeds will be held for loans to the Government of Turkey to promote Turkish economic development. The remaining liras generated by the commodity sales will be used to cover the cost of U.S. activities in Turkey, including the operation of the Fulbright program of educational exchange.

The conclusion of the agreement comes at a time when Turkey is suffering from severe wheat shortages caused by an insufficient crop. The U.S. Government intends to expedite wheat shipments so that the shortage may be met with the least possible delay.

International Aviation Policies

Following is the text of remarks made by Acting Secretary Hoover at a government-industry aviation meeting at the Department of State on November 14, together with an announcement on the results of the conference.

REMARKS BY ACTING SECRETARY HOOVER

Press release 582 dated November 14

The Department of State has asked you, some of the most important representatives of the United States international aviation field, to meet with us at this conference today. The purpose of the meeting is to take a searching look at our international aviation policies to make certain that they are the best we can develop; that they are in harmony with the overall policies of our country; and to insure that all of us are doing all we can to carry them out in the most effective manner. The complexity of some of the problems and the need to solve them justify the time and attention that everyone concerned is giving to this meeting.

The conduct of our aviation dealings with the rest of the world has, of course, an immediate bearing on our general foreign relations and the overall objectives of the United States. The conduct of our aviation relations and the operation abroad of our air carriers can contribute immensely to the prestige of the United States and to the accomplishment of our national objectives.

As stated in our letters of invitation, we hope to exchange ideas with you and give you the background on our international problems. In this way I believe you will have a better understanding of the responsibility which we must exercise in taking steps which reflect the overall public interest. It is true that sometimes these actions may not satisfy all interested parties.

It is my hope that this meeting can be used to strengthen our ability to work together as a team and at all times to present a united front when we deal with other countries. The decisions of our Government in respect to international aviation are designed to reflect what is best for the American people as a whole and, at the same time, wherever possible, to be in the interest of all who are here today.

We propose to start the meeting with a review of the aviation problems that face us, as the State Department sees them. Situations in individual countries will be cited as illustrations of the most serious of the problems. In this way we hope you can have the total picture, in addition to the day-to-day aspects with which you are concerned. After this review is completed, the meeting will be open for discussion which we hope will be of benefit to us all.

I think I need not tell you of my own great interest in the welfare of United States aviation. I wish that I could be with you for your entire meeting, but I am sure you will understand the circumstances of my present schedule which prevent this. However, I know that every effort has been made to arrange a successful meeting.

RESULTS OF CONFERENCE

Press release 588 dated November 16

At the final session on November 16 of a government-industry conference held at the Department of State on problems of international relations in the civil aviation field, the consensus was that the discussions had been so helpful that consideration should be given to calling similar meetings at appropriate times in the future.

This conference, the first of its kind, was a seminar-type meeting, in which views and information were exchanged informally on a broad range of aviation problems, most of them extremely complex and technical. The conference lasted 3 days.

The participants included officers of the U.S. Government agencies having an important inter-
est in international civil air matters, executives of U.S. airlines engaged in international operations, executives of U.S. aircraft manufacturing firms, and representatives of industry associations. All members of the Civil Aeronautics Board attended the sessions.

Also present were three experts from outside either industry or government: George P. Baker of the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration; G. Nathan Calkins, Jr., attorney of Washington, D.C.; and William A. M. Burden, business executive of New York City. They were selected to assist in the discussions because of their wide experience in civil aviation matters.

No policy decisions were reached in the meeting, nor were any expected, because of the exploratory nature of the discussions. The problems were dealt with in an objective manner, and the discussions were conducted in a friendly spirit of cooperation for the national interest. Views expressed by the participants will be taken into careful consideration in development and application of U.S. policy in the conduct of air transport relations with other countries.

Livingston Satterthwaite, Director of the Office of Transport and Communications, Department of State, acted as chairman during the 3 days.

**Eximbank Credit to Mexico for Railway Rehabilitation**

A credit of $23,260,000 has been authorized to Mexico to further the rehabilitation program of the National Railways of Mexico, as announced on October 23 by Samuel C. Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank. This credit was authorized in favor of Nacional Financiera, S.A., for use by the National Railways of Mexico, and it represents the remaining balance of the $150-million general line of credit authorized to Mexico in 1950 for various types of projects.

This credit is to enable the National Railways to purchase U.S. materials, equipment, and services urgently needed to alleviate traffic congestion brought about by increased traffic demands. Approximately half of the credit will be spent for the purchase of Diesel locomotive units, including both road and switcher types, and the balance for the purchase of rails, accessories, switches, communication equipment, and electrical supplies. The credit will be repayable in semiannual installments over a period of 10 years commencing in June 1958.

Over the past 10 years the National Railways has invested some $207 million in the rehabilitation of its system, of which almost $90 million has been provided through previous Export-Import Bank credits. Regular payments received by the bank have reduced the unpaid balance to $46 million, and all the credits are current.

**U.S. Atoms-for-Peace Team To Visit Latin America**

The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State (press release 573) announced on November 7 that a 10-man atoms-for-peace mission, composed principally of nuclear scientists, will visit six Latin American nations beginning November 9. The mission will participate in discussions of the scientific potential of peaceful applications of atomic energy in the respective countries, especially in the areas of radioisotope applications and nuclear research and training.

The mission, sponsored jointly by the Department of State under its international educational exchange program, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and the International Cooperation Administration, will visit Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, Panama, and Costa Rica. Last June a similar group made an orientation and survey tour that included Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay.

Members of the team, in cooperation with local scientists, will hold unclassified discussions and give lectures on the application of radioisotopes to industry, medicine, and biology; nuclear educational and training programs, including research reactors; and organization and functions of atomic energy administrative organizations. Additionally, staffs of the respective U.S. Embassies will be briefed on all aspects of the atoms-for-peace program.

The mission is headed by Clark C. Vogel, Assistant Director, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Other Atomic Energy Commission representatives are Louis H. Roddis, Deputy Director, Division of Reactor Development; John K. Rouleau, Chief, Western
Good Partnership in Paraguay

by Arthur A. Ageton
Ambassador to Paraguay

Most of you with me here tonight are, I am sure, fully cognizant of the good-neighbor policy, which, in its essence, abandoned a bad old policy of a manifest destiny to impose upon our sister Republics of the Americas the benefits of our system of American democracy, even if force be required, and substituted for it a policy of friendship, good neighborliness, and a willingness to live and let live. I wonder if you are as fully informed on our more recent policy of good partnership. It is about that policy that I would like to talk tonight, because during my 2 years as Ambassador to Paraguay I have seen that policy in dramatic action, and the good results that came from it.

What is this policy of good partnership of which I speak? President Eisenhower recently expressed the central core of the policy when he said, “In our modern world, it is madness to suppose that there could be an island of tranquillity and prosperity in a sea of wretchedness and frustration.” He recognized this problem as long ago as 1947 when he wrote that there was “no alternative to the maintenance of real and respectable strength—not only in our moral rectitude and our economic power, but in terms of adequate military preparedness.” The strength that he had in mind was not military strength alone. “The heart of the collective security principle,” he said, “is the idea of helping other nations to realize their own potentialities—political, economic and military. The strength of the free world lies not in cementing the free world into a second monolithic mass to compete with that of the Communists. It lies rather in the unity that comes of the voluntary association of nations which, however diverse, are developing their own capacities and asserting their own national destinies in a world of freedom and self respect.”

To seek the way of long-term principle rather than that of short-term expediency requires the moral strength which our President infers when he says, “Today we are competing for the minds, hearts and trust of all the world.”

The good-partner policy, then, is the policy of working together with the governments and peoples of our various sister Republics of Latin America to improve their economy, to raise their standards of living, to strengthen not only their military capabilities but their will to resist the blandishments of that other world, that other philosophy, of communism. And also, we have a firm policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of our sister American Republics which is the very keystone of the inter-American system. We are seeking to help these governments and these peoples not only with loans from govern-
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ment to government to build stronger national economies but also by taking steps to encourage our own private investors to go into those areas of Latin America where foreign capital is needed and where the local conditions are favorable. But we do not seek to raise the standards of living in this hemisphere only in order to give the citizens of those countries the will to resist Communist propaganda and subversion. The standards of living of this hemisphere must be raised because, as former Assistant Secretary Henry Holland has said:

The most sacred obligation of a government is to give its citizens an opportunity to attain lives of greater freedom and dignity. . . . Better living standards in the Americas are an end in themselves. We would be cynical indeed if we sought them only as a defense against communism.

We also have the objective in the political field of trying always to help those good people who work toward the perfection of political institutions based on spiritual and moral principles, institutions that stand for individual freedom and inviolability of the person of every man and woman.

But I would like to stress here that we do not seek to impose our solutions on any government, any people, any segment of a people, any area. To be good partners, we seek to work with the people of a country to bring them the technical know-how that we may have, to advance them the money they may need, to assist them freely and openheartedly in time of crisis or emergency, to show them how our political and economic systems operate, to bring them to know us through our associations and our joint efforts, that we may understand them and they may understand us a little better. Let me accent again that it is this working together toward the good objectives we share that constitutes the very heart of good partnership in Latin America. Let me tell you a little about this good-partnership policy as I have seen it in action in Paraguay.

Description of the Country

The Republic of Paraguay is a small, landlocked, inland country over 1,000 miles up the river complex of the La Plata, Paraná, and Paraguay Rivers, over which it has its only access to the sea and to the markets of the world, over which must pass all of its foreign trade.

Approximately the size of California, some 157,000 square miles, Paraguay has a population of about 1 1/2 million people. By comparison, California, according to the last census, has a population of 10 1/2 million. Although Paraguay possesses a rich and fertile land, only about 3 percent of it is under cultivation. In the large area of the Gran Chaco to the west of the Paraguay River, for example, only about 50,000, or 4 percent, of the people of the country live, while the balance reside east of the River Paraguay in the central zone, which has been farmed and cultivated for more than 400 years.

We have seen that Paraguay is an isolated, inland country. Asunción, its capital, is extremely well serviced by international airlines, with a total of 48 scheduled arrivals and departures weekly. But internal communications are handicapped by the sad lack of any reasonable sort of network of passable roads. Some of the most productive citizens of Paraguay are settled in isolated colonies such as Filadelfia, Primavera, Hohenau, Independencia, La Colmena, from which it is difficult at any time of the year, and virtually impossible much of the year, to deliver their products to the market or to obtain goods from Asunción or from the smaller cities of Encarnación, Villarrica, or Concepción. In all of the vast expanse of the Chaco, there are only primitive trails and wagon tracks. Until very recently, all of the transportation in and out of the Chaco was carried over private logging railways and by two-wheeled ox carts.

The People of Paraguay

The population of Paraguay is often called homogeneous or one race. The vast majority of the people are descended from intermarriage of Spanish and other European settlers with the Guarani Indian tribe, which led to the formation of virtually a new race in the eastern areas of Paraguay that is neither Guarani nor European. The Paraguayans are justly proud of this race, particularly of its warrior attributes, which were illustrated dramatically in the War of the Triple Alliance in the 1870's and the Chaco War with Bolivia in the 1930's. However, both of these wars were so sanguinary that even today the country has not fully recovered from the loss of manpower. Although immigration has been encouraged, the number of immigrants has not been large—some
33,000 since 1918, most of whom have settled in the isolated colonies previously mentioned, which has discouraged intermarrying with the native Paraguayans.

Paraguay has a basically Guaraní culture overlaid with Colonial Spanish and European influences. The Guaraní language, assisted by Spanish words and phrases for expressing ideas introduced into the language during the past 400 years, is still the dialect of the vast majority of the Paraguayan people. The Paraguayans have a plaintive and attractive native music built around *cojuntos* (groups) of Paraguayan harps and guitars, which is distinctive from the music of neighboring Latin American peoples, being based on an ancient Spanish polka rhythm. The Paraguayan dances are graceful and colorful, the Sante Fe being a sort of Latin-rhythm square dance, while the national favorite for social dancing is the Paraguayan polka, although Brazilian importations of samba and rhumba are extremely popular. More surprising is to find the children in the schools dancing a graceful minuet and other ancient Spanish court *bailes*. With our Centro Cultural teaching American square dances, it is not as surprising to encounter Texas Star and Virginia Reel among the exhibition dances of the school children.

In the central agricultural zone, after 400 years of cultivation the land is farmed out. In the Alta Parana region are heavy rain forests which cover a fabulously rich earth. In the northwest of Paraguay, along the Brazilian border, is another area of fabulously rich soil on which practically any farm products can be grown and where the new coffee plantations of Paraguay will soon come into production. Across the Paraguay River in the Gran Chaco extending to the Bolivian foothills lies 54 percent of the land devoted to cattle raising, a flat delta terrain built up by many rivers running down from the Andes, much of which is under water a good part of the year in the areas along the river.

The Mennonites have proved that the further reaches of the Chaco around Filadelfia can be a rich and fertile agricultural area comparable to our Great Plains at the turn of the century. In the Chaco live the wild Indian tribes, the peaceful Chalupes and Lenguas, noted for their extreme disinclination to work and their incomparable bodily dirtiness. Further out along the Bra-

dizilian border lives a ferocious warrior tribe known as the Moros, which is still contesting the spread of civilization into their area. In 1955 a group of Moros encamped on the outskirts of the Mennonite colonies attacked a farmer working in his field and a blacksmith working at his forge in one of the villages. The Mennonites are a peaceful people who carry no firearms, but the Moros are not as considerate. In their 30 years of colonization in the Chaco, not a few of the Mennonites have ended their lives with an arrow or spear in their backs—the price of the advancement of civilization in many a country.

Asunción is a city of some 250,000, with about a million other inhabitants concentrated in the agricultural area extending from the capital down through the Misiones to Encarnación on the Paraná River. The capital of Paraguay is a fascinating city, more colonial in appearance than any other capital in Latin America although it has a street railway system, bus lines, street lights, moving picture theaters, modern stores, and some handsome public buildings. The palace that Don Carlos Lopez, the second President of the Republic of Paraguay, built on the banks of the River Paraguay is still Government House. No longer a residence, it houses the offices of the President and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Helped by a loan from our Eximbank, Asunción is now constructing its first central water-supply system. Only a small portion of the downtown area of the city is served by a sewer system.

For me, some of the indelibly impressed signatures of the city are dairy cows and burros grazing in the streets; an old Paraguayan woman sitting on the sidewalk, smoking a long black cigar as she prepares a cup of *maté*, the national drink; Indians from across the river with ostrich feather dusters and bows and arrows to sell; a stately woman walking down the street with almost anything balanced on her head, from a 5-gallon can of milk to a basket of chickens or a bundle of a dozen brooms for sale; little boys chasing their burros home, laden with tripe and other viscera sold to them for a few guaranies at the slaughterhouse; workmen pounding rock into the earth of the streets, with large four-man wooden mallets to cobblestone Asunción's streets. For much of the year, the trees which line the streets are festooned with golden oranges, but the sampler is doomed to disappointment as they are *agria* and their
juice is very bitter. In heavy downpours, the streets become torrents which have been known to carry cobblestones, paving, and even automobiles with them.

The way of life in Paraguay varies in all of its complexity from the nomadic Indian civilization of the Moro, to the two-wall mud hogar of the Chaco Indian, to the brick or dobe farmhouse of the Paraguayan paisano, to the early 20th century farm culture of the isolated communities of the Mennonites, Hutterites, and Slavs, to the finest and most modern residence that one could desire in Asunción. There are but few great fortunes, and there are many peasant farmers in the country who would be considered quite poor by our mid-Western standards but who seem to be content with their subsistence-level agricultural operation on 2- to 25-acre quintas. Overlaid on the 19th century economy are such dramatic exemplifications of our 20th century machine age as the airplane, modern farm machinery, the heavy-duty tractor, modern road machinery, and the automobile. Into this mixed economy in 1942, under the direction of Nelson Rockefeller, came our first North American technicians to help the Paraguayans progress in the fields of agriculture, health, and education.

Results of Technical Assistance

Working together with the Paraguayans, these technicians have accomplished some spectacular results. The outstanding accomplishments in the field of public health have been the establishment of the one tuberculosis hospital in the country at Bellavista and of public health centers in the Ministry of Health in Asunción, in Barrio Obrero, a workers' residential district of Asunción, and in Encarnación, Concepción, and Villarica, the next three largest cities after Asunción. Doctors and nurses have been assisted to acquire a better education by scholarships to the United States and to neighboring countries. Technicians of the Public Health Servicio, working together with Paraguayans of the Ministry of Public Health, developed a plan for a modern water-supply system, which was the basis for an approved loan of $7,200,000 from our Export-Import Bank. The detailed plans for this water system have been completed and the contract for construction let to an American firm. These same technicians jointly planned a modern sewage disposal system for Asunción, which the city government of Asunción is slowly constructing as money becomes available.

The Health Servicio also provided a building for the maternity hospital in Barrio Obrero and assisted with many improvements in the physical plant at the Hospital de Clinicas, the institution in which students and graduates of the Medical School of the University of Asunción take their practical instruction and internship. To assist in the eradication of leprosy, the Servicio developed a subsistence farm for inmates of the Santa Isabel Leper Colony, which is now operating satisfactorily under Paraguayan management. New buildings and better management have improved a leprosy preventorium for children of leprous parents at Santa Teresita on the outskirts of Asunción. This Servicio's nursing and social service technicians have assisted in the management of the Instituto de Enseñanza de Dr. Andres Barbero.

In the field of vocational education, the most dramatic accomplishment has been the construction, equipment, and operation of a fine vocational school in Asunción, which has now been turned over to the directorship of a Paraguayan engineer educated on a scholarship to the United States. This school is producing the many trained electricians, printers, machinists, plumbers, and radio and refrigeration technicians required by the Paraguayan economy. A vocational school has also been established as part of the Colegio Nacional in Concepción.

In the field of elementary and secondary education, the outstanding accomplishment has been the construction and operation of a rural normal boarding school at San Lorenzo, where student teachers from country districts follow a 5-year course in proper methods of teaching and curricula planning, looking toward a badly needed expansion of the public school system of Paraguay. The management of this school is now being turned over to Paraguayan teachers, many of whom were trained on scholarships in the United States. In association with this normal school, Paraguayan and American technicians supervise the operation of an elementary experimental school, in which the student teachers obtain their practical experience.

In agriculture, American and Paraguayan technicians have labored together effectively in the fields of agronomy, cooperative development of
improved breeds of beef cattle, modern dairy practice, use and development of forestal products from Paraguay’s 83 varieties of trees, improved agricultural education, an artificial insemination program. Introduction of United States beef cattle blood lines has laid the foundation for a greatly improved livestock economy, one of Paraguay’s most important sources of foreign exchange. Technicians at the Servicio cattle ranch at Barrerito have introduced sound methods for improvement of the criollo cattle herds of the Paraguayan central zone and demonstrated better methods of range management by pasture fencing and controlled breeding. Highly significant in the fields of both public health and agriculture has been experimentation with seed germination, which has brought to Paraguay a completely new truck-gardening industry and an infinitely more varied and healthful diet for its people. Currently, the most outstanding joint labors in agriculture are the establishment and supervision of 10 agricultural extension service offices, which have organized 35 rural youth and rural women’s clubs similar to our 4-H clubs in the United States. The Agricultural Servicio is now turning its attention increasingly to education, extension service, and increased agricultural production.

Cooperative Undertaking

It gives me great pleasure at this point to emphasize again that this work is not under the sole management and direction of American technicians and officials assigned to Paraguay for this purpose; it is truly an exemplification of good partnership, of the joint efforts of American and Paraguayan officials and technicians. Furthermore, the Paraguayan Government has an outstanding record among the countries of Latin America in which such technical aid has been and is being extended. Paraguay has always contributed its fair share of monetary support to our joint efforts, looking toward an increase in production, improvement of the economy, and raising the standard of living of the Paraguayan people, with the long view of taking over the complete responsibility for financing and operation of all of our joint projects as soon as may be practicable.

In addition to these efforts in technical assistance, we have inspired a novel agreement for construction of a road network in the Gran Chaco, whereby the Ministry of Public Works furnishes the machinery and labor, the Mennonites at Filadelfia supply technically trained young men to operate the road machinery and instruct Paraguayans in its maintenance and operation, the cattle ranchers of the Chaco provide the money for fuel and oil, and our Operations Mission makes the plans and supplies the supervising road engineers. With new road machinery and soldier labor furnished by the Paraguayan Department of Defense, this joint team has commenced work on the first section of road which will connect Filadelfia and Mariscal Estigarribia in the Chaco with the Paraguay River at Asunción and Concepción.

To encourage private investment by American and other foreign capital, we have prepared a fine volume describing the economic basis for foreign investment in Paraguay, have assisted with drafting an investment guaranty law, and have negotiated an investment guaranty agreement with the Paraguayan Government, all of which combine to make investment in Paraguay much more attractive. With this and other assistance rendered, one American firm has reopened a long-closed meat packing plant and another has arranged a long-term credit for badly needed road and agricultural machinery.

During these 2 years, we have assisted the Government of Paraguay with a loan for the Asunción waterworks and for rehabilitation of the Asunción International Airport. We are now actively studying the proposal for a push-tow barge line on the Paraguay River. Thanks to a negotiated sale of $3 million of excess agricultural products to Paraguay under Public Law 480, we will be able to lend the Government of Paraguay local currency to assist it to accomplish such economically sound development projects as the waterworks, airports, road network, sewer system, immigration, and capital assistance to private industry.

Our military missions have assisted the Paraguayan Armed Forces to train and organize their military units so that they will better support our joint objectives of defense of the Western Hemisphere. Members of our missions work together closely with their coworkers in the Paraguayan Army and Air Force. Both of our missions have arranged to send many Paraguayan officers and men to the U.S. Army Caribbean School and the
U.S. Air Force Latin American School, as well as to our Army and Air Force schools in the United States.

This exchange of military students is only one facet of our cultural exchange with Paraguay. I have previously mentioned the many scholarships given to Paraguayans by our International Cooperation Administration. The State Department's International Educational Exchange Program brings students to our universities each year. All of these programs which bring foreign students to the United States are important, for they help to increase the understanding of us North Americans among our Latin American friends to the south, fostering a mutual understanding between peoples that is essential to a true peace in the world.

In the cultural field, the brightest star in the crown of our efforts in Paraguay is the Paraguayan-American Cultural Center, which has been operating in a former private school building in downtown Asunción since 1942. Managed by a Board of Governors 90 percent Paraguayan, the President is a distinguished Paraguayan surgeon. The Director and Director of Courses are American grantees, but the Assistant Director and the other teachers and employees are Paraguayans. The center has currently enrolled in its English classes some 1,700 students. It is the home of the Ex-Residents (of the United States) Club, enrolling as members any person who has ever lived in our country, which meets periodically at dinners, dances, or picnics for friendly social intercourse.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library located in the center is Asunción's most important lending library and now has some 9,100 volumes of Spanish and English books on its shelves. On the tables of its reading room, the center keeps copies of 93 American and Spanish periodicals available to members and nonmembers alike.

On adjacent property which it has purchased, the center will soon commence construction of a new auditorium to seat 200 persons, financing the construction with its own funds and a loan from local sources. On a daily basis, the center offers an interesting series of cultural and educational programs. In a typical week, the center program would provide two programs of movies, a concert of recorded classical and popular music, two rehearsals of the mixed polyphonic chorus, an evening of square dancing, a lecture on art by a local or visiting expert in conjunction with a visiting art exhibit. The center also offers such entertainment for its American and Paraguayan members as dances, receptions, teen-age parties, dinners, picnics, etc. The center has 1,234 dues-paying members; in calendar year 1955, the management estimates that over 100,000 persons used the facilities of the center.

In my opinion, these cultural centers, or joint information centers, throughout the Latin Americans make our finest contribution to mutual understanding between our peoples.

**Plans for the Future**

So much for our significant joint efforts in the past. Doubtless you would like to ask, "Where do we go from here?" We have recently been making studies in all of our missions to determine new directions for our mutual efforts.

In agriculture, with Paraguay's vital need to increase production, our Servicio will be directing its efforts into agricultural education, field extension service, increasing the production of present export crops, and initiating production of new crops which will earn or save foreign exchange.

In public health, Servicio and Ministry doctors and technicians will increasingly devote their efforts to technical aid with a view to spreading the benefits of public health more broadly throughout the country. Control and eventual eradication of malaria will become of increasing interest to us in Paraguay as the improved road conditions tend to spread the incidence of that disease through the country. In medical education, the Health Servicio will cooperate closely with the Education Servicio to raise the standard of medical and nursing education.

In education, our Servicio will become increasingly concerned with educational problems at high school and university levels, in which, until now, they have worked but little. Its technicians will be working with their opposite numbers in the Ministry to continue to improve teaching methods, curricula, and teaching staff in the primary and secondary schools and to extend the benefits of education to all of the children of Paraguay.

More and more, we will be devoting our attention to improving the economy of the country in cooperation with the Paraguayan Government by encouraging sound financial and fiscal policies which will make foreign investment safe and
profitable. Working together with Paraguayan Government officials, we will seek ways to increase the incentive for farmers and small industries.

We will continue to work in the field of transportation—land, air, and water. Our joint plans provide for continuing technical assistance in roadbuilding and airport construction. With sound development of a good road network, agricultural production can be rapidly expanded, but it will need eager minds and strong backs to do the planning and the work. We will be working together to introduce the immigrants that this underpopulated and richly endowed country will require for advancement.

In support of our policy of good partnership, we will continue our cooperation with the Government to help eliminate or contain the subversive efforts of the international Communist conspiracy which seeks to overthrow our free governments. In the military field, we will encourage the concept of a joint American defense to which each of our countries will make a coordinated contribution according to its own capabilities. We believe that this will strengthen our defense against subversion at home and attack from outside the hemisphere.

In the cultural field, we will continue to seek to broaden and strengthen the mutual understanding and respect for the convictions and aspirations of the other peoples of this hemisphere, so that we may achieve all that is noble and desirable in the economic, political, and military fields.

All of these objectives are practical and feasible. We shall try to accomplish them not by trying to impose our methods, our system, our opinions, or our financial, political, or military power on any other country but by working together as good partners in progress.

In all of these areas, we have been helpful to the Government and people of Paraguay and of the other free countries of the Western World. But it is particularly in the cultural and informational field that we must work together to inform and alert the peoples of the other countries of this hemisphere as to the mortal danger they face from internal subversion and external coercion by the Communist international conspiracy. We have made striking progress in convincing the other Republics of the Americas that our people and their peoples must maintain what military leaders call a "posture of strength."

This must be more than a posture of military strength—we must also possess economic and moral strength. Our economic system of people's capitalism depends more and more upon trading freely with the other free nations of the world—upon selling them surplus goods from our farms and our great industrial establishment and upon buying from them the raw materials which we must have to keep that establishment operating at peak efficiency. Our Government has helped by building up the economic strength of the other nations of the Americas and by promoting an international economic climate where increased foreign trade is possible and profitable.

But we must always remember that the economic strength, the freedom, and the security of our country rest upon the moral and spiritual vigor of our people and upon the continuing freedom of choice of the vast majority of the rest of the peoples of the world. Because of our Christian system of ethics, we owe our position of leadership in the world today not so much to our military and economic power as to the unusual kind of idealism we present to the world.

In all our dealings with the other peoples of the world, we must be vigilant to maintain the opposite of the spurious moral code which Marx and Lenin gave to the Communist World. If our objectives be sound, then we must always seek to achieve them only by means which are morally correct.

We must never forget that communism claims to be a sort of humanism which pretends to work for the material good of all mankind; that professes to believe in the equality of races, sexes, and individuals; that promises an eventual Golden Age when all will be members of one happy family.

We must recognize the Russian and international communism for what it is—an international conspiracy for power and conquest, a sham before the world. It is indeed powerful militarily but it is desperately weak morally; there is no basis in ethics for the Communist philosophy of moral good. As always, the motivating force of communism is lust for personal power and position and their perquisites.

I cannot do better to end this talk than to quote from the book of my old friend, Admiral William

*Admiral Ambassador to Russia, Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, 1955.*
H. Standley, for a year and a half our Ambassador to Soviet Russia during the last war:

“We cannot win this war of ideologies by military and economic strength alone. While maintaining a posture of strength in those areas, the power of the Communist conspiracy can best be attacked by understanding it for the sham and pretense that it is, by working against it in the fields where it prospers—among the underprivileged, in the press, on the radio, in the trade unions, among intellectuals who are often attracted by its pseudo-humanistic philosophy—by recognizing the basic immorality of its beliefs within which are lodged the seeds of its own destruction—the debasing greed for power and privilege of its leaders.

“Finally, we must each of us know, honor and frequently recall the eternal values of the beliefs which we hold, for which we struggle, for which we work, for which we are committed to fight, by which, in the long course, we must live or die.”

World Bank Reports $8.4 Million Net Income for 3-Month Period

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on November 6 reported a net income of $8.4 million for the 3 months ending September 30, 1956, compared with $6.2 million for the same period in 1955.

This income was placed in the supplemental reserve against losses on loans and guaranties and raised the reserve to $159 million. Loan commissions amounted to $3.9 million and were credited to the bank’s special reserve, increasing that reserve to $81 million.

Total reserves on September 30, 1956, were $240 million.

Gross income, exclusive of loan commissions, was $17 million, compared with $15.2 million in 1955. Expenses for the 3-month period totaled $8.6 million.

The bank made three loans totaling $34 million—two in Austria and one in Costa Rica. This brought the total number of loans to 153 in 44 countries and raised the gross total of commitments to $2,754.1 million. Disbursements on loans were $64.7 million, making total disbursements $2,028.3 million on September 30.

Repayments of principal received by the bank amounted to $8.6 million. Total principal repayments, including prepayments, amounted to $264.5 million on September 30; this included $173 million repaid to the bank and $91.5 million to the purchasers of borrowers’ obligations sold by the bank.

The bank sold or agreed to sell the equivalent of $11.7 million principal amounts of loans. The total amount of such sales was $287.9 million on September 30, of which $218.9 million was without guaranty.

In sinking fund operations the bank purchased a face amount of $900,000 of its 3 1/2 percent 15-year bonds of 1954 due 1969 and £3,400 of its 3 1/2 percent 20-year sterling stock of 1951 due 1966/71. The funded debt of the bank was consequently reduced to $849.3 million at September 30, 1956.

During September the bank arranged to sell at par a $75-million issue of 2-year bonds by private placement entirely outside the United States. In September the bank also entered into an agreement with the Swiss Confederation, subject to ratification by the Swiss Parliament, whereby the Swiss Government will lend Sw Fr 200 million (approximately $47 million) to the bank.

Argentina and Viet-Nam became members of the bank during the quarter; their capital stock subscriptions were $150 million and $12.5 million respectively. At September 30, the bank had 60 member countries and total subscribed capital was $9,263.2 million.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

84th Congress, 1st Session


84th Congress, 2d Session


Question of Chinese Representation in the United Nations

Following are texts of statements by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., U.S. Representative to the General Assembly, on the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations.

STATEMENT IN GENERAL COMMITTEE, NOVEMBER 14

U.S. delegation press release 2516

I propose that this committee recommend to the General Assembly that it adopt the following motion:

The General Assembly
1. Decides not to include in the agenda of its Eleventh Regular Session the additional item proposed by India in Document A/3338;
2. Decides not to consider at its Eleventh Regular Session any proposals to exclude the Representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat the Representatives of the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China.

I would like to just speak a moment or two on this motion.

We strongly oppose the seating of the representatives of the Chinese Communist regime, which has consistently acted in contempt of the purposes and principles of our charter. But I shall not discuss the substance of this matter in this procedural meeting.

I will merely say that it must be obvious to everyone at this table that here is a question which divides the United Nations very strongly. At this time of difficulty in world history in Hungary and in the Near East, it is particularly desirable that we should not further divide the United Nations.

I think the arguments which have held true in the past not only hold true today but there is this added factor. For that reason I hope that the motion which I have made will be adopted.1

1The vote on the motion was 8-5, with 1 abstention.

STATEMENT IN PLENARY, NOVEMBER 15

U.S. delegation press release 2519-A

I will not respond in detail to the diatribe of the Soviet representative [Dmitri T. Shepilov]. That is pretty much the standardized version that we have had here every year.

I will make this comment: He talks about the hopes of American citizens to enslave China, and he talks about American interference in China. This, Mr. President, from the representative of a country which at this very moment that I am speaking is deporting the young manhood of Hungary to Siberia in boxcars, surely sets some kind of a record in infamous hypocrisy.

I also note his reference to the peaceful development of China by the Chinese Communist Government. I wonder if he includes the slaughter of millions of Chinese by this Communist administration as a sign of peaceful development.

Now, Mr. President, the resolution which has been reported to this session by the General Committee is a recommendation which is clearly within the rules. The fact that it is clearly within the rules was held by the chairman of the General Committee, who is none other than your honorable self who is sitting here today as President of the General Assembly [Wan Waithayakon]. The fact that this is a recommendation clearly within the rules was not only held by you, sir, but was held by the General Committee by a decisive vote.

This recommendation is also clearly within the precedents. It was done by the General Committee during the 6th session of the General Assembly. So there isn’t any question about this being clearly legal and within the rules.

This resolution presents the issue clearly to this plenary session. It draws the issue clearly. We can vote it up or we can vote it down. The issue which we confront is whether or not to accept the report of the General Committee. The amendment2 of the distinguished representative from

2The Indian amendment, which proposed deletion of the word “not” from paragraph 1 and deletion of paragraph 2, was rejected by a vote of 25 to 45, with 9 abstentions.

November 26, 1956
India [Arthur S. Lall] therefore is not necessary. In my opinion it is clearly superfluous. It simply inverts the way you vote.

The United States, as I think everyone knows, strongly opposes the admission of the Chinese Communist regime, but I will not discuss the substance today. I will merely submit this thought to the Assembly, which was often voiced in the General Committee and which I believe will appeal to all our instincts of prudence and wisdom: If ever there was a year which is full of crises for the world—when we face a crisis in the Near East and a crisis in Hungary and other places—so if ever there was a year when it would be unwise further to divide the United Nations, this is the year.

For that reason we support this resolution which merely provides that we decide not to consider this question at our 11th regular session.  

**Inscription of Hungarian Question on General Assembly Agenda**

*Statement by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. U.S. Representative to the General Assembly*  

I support the motion of the representative of India [V. K. Krishna Menon] to put the question of Hungary on the agenda of the General Assembly.

The situation in Hungary is of utmost urgency, all the more so since the present Hungarian authorities have now announced their rejection of almost all of the recommendations of the emergency session. Meanwhile the merciless repression of the Hungarian people continues, which of course utterly revolts the civilized world. The situation is as heartbreaking as ever.

As Hungarian men, women, and children face the Soviet terror, they look to this Assembly for assistance. We must continue to search for and act on every appropriate means to extend that assistance, to resist this dark and bloody, sordid and sinister influence that is at large in the world.

The Soviet representative [Dmitri T. Sheplov]

---

2. The Assembly accepted the General Committee's recommendation by a vote of 47 to 24, with 8 abstentions.


---

**U.S. Delegations to International Conferences**

**Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia**

The Department of State announced on November 14 (press release 583) that the U.S. Government will participate in the eighth meeting of the Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (generally known as the Colombo Plan), which is scheduled to be held at Wellington, New Zealand, from November 19 to December 8, 1956. A preliminary working group, which convened at Wellington on November 5, will meet until the 17th.

Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, will be the U.S. representative to the Ministerial Meeting, which will be held from December 4 to 8. Howard P. Jones, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Economic Affairs, will serve as alternate U.S. representative to the Ministerial Meeting. Jack C. Corbett, Director of the Office of International Financial and Development Affairs, Department of State, will be the U.S. representa-

---

2. The Committee recommended inscription of the item by a vote of 11 to 2, with 1 abstention. At its plenary meeting the same day, the General Assembly decided by a vote of 62-9-8 to include the item on its agenda; subsequently, by a vote of 51-9-19, the Assembly approved the General Committee's recommendation that the item be dealt with directly in plenary (i.e. without reference to a committee) as a matter of priority.
tive to the Officials Meeting and alternate U.S. representative to the Ministerial Meeting.

Other members of the delegation, who will serve as advisers to both meetings, are:

Solomon H. Chaikin, Special Assistant for Asian Regional Programs, Office of the Deputy Director for Operations, International Cooperation Administration
Alex B. Daspit, Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service, Department of State
Ralph Hirschtritt, Assistant Chief, South and Southeast Asia Division, Office of International Finance, Department of the Treasury
William Kling, First Secretary, American Embassy, Wellington
John Gordon Mein, Deputy Director, Office of Southwest Pacific Affairs, Department of State
George S. Springsteen, Jr., Economic Development Division, Office of International Financial and Development Affairs, Department of State
Walter G. Stoneman, Deputy Chief, Thailand Division, Office of Far Eastern Affairs, International Cooperation Administration

Henry L. Pitts, Jr., Office of International Conferences, Department of State, will serve as secretary of the delegation.

The annual meetings of the Colombo Plan nations are held for the purpose of exchanging views on problems concerning the economic development of the countries of South and Southeast Asia and to provide a framework within which an international cooperative effort can be promoted to assist the countries of the area to raise their living standards. The United States became a member of the Consultative Committee in 1951 and has since that time participated in the annual meetings of the Committee. The United States discusses and reports on its economic programs in South and Southeast Asia at the annual meetings. U.S. economic aid, however, is distributed on a bilateral basis.

Items on the agenda include approval of the annual report, which reviews the accomplishments and progress made under the Colombo Plan program; a report on technical assistance; and the Colombo Plan Information Unit.

Countries represented on the Committee are Australia, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Malaya and North Borneo, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States, and Viet-Nam. Observers from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East will also attend the Wellington meetings.

Trade Committee of U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America

The Department of State announced on November 16 (press release 587) that Ambassador Harold M. Randall will be chief of the U.S. delegation to the first meeting of the Trade Committee of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America, which will be held at Santiago, Chile, beginning November 19. Ambassador Randall is U.S. representative on the Inter-American Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States.

Other members of the delegation are as follows:

Alexander Rosenson, Economic Adviser, Office of Regional Economic Affairs, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State
Margaret Potter, Chief, Trade Agreements Branch, Trade Agreements and Treaties Division, Bureau of Economic Affairs, Department of State
Robert J. Dorr, First Secretary, American Embassy, Santiago

The meeting is being held pursuant to resolution 101 (VI) of the Sixth Session of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America at Bogotá, September 1950. The resolution provides for the establishment by the Economic Commission for Latin America of a Trade Committee formed by member countries for the purpose of intensifying inter-American trade through the solution of practical problems which hamper or delay such trade.

TREATY INFORMATION

Air Transport Agreement With Colombia Signed

Press release 556 dated October 25

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

A bilateral air transport agreement between the United States and the Republic of Colombia was signed on October 24 at Bogotá. The agreement
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was signed for Colombia by José Manuel Rivas Sacconi, Minister of Foreign Relations, and Mauricio Obregón, Colombian Ambassador to Venezuela, and for the United States by Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal.

This agreement is substantially the same as those in effect between the United States and some 45 other countries. It will replace an agreement on air transport (commonly known as the Kellogg-Olaya Pact) entered into by Colombia and the United States on February 23, 1929. The new agreement makes provision for the route to be flown between the two countries by their respective airlines and generally provides for the regulation of civilian air transport between them. The agreement becomes provisionally effective on January 1, 1957, pending ratification by the Government of Colombia.

TEXT OF AGREEMENT

AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Colombia,
Desiring to conclude an Agreement for the purpose of promoting and regulating air communications between their respective territories,
Have appointed as their plenipotentiaries: His Excellency the President of the Republic of Colombia: José Manuel Rivas Sacconi, Minister of Foreign Relations, and Ambassador Mauricio Obregón; and His Excellency the President of the United States of America: Philip W. Bonsal, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, accredited to the Government of the Republic of Colombia; who having communicated their respective full powers, found to be in due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

For the purposes of the present Agreement and its Annexes, except where the text provides otherwise:

(A) The term “Agreement” shall be deemed to include the Agreement and its Annexes.

(B) The term “Aeronautical authorities” shall mean in the case of the United States of America, the Civil Aeronautics Board or any person or agency authorized to perform the functions exercised at the present time by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and, in the case of the Republic of Colombia, the Dirección General de la Aeronautica Civil or any person or agency authorized to perform the functions exercised at present by the said Dirección General.

(C) The term “designated airline” shall mean an airline that one contracting party has notified the other contracting party, in writing, to be the airline which will operate a specific route or routes listed in Annex II of this Agreement.

(D) The term “territory” in relation to a State shall mean the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto under the sovereignty, suzerainty, jurisdiction, protection, mandate or trusteeship of that State.

(E) The term “air service” shall mean any scheduled air service performed by aircraft for the public transport of passengers, mail or cargo.

(F) The term “international air service” shall mean an air service which passes through the air space over the territory of more than one State.

(G) The term “stop for non-traffic purposes” shall mean a landing for any purpose other than taking on or discharging passengers, cargo or mail.

(H) The term “traffic requirements” shall mean the demand of the traffic in passengers, cargo and mail over the routes specified in Annex II.

ARTICLE 2

Each contracting party grants to the other contracting party rights necessary for the conduct of air services by the designated airlines, as follows: the rights of transit, of stops for non-traffic purposes, and of commercial entry and departure for international traffic in passengers, cargo, and mail at the points in its territory named on each of the routes specified in the appropriate paragraph of Annex II of the present Agreement.

ARTICLE 3

Air service on a specified route may be inaugurated by an airline or airlines of one contracting party at any time after that contracting party has designated such airline or airlines for that route and the other contracting party has given the appropriate operating permission. Such other party shall, subject to Article 4, be bound to give this permission provided that the designated airline or airlines may be required to qualify before the competent aeronautical authorities of that party, under the laws and regulations normally applied by these authorities, before being permitted to engage in the operations contemplated by this Agreement. In addition, in areas of hostility or military occupation, or in areas affected thereby, said operations shall be subject to the approval of the competent military authorities.

ARTICLE 4

Each contracting party reserves the right to withhold or revoke, or impose such appropriate conditions as it may deem necessary with respect to, the operating permission referred to in Article 3 of this Agreement in the event that it considers that substantial ownership and effective control of an airline designated by the other contracting party are not vested in such other contracting party or its nationals. Either contracting party desiring to exercise such rights shall give thirty (30) days advance notice of its intention to the other contracting party. If during this period of thirty (30) days, the party receiving the notice submits to the other party a request for consultation.
with respect thereto, such consultation shall take place in accordance with Article 11 of this Agreement, and further action to revoke, or impose conditions on, the operating permission shall be held in abeyance for a reasonable period of time to permit the conclusion of such consultation. Each party may also, without prior consultation, refuse or revoke, or impose the conditions which it deems appropriate on, such operating permission in case the airplane designated by the other party does not comply with the laws and regulations referred to in Article 5 of this Agreement, or in case of the failure of the airline or the government designating it otherwise to perform its obligations hereunder, or to fulfill the conditions under which the rights are granted in accordance with this Agreement.

**Article 5**

(A) The laws and regulations of one contracting party relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of the airline or airlines designated by the other contracting party, and shall be complied with by such aircraft upon entering or departing from and while within the territory of the first contracting party.

(B) The laws and regulations of one contracting party relating to the admission to, sojourn in or departure from its territory of passengers, crew, or cargo of aircraft, such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine shall be complied with by or on behalf of such passengers, crew or cargo of the other contracting party upon entrance into and departure from, and while within the territory of the first contracting party.

**Article 6**

Certificates of airworthiness, certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by one contracting party, and still in force, shall be recognized as valid by the other contracting party for the purpose of operating the routes and services provided for in this Agreement, provided that the requirements under which such certificates or licenses were issued or rendered valid are equal to or above the minimum standards which are or may be established pursuant to the Convention on International Civil Aviation. Each contracting party reserves the right, however, to refuse to recognize, for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to its own nationals by another State.

**Article 7**

In order to prevent discriminatory practices and to assure equality of treatment, both contracting parties agree that:

(A) Each of the contracting parties may impose or permit to be imposed just and reasonable charges for the use of public airports and other facilities under its control. Each of the contracting parties agrees, however, that these charges shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international services.

(B) Fuel, lubricating oils, consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores introduced into the territory of one contracting party by the other contracting party or its nationals, and intended solely for use by aircraft of such contracting party shall be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from customs duties, inspection fees and other national duties or charges.

(C) Fuel, lubricating oils, other consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores retained on board aircraft of the airlines of one contracting party authorized to operate the routes and services provided for in this Agreement shall, upon arriving in or leaving the territory of the other contracting party, be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from customs duties, inspection fees and other national duties or charges, even though such supplies be used or consumed by such aircraft on flights in that territory.

(D) Fuel, lubricating oils, other consumable technical supplies, spare parts, regular equipment, and stores taken on board aircraft of the airlines of one contracting party in the territory of the other and used in international services shall be exempt on a basis of reciprocity from customs duties, excise taxes, inspection fees and other national duties or charges.

**Article 8**

There shall be a fair and equal opportunity for the airlines of each contracting party to operate on any route covered by this Agreement.

**Article 9**

In the operation by the airlines of either contracting party of the trunk services described in this Agreement, the interest of the airlines of the other contracting party shall be taken into consideration so as not to affect unduly the services which the latter provide on all or part of the same routes.

**Article 10**

The air services made available to the public by the airlines operating under this Agreement shall bear a close relationship to the requirements of the public for such services.

It is the understanding of both contracting parties that services provided by a designated airline under the present Agreement shall retain as their primary objective the provision of capacity adequate to the traffic demands between the country of which such airline is a national and the countries of ultimate destination of the traffic. The right to embark or disembark on such services international traffic destined for and coming from third countries at a point or points on the routes specified in Annex II of this Agreement shall be applied in accordance with the general principles of orderly development to which both contracting parties subscribe and shall be subject to the general principle that capacity should be related:

(a) To traffic requirements between the country of origin and the countries of ultimate destination of the traffic;

(b) To the requirements of through airline operation; and,
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(c) To the traffic requirements of the area through which the airline passes after taking account of local and regional services.

**Article 11**

Consultation between the competent authorities of both contracting parties may be requested at any time by either contracting party for the purpose of discussing the interpretation, application, or amendment of this Agreement or any part or parts thereof. Such consultation shall begin within a period of sixty (60) days from the date of the receipt of the request by the Department of State of the United States of America or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Colombia, as the case may be. Should agreement be reached on amendment of the Agreement, such amendment will come into effect upon confirmation by an exchange of diplomatic notes.

**Article 12**

Except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, any dispute between the contracting parties relative to the interpretation or application of this Agreement which cannot be settled through consultation shall be submitted for an expression of opinion to a tribunal of three arbitrators, one to be named by each contracting party, and the third to be agreed upon by the two arbitrators so chosen; provided, that such third arbitrator shall not be a national of either contracting party. Each of the contracting parties shall designate an arbitrator within two months of the date of delivery by either party to the other party of a diplomatic note requesting arbitration of a dispute; and the third arbitrator shall be agreed upon within one month after such period of two months.

If either of the contracting parties fails to designate its own arbitrator within two months, or if the third arbitrator is not agreed upon within the time limit indicated, either party may request the President of the International Court of Justice to make the necessary appointment or appointments by choosing the arbitrator or arbitrators.

The contracting parties will use their best efforts under the powers available to them to put into effect the opinion expressed by the arbitrators. A moiety of the expenses of the arbitral tribunal shall be borne by each party.

**Article 13**

This Agreement, amendments thereto, and contracts connected therewith shall be registered with the International Civil Aviation Organization.

**Article 14**

If a general multilateral air transport convention accepted by both contracting parties enters into force, the present Agreement shall be amended so as to conform with the provisions of such convention.

**Article 15**

Either of the contracting parties may at any time notify the other of its intention to terminate the present Agreement. Such a notice shall be sent simultaneously to the International Civil Aviation Organization. In the event such communication is made, this Agreement shall terminate one year after the date of its receipt, unless by agreement between the contracting parties the notice of intention to terminate is withdrawn before the expiration of that time. If the other contracting party fails to acknowledge receipt, notice shall be deemed as having been received fourteen days after its receipt by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

**Article 16**

This Agreement, upon entry into force provisionally, will supersede and terminate the Agreement concerning air transport effected by the exchange of notes between the contracting parties on February 23, 1929.

**Article 17**

The present Agreement shall enter into force provisionally on January 1, 1957, and will become definitive upon receipt by the Government of the United States of America of a notification by the Government of the Republic of Colombia of its ratification of the Agreement.

In witness whereof, the undersigned being duly authorized by their respective Governments, have signed the present Agreement.

Done in duplicate at Bogotá in the English and Spanish languages this 24th day of October, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America

**Philip W. Bonsal**

For the Government of the Republic of Colombia

**José Manuel Rivas Sacconi**

**Mauricio Obregon**

**Annex I**

Rates to be charged on the routes provided for in this Agreement shall be reasonable, due regard being paid to all relevant factors, such as cost of operation, reasonable profit, and the rates charged by any other carriers, as well as the characteristics of each service, and shall be determined in accordance with the following paragraphs:

(A) The rates to be charged by the airlines of either contracting party between points in the territory of the United States and points in the territory of Colombia referred to in Annex II of this Agreement shall, consistent with the provisions of the present Agreement, be subject to the approval of the aeronautical authorities of the contracting parties, who shall act in accordance with their obligations under this Agreement within the limits of their legal powers.

(B) Any rate proposed by an airline of either contracting party shall be filed with the aeronautical authorities of both contracting parties at least thirty (30) days before the proposed date of introduction; provided that this period of thirty (30) days may be reduced in particular cases if so agreed by the aeronautical authorities of each contracting party.

(C) During any period for which the Civil Aeronautics Board of the United States has approved the traffic conference procedures of the International Air Transport
Association (hereinafter called IATA), any rate agreement concluded through these procedures and involving United States airlines will be subject to approval of the Board. During any period for which the Dirección de Aeronautica Civil of Colombia has approved traffic conference procedures of the said Association, any rate agreement concluded through these procedures and involving Colombian airlines will be subject to the approval of said Dirección de Aeronautica.

(D) The contracting parties agree that the procedure described in paragraphs (E), (F) and (G) of this Annex shall apply:

1. If, during the period of the approval of both contracting parties of the IATA traffic conference procedure, either, any specific rate agreement is not approved within a reasonable time by either contracting party, or, a conference of IATA is unable to agree on a rate, or
2. At any time no IATA procedure is applicable, or
3. If either contracting party at any time withdraws or fails to renew its approval of that part of the IATA traffic conference procedure relevant to this Annex.

(E) In the event that power is conferred by law upon the aeronautical authorities of the United States to fix fair and economic rates for the transport of persons and property by air on international services, the contracting parties will consult in accordance with Article 11 for the purpose of amending this Annex I to provide for the handling of rate matters under such circumstances. Until such time as the new procedures referred to are agreed upon, the procedures set forth in paragraphs (F) and (G) below shall apply.

(F) Prior to the time when such power may be conferred upon the aeronautical authorities of the United States, if one of the contracting parties is dissatisfied with any rate proposed by the airline or airlines of either contracting party for services from the territory of one contracting party to a point or points in the territory of the other contracting party, it shall so notify the other prior to the expiry of the first fifteen (15) of the thirty (30) day period referred to in Paragraph (B) above, and the contracting parties shall endeavor to reach agreement on the appropriate rate.

In the event that such agreement is reached, each contracting party will use its best efforts to cause such agreed rate to be put into effect by its airline or airlines.

It is recognized that if no such agreement can be reached prior to the expiry of such thirty (30) days, the contracting party raising the objection to the rate may take such steps as it may consider necessary to prevent the inauguration or continuation of the service in question at the rate complained of.

(G) When in any case under Paragraphs (E) or (F) of this Annex the aeronautical authorities of the two contracting parties cannot agree within a reasonable time upon the appropriate rate after consultation initiated by the complaint of one contracting party concerning the proposed rate or an existing rate of the airline or airlines of the other contracting party, upon the request of either, the terms of Article 12 of this Agreement shall apply.

ANNEX II

Schedules of Routes

A. An airline or airlines designated by the Government of the United States shall be entitled to operate air services on each of the air routes specified via intermediate points, in both directions, and to make scheduled landings in Colombia at the points specified in this paragraph:

1. From United States territory to Barranquilla, Bogotá, Leticia and beyond to points in the Western Hemisphere.
2. From United States territory to Calli and beyond to points in the Western Hemisphere.
3. From United States territory to Medellín.
4. From Colombian territory to New Orleans.

B. An airline or airlines designated by the Government of Colombia shall be entitled to operate air services on each of the air routes specified via intermediate points, in both directions, and to make scheduled landings in the United States at the points specified in this paragraph:

1. From Colombian territory to New York and beyond to points in the Western Hemisphere.
2. From Colombian territory to Miami and New York.
3. From Colombian territory to San Juan, Puerto Rico, and beyond to Europe.
4. From Colombian territory to New Orleans.

C. If a third country allows either of the contracting parties to use one of said third country's airports to serve the territory of said contracting party, as defined in this Agreement, the other contracting party will not object to such use.

D. Points on any of the specified routes may at the option of the designated airline be omitted on any or all flights.

Educational Exchange Agreement With Argentina

Press release 571 dated November 5

The Governments of Argentina and the United States on November 5 signed an agreement putting into operation a program of educational exchanges authorized by the Fulbright Act. The signing took place at Buenos Aires with Luis A. Podestá Costa, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship, representing Argentina and Ambassador Willard L. Beaulac representing the United States.

The agreement provides for the expenditure of Argentine currency up to an aggregate amount of the peso equivalent of $300,000 received from the sale of surplus agricultural products in Argentina to finance exchange of persons between the two countries to study, do research, teach, or engage in other educational activities. The pur-
pose of the program is to further mutual understanding between the peoples of Argentina and the United States by means of these exchanges.

Under the terms of the agreement, a Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States and Argentina will be established to facilitate the administration of the program. The Commission's Board of Directors will consist of six members with equal representation as to Argentine and United States citizens in addition to the American Ambassador, who will serve as honorary chairman. All recipients of awards under the program authorized by the Fulbright Act are selected by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, whose members are appointed by the President of the United States and which maintains a secretariat in the Department of State.

With the signing of this agreement, Argentina becomes the 33d country and the fourth of the other American Republics to participate in the educational exchange program initiated 10 years ago under authority of the Fulbright Act. Educational exchanges between Argentina and the United States have been carried out for a number of years under the Act for Cooperation Between the American Republics, the Smith-Mundt Act, and other legislation. The agreement signed on November 5 will augment the present number of exchanges to a considerable extent.

After the members of the Commission have been appointed and a program has been formulated, information about specific opportunities to participate in the exchange activities will be released.

**Current Actions**

**MULTILATERAL**

**Aviation**

Protocol to amend convention for unification of certain rules relating to international carriage by air signed at

---

1 The United States and Ecuador signed an agreement for a $300,000 program on Oct. 31. For announcements of educational exchange agreements with Chile and Peru, see Bulletin of Apr. 11, 1955, p. 604, and May 14, 1956, p. 815.

Warsaw October 12, 1929 (49 Stat. 3009). Done at The Hague September 28, 1953.\(^2\)

Signatures: Australia, July 12, 1956; Canada, August 16, 1956.

Ratification deposited: El Salvador, September 17, 1956.


Adherence deposited: Morocco, November 13, 1956.

**Narcotic Drugs**

Convention for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs. Done at Geneva July 13, 1931. 48 Stat. 1543.

Accession deposited: Jordan, April 12, 1954.

**Telecommunications**


Notice of denunciation received: Peru, August 13, 1956 (effective August 13, 1957).


Ratification deposited: Afghanistan, October 4, 1956.

**Wheat**


Acceptance deposited: Guatemala, November 6, 1956; Dominican Republic, November 8, 1956.

**BILATERAL**

**Italy**


Proclaimed by the President: November 2, 1956.


Proclaimed by the President: November 2, 1956.

**Peru**


---

2 Not in force.

---
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Check List of Department of State Press Releases: November 12-18

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Press releases issued prior to November 12 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 549 of October 22, 556 of October 23, 571 of November 5, and 573 of November 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>Sale of agricultural surplus commodities to Turkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>Visit of Polish housing officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>Government-industry aviation meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>Delegation to Colombo Plan meeting (rewrite).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Greek Prime Minister sees Acting Secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>11/15</td>
<td>Educational exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>11/16</td>
<td>Hoover: General Assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>11/16</td>
<td>Delegation to ECLA meeting (rewrite).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>11/16</td>
<td>Government-industry aviation meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>11/17</td>
<td>ANZUS Council meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td>Dulles: statement on leaving hospital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not printed.*
The Suez Canal Problem

In this documentary volume is printed a considerable collection of documents pertaining to events from the purported nationalization of the Universal Suez Maritime Canal Company by the Egyptian Government on July 26, 1956, through the Second London Conference on the Suez Canal, September 19-21. Texts of those agreements and treaties of the past century which have a particularly important bearing on the present legal status of the Suez Canal are included. Also in the publication are key documents on the "nationalization" of the canal and on the Western reaction; all the substantive statements of the 22-power London Conference; published papers of the Five-Power Suez Committee and of the Second London Conference on the Suez Canal; and significant public statements of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles on the Suez Canal problem throughout the period from the "nationalization" of the Universal Suez Canal Company to the action at London to establish a Canal Users Association.

Copies of The Suez Canal Problem, July 26-September 22, 1956 may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for $1.25 each.

Publication 6392
$1.25

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

$0.00
(cash, check, or money order).

Please send me ______ copies of The Suez Canal Problem.

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Street Address: ____________________________________________________

City, Zone, and State: _______________________________________________
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General Assembly Action on the Hungarian Question

Following are texts of statements made in the General Assembly by U. S. Representatives Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., James J. Wadsworth, and William F. Knowland concerning the situation in Hungary, together with texts of resolutions adopted by the Assembly on November 21.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, NOVEMBER 19

U. S. delegation press release 2522

The statements which were made this morning by the individuals who purport to speak here for Hungary [Imre Horvath and Endre Sik] must all be seen in the light of the very simple fact that the authorities there will not allow free elections—only the stacked and prearranged Communist variety. Obviously, free elections would result in the speedy disappearance of the Communist regime. Equally obviously, this is why the Communist regime does not allow them. Where there is no freedom there can be very little truth. And I really think that this is why they are not doing the speeches which were made by the two Communist Hungarian representatives this morning.

To turn now to what the Soviet representative [Dmitri T. Shepilov] said: First, he spoke about United States legislation. United States legislation and United States activities concerning the peoples of Eastern Europe are not at all what he said they were. As I said the other night, where the people of Eastern Europe are concerned, the United States seeks to fill their stomachs with food; the Soviets seek to fill their stomachs with lead. There is just about that much difference.

Also, the Soviet representative may as well understand, because this is a basic fundamental thing about American people, that the American people acting through their Congress are opposed to oppression wherever it occurs. That has been true in this country from the beginning of its history. Abraham Lincoln, speaking about the Declaration of Independence—which is the basic American document issued at the time of our American Revolution—said that it gave liberty not alone to the American people but hope for the world for all future time. Abraham Lincoln thought of the ideal of liberty not as something that you just keep and hug to your own breast but as something that you want others to get.

That is the spirit that is back of the legislation to which the Soviet representative referred.

As a matter of fact, Soviet charges against that American legislation have been heard a number of times at previous sessions of this Assembly; previous Soviet representatives have brought it up in resolutions. Their contentions concerning it have never been upheld by the General Assembly.

Now, as regards the statement that we sought to give the impression that there would be United States military help in Hungary, I assert on the very highest authority—and this has been gone into very thoroughly—that no one has ever been incited to rebellion by the United States in any way—by radio broadcast or in any other way.

The rest of the Soviet speech is of course, as we all know, contrary to all the known facts. It is the typical Soviet hash of self-serving newspaper clippings. I listened to it very carefully and it may be that I missed a word here or there, but in the attention that I gave it I never heard one single direct, unqualified denial that these deportations were taking place from Hungary. I have only read through about a third of the text, but listening to it I did not hear one single unqualified denial.

In fact, the tone of the speech was defensive, and really small wonder. Just stop and think—like his predecessor, the Soviet representative denied the Soviet outrages. Yet he refuses to allow United Nations investigators or observers to come...
into the country to find out the truth. Surely, Mr. President, if he believed his own statements he would welcome an impartial United Nations investigation.

By opposing United Nations observers, Mr. Shepilov has succeeded in putting himself into the weakest position in which I have ever seen a debater put himself in any public forum. In effect, he has said to this General Assembly, "I do not believe what I myself have just said."

Now, the facts are not mysterious. For more than 2 weeks the world has watched the tragedy of Hungary, the drama of a great people rising to break the shackles of oppression only to be thwarted by a strategy of duplicity and terror by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, this was a movement of workers, of farmers, of students—of young people. That is why workers in every free country are outraged. These parades by working people, these demonstrations all over the world are not because some old Fascist has suddenly sprouted up. It is because they recognize this as a genuine movement of workers and of youth.

The world first saw a massive concentration of Soviet tanks and troops mobilized around Budapest and throughout Hungary. We were told that negotiations were in progress to secure the withdrawal of these troops. Then the Soviet Union revealed its true intentions. These troops movements were not the redeployment which they were claimed to be. They were part of a plan to restore Soviet domination over the Hungarian people, under the guise of a trumped-up call for help from Hungarian authorities.

Ensuing events disclosed the true nature of the situation, which I shall briefly summarize as the necessary background for what has happened more recently.

On November 4, Soviet troops began their attack on the Hungarian people and their Government at dawn. Two hours later a group of men which has since called itself the Government of Hungary attempted to regularize this act of aggression by issuing a call to the Soviet troops for help against the population of Hungary. Since then we have been told repeatedly that Soviet forces began their activities in answer to this call for assistance and that they are carrying out their activities at the invitation of the Government of Hungary. As the distinguished Foreign Minister of Belgium, M. Spaak, so aptly put it the other day, the Soviet Union must think we are all fools to believe this propaganda in the face of concrete evidence to the contrary.

The bravery and the determination of the people of Hungary are a stirring example for all free men. Even now there are still reports of fighting, of strikes, of continued resistance—so great is the love of liberty in the hearts of that people.

The Soviet Union has been deaf to all the pleas of the United Nations. It has not withdrawn its troops. Representatives of the Secretary-General have been refused entrance into Hungary to investigate the situation. Our distinguished Secretary-General himself, with all of the well-deserved prestige that he carries by virtue of his office and by virtue of his own personal qualities, has not been accorded the most common courtesy which is due to him from a member of the United Nations. His offer to go to Budapest was met with a suggestion that he meet with Hungarian representatives at a place far removed from the events which are of so much concern to us here.

Now as a climax to this story of terror, the Soviet Union is conducting a mass deportation of Hungarian people. We have factual information to substantiate the numerous reports which have appeared in the press.

Information available to the United States Government indicates as of November 14 that the deportations from Budapest alone run to a minimum of 16,000 people.

On November 13, for example, at least 3 trains of 60 boxcars, each with 50 to 60 persons crowded into a car, were reported moving east over the Monor-Szolnok-Debrecen route.

On November 9 a trainload of about 1,500 men, women, and children was reported at Debrecen. A like number was reported on November 11.

Notes have been thrown from trains appealing to the finders of the notes to notify relatives.

Our reports indicate that this movement is continuing. We have had confirmation of a trainload of young Hungarians in sealed freight cars moving toward the Soviet border through Cluj, Predeal, and Ploesti, Rumania. And the people in Rumania who saw them said they were pleading with the people outside of the train to help them to escape.

Mr. President, I understand that the weather in Hungary is still mild at this time of the year but that it is already cold in Russia inside Siberia. It is inevitable that many of the men in these box-
cars, because they are just open boxcars, will die from cold and exposure—just as the unfortunate victims of the Nazi concentration camps died in the trainloads of boxcars which I saw with my own eyes all around the outskirts of the horrible Nazi camp at Dachau in 1945.

This is all information available to the United States Government. None of it is drawn from press reports. But, to provide further confirmation, I cite the following broadcast of the official Hungarian radio.

On November 14, at 1500 GMT, the Budapest Home Service broadcast the following news:

The resumption of work in Szolnok County has begun in the past few days. Some 40 to 50 percent of the workers are active in the factories and enterprises. Railway communications have also started to some extent.

According to the latest reports, however, sealed railway cars have carried prisoners eastward from Budapest, and therefore the railway men allegedly again went on strike. Information was passed on to the various factories, too, and more and more workers are quitting their jobs.

During the past 24 hours the United States has received additional reliable evidence. On November 16 a group of young men were rounded up by Soviet troops near Budapest’s South Station. Also on November 16 Soviet troops removed a number of wounded youths from a hospital located at Peterfy Sandor Utca. On November 17 Soviet troops were seen removing youths from a school located on Vardysmarty Utca. This is very recent.

Because of these reports, the United States welcomes the initiative taken by the delegation of Cuba. These reports add new urgency to the need for prompt compliance with the General Assembly resolutions of November 4 and 9 calling for the withdrawal of all Soviet forces from Hungary and for the dispatch of observers to Hungary by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

As we sit here this afternoon, these boxcars jammed with these unfortunate human beings are rattling away to the cold of Siberia. We urge the Soviet Union to show a decent respect for the opinion of mankind, to cease immediately these deportations, and to return promptly to their homes those Hungarians who have already been taken into exile.

We urge the Hungarian authorities to abide by the provisions of the United Nations Charter and of the peace treaty of 1947, which enjoins them to take all measures necessary to secure to all persons “the enjoyment of human rights, and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion and public meeting.” Let me remind the representative of Hungary that just the other day, speaking from this rostrum, he pledged his Government’s adherence to the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, to vote this resolution is not much, but it is something. To be sure, it will not bring back to life those who have been killed. But some word of it may get through and give some assurance to brave men and women in Hungary that they are not forgotten. Word of this resolution will certainly get through all over the free world and will add to the weight of condemnation which is raising such havoc with international communism.

Passage of this resolution will keep faith with the heroic dead whose sacrifice necessitates that we take every action within our power to take. Mr. President, to vote this resolution—when you compare it with this enormity of man’s inhumanity to man—is not much. But it is something, and we should, therefore, pass it without delay.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR WADSWORTH, NOVEMBER 21

U.S. delegation press release 2524

I want to make a very brief reply to the remarks of the Soviet representative, who utilized a large portion of his speech this morning in attacking the facts about deportations from Hungary which were presented to this Assembly by the United States representative the other day.

Let me repeat that the facts which were presented here were drawn from information available to the United States Government. None of these facts was based on rumor, or on press or other news media reports.

Now, since Ambassador Lodge spoke here the other day, new evidence has become available. For example, we now have information concerning large numbers of deportees arriving at Zahony on the 14th and 16th of this month. There is evidence that on the 15th of this month many deportees broke out of railway cars just north of the Kisvarda railroad station. There is also evidence to the effect that Soviet and not Hun-
garian railway personnel are in charge of railway operations between Debrecen and Zahony.

Now, Mr. President, I could cite many additional facts. And as to the alleged denials put forward and quoted by the Soviet representative this morning, I shall be glad to leave it to this Assembly to decide what credence it wishes to give to the sources that he has quoted. In my delegation’s view these sources are questionable, to say the least.

In our opinion, Mr. President, one needs to ask only two simple questions: If these reports are not true, why have the Soviet and Hungarian authorities refused to permit United Nations observers to enter their country? Why have they refused to receive the Secretary-General?

Now, we are content to leave the answers to those questions to undistorted history based on the impartial observation which this Assembly seeks.

We continue to believe that everything possible must be done to permit that impartial observation to take place. That is why, Mr. President, the United States will vote for both of the resolutions which are before us, as amended by those amendments which have been accepted by the sponsors.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND, NOVEMBER 21

U.S. delegation press release 22925

The United States delegation has studied with great interest the “Interim Report by the Secretary-General on Refugees from Hungary,” dated 19 November 1956. This report indicates that the Secretary-General and the Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees have acted with commendable speed, understanding, and skill in marshaling resources for the assistance of the Hungarian refugees. It also indicates that many governments throughout the world have responded promptly and generously with offers of asylum, food, clothing, medicine, and financing for these refugees.

These offers from governments and nongovernmental agencies have come from a wide variety of sources and have been distributed through various public and private channels. The United States delegation would not want to reduce the number of effective channels for collecting and distributing aid to the Hungarian refugees. At the same time we would urge that in order to avoid waste and

overlapping the relief operation should be coordinated and planned through a single organization. It would appear that the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees is the appropriate organization for this purpose.

As the Deputy High Commissioner’s report to the Secretary-General clearly shows, aid now available for the refugees represents only a small part of their most urgent needs. Moreover, the number of Hungarian refugees is steadily increasing; about 2,000 per day continue to flee their homeland. According to the latest report over 51,000 have fled from Hungary—8,000 last night alone. This morning 62 Hungarian refugees, the vanguard of more than 5,000, arrived on American soil by air. The arrival of additional refugees is being expedited by the United States Government.

Now, unless the large gap between the needs and the resources is filled, the Hungarian refugees will face the most severe privations. In view of this urgent need and appealing to the conscience of people throughout the world, the United States proposes the following resolution for the consideration of this Assembly. This resolution was presented on behalf of Argentina, Belgium, Denmark, and the United States.

[Senator Knowland then read U.N. doc. A/3374.]

Mr. President, I merely want to take one additional moment to speak on the amendments offered by the delegation from Hungary. We note the amendments offered by Hungary and we are opposed to the same. It is obvious that the refugees who are leaving Hungary have no desire to return, and the free nations of the world will certainly not agree to any forcible repatriation. I hope the amendment of Hungary will be defeated.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED ON NOVEMBER 21

Cuban Proposal


The General Assembly,
Recalling its resolutions 1004 (ES-II) [A/Res/393] of 4 November 1956 and 1005 (ES-II), 1006 (ES-II) and

2 U.N. doc. A/Res/393. The amendments, among other things, sought the speedy return to Hungary of “Hungarian nationals who as a result of the present situation became refugees.” The Assembly rejected the amendments.

4 U.N. doc. A/L. 214. The amendments, among other things, sought the speedy return to Hungary of “Hungarian nationals who as a result of the present situation became refugees.” The Assembly rejected the amendments.

5 Introduced on Nov. 15; adopted as amended (A/3357/Rev. 2) by a vote of 55 to 10, with 14 abstentions.
1007 (ES-II) [A/Res/397, 398, and 399] of 9 November 1956 adopted at the second emergency special session,

*Noting* that the Secretary-General has been requested to report to the General Assembly on compliance with resolutions 1004 (ES-II) and 1005 (ES-II),

*Having received* information that the Soviet army of occupation in Hungary is forcibly deporting Hungarian men, women and children from their homes to places outside Hungary,

*Recalling* the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the principle embodied in Article 2, paragraph 4, the obligations assumed by all Member States under Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, the principles of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, in particular article 11 (c) and (e), to which Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are parties, and the Treaty of Peace with Hungary, in particular the provisions of article 2,

1. *Considers* that the information received adds urgency to the necessity of prompt compliance with resolutions 1004 (ES-II) and 1005 (ES-II) calling for the prompt withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary and for the dispatch of observers to Hungary by the Secretary-General;

2. *Urges* the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Hungarian authorities to take immediate steps to cease the deportation of Hungarian citizens and to return promptly to their homes those who have been deported from Hungarian territory;

3. *Requests* the Secretary-General to keep the General Assembly informed as to compliance with this as well as the above-mentioned resolutions, so that the Assembly may be in a position to consider such further action as it may deem necessary.

Proposal of Ceylon, India, and Indonesia

U.N. doc. A/Res/409

The General Assembly,

*Noting* that certain Member States have affirmed that Hungarian nationals have been forcibly deported from their country,

*Noting further* that certain other Member States have categorically affirmed that no such deportations have taken place,

*Recalling* paragraph 5 of its resolution 1004 (ES-II) of 4 November 1956, in which the Government of Hungary is asked to permit observers designated by the Secretary-General to enter the territory of Hungary, to travel freely therein, and to report their findings to the Secretary-General,

*Noting* that the Secretary-General is pursuing his efforts in this regard with the Hungarian Government,

*Noting further* that the Secretary-General has urged Hungary as a Member of the United Nations to co-operate with the great majority in the clarification of the situation,

1. *Urges* Hungary to accede to the request made by the Secretary-General without prejudice to its sovereignty;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly without delay.

---

Proposal of Argentina, Belgium, Denmark, and the United States

U.N. doc. A/Res/409

The General Assembly,

*Noting* the grave situation described in the report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to the Secretary-General in document A/3371 and Corr. 1 and Add. 1,

*Considering* that the flow of refugees from Hungary continues at a high rate,

*Recognizing* the urgent need of these tens of thousands of refugees for care and resettlement,

1. *Takes note with appreciation* of the action taken by the Secretary-General to determine and help to meet the need of the Hungarian refugees, and by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to assist these refugees and to bring about co-ordinated action on their behalf by Governments, inter-governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for Refugees to continue their efforts;

3. *Urges* Governments and non-governmental organizations to make contributions to the Secretary-General, to the High Commissioner for Refugees or to other appropriate agencies for the care and resettlement of Hungarian refugees, and to co-ordinate their aid programmes in consultation with the Office of the High Commissioner;

4. *Requests* the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner for Refugees to make an immediate appeal to both Governments and non-governmental organizations to meet the minimum present needs as estimated in the report of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees to the Secretary-General and authorizes them to make subsequent appeals on the basis of plans and estimates made by the High Commissioner with the concurrence of his Executive Committee.

Response to Relief Needs of People of Hungary

White House press release dated November 20

The American people have responded spontaneously to the relief needs of the people of Hungary.

There has been a similar warm and forthright response from other friendly countries.

This help has assisted in providing for the most pressing wants of the Hungarian people for food, clothing, medical and other relief supplies.

The contributions from the United States and other countries have also helped to provide for the care and feeding of the very large numbers of refugees who are fleeing over the border into Austria, while they await processing and transit.
portation to the United States and to other friendly countries which have offered to receive them. As for the situation within Hungary itself, it is recognized that emergency relief supplies in very large quantities will undoubtedly have to be provided for some time to come.

To date, the American people and the U.S. Government have made available more than $5 million worth of food, blankets, medical and other relief supplies and services in furtherance of President Eisenhower's offer of assistance to alleviate the sufferings of the Hungarian people.

Private American charitable organizations and U.S. officials (in cooperation with representatives of the Austrian Government and the Austrian Red Cross and representatives of the Red Cross Societies and other voluntary agencies from other friendly countries) are using all possible means at hand to cope with the situation presented by the influx of refugees into Austria. Food, blankets, and medical supplies are being shipped by the fastest means possible from the United States and from other countries to meet the mounting demands for the basic needs of the refugees.

Following delays due to the difficulties of negotiating with the Hungarian and Soviet authorities, the International Committee of the Red Cross has again begun to move relief supplies into Hungary by truck convoys. So long as conditions within Hungary continue as they are at present, distribution of relief supplies within Hungary will be carried out by the International Committee of the Red Cross, and it has reached an agreement to this effect with United Nations authorities.

All help from the United States to the people within Hungary, both through private contributions and and Government supplies, will continue to be distributed in Hungary through this channel.

As quickly as information is received from those on the scene in Hungary as to the types and amounts of supplies which are needed, assistance is and will continue to be forthcoming promptly from the United States, both from the resources of private charitable organizations and from U.S. Government expenditures. Aid and support for the relief of Hungarians will be rendered through the use, as necessary, of the $20 million made available in the President's announcement on November 2,¹ and, as may be required, through the expenditure of other funds.

¹ Bulletin of Nov. 12, 1956, p. 704.

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE SUMMARY**

Following are additional details on assistance to the Hungarian people, compiled for the White House by the Department of State.

The first emergency relief which was made available to the Hungarian people by the United States was through the diversion 2 weeks ago of 2,000 tons of food obtained from stocks of U.S. voluntary relief agencies in Austria, or in transit to them from the United States.² The closing of the border by the Soviet forces prevented the shipment of all but a very small amount of this food to Hungary.

The urgent, immediate problem then was to assist Austria in caring for the great numbers of refugees from Hungary. The balance of the 2,000 tons of food remaining is being used for this purpose, and to meet other immediate needs the U.S. military forces in Europe are continuing to rush blankets and mess kits from their stocks to refugee centers in Austria. To help meet the cost of emergency food, care, and resettlement of these refugees, the U.S. Escapee Program has been authorized $1.5 million. Additional supplies, personnel, and funds have been rushed to Austria from other U.S. Escapee Program operations in Europe. The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration has appealed for $300,000 for the movement of Hungarian refugees. It has now received from other Governments a total of $100,000. In addition, the United States has pledged up to a total of $130,000 for this movement.

In addition to the 2,000-ton supply of food noted above, the American Red Cross and the U.S. voluntary relief agencies have provided food, medical supplies, clothing, and other relief supplies to the value of about $2,100,000. Other shipments and contributions are being made in substantial quantity as each day goes by.

In response to a resolution of the U.N. General Assembly which called on U.N. member nations to assist the Hungarian people,³ the United States presented $1 million to the United Nations Secretary-General on November 13.⁴ Five hundred thousand dollars of this has been turned over to the Austrian Government for use in caring for refugees in Austria, and the balance will be used by

³ Ibid.
the United Nations at its discretion for refugee relief or resettlement.

ASSISTANCE FURNISHED FROM AMERICAN PRIVATE SOURCES FOR RELIEF OF HUNGARIAN PEOPLE AS OF NOVEMBER 16, 1956

I. Commodity breakdown and estimated value of assistance given or on hand in Austria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash (for supplies and services)</td>
<td>$353,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2,404,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicines, hospital and medical supplies</td>
<td>269,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>217,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blankets and bedding</td>
<td>42,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>60,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total value.................................. $3,346,200

II. Additional supplies offered or en route to area:

| Food                                         | $12,000  |
| Clothing                                     | 75,000   |
| Medicines, hospital and medical supplies     | 200,000  |

Total value.................................. $287,000

Grand total.................................. $3,633,200

III. Names of agencies reporting donations:

American National Red Cross
American Friends Service Committee, Inc.
American Friends of Austrian Children, Inc.
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc.
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.
Brethren Service Commission
Catholic Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference
CARE, Inc.
Church World Service
Foster Parents’ Plan, Inc.
International Rescue Committee
Lutheran World Relief, Inc.
Save the Children Federation, Inc.

IV. Sources of information:

American National Red Cross, American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., and individual donor agencies.

Role of American Relief Agencies in Aid to Hungarian Refugees

Press release 594 dated November 23

In view of the large number of communications it has received from American citizens asking for information on how they can assist the Hungarian refugees and people, the Department of State is calling attention to the most important role being played by the American relief agencies in this effort.

The Department of State welcomes the generous assistance already made available by the American people and suggests that the greatest need at the present time is for funds as the form of help which can most readily be used to meet urgent requirements.

Among the private groups active in this field from which information and guidance may be obtained are:

The American Red Cross, 17th and D Sts., NW., Washington, D. C. The national headquarters of the American Red Cross, or any of its chapters throughout the country, will accept contributions to assist it in its efforts on behalf of Hungarians. The American Red Cross, working through the International Red Cross, is helping both Hungarian refugees in Austria and Hungarian people inside Hungary.

The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, 20 W. 40th St., New York, N. Y. This organization has 42 separate relief agencies as members. At least 10 are actively engaged in assisting in every feasible way in caring for Hungarian refugees. They carry the major burden in handling the resettlement of these refugees in the United States. The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service will accept contributions on behalf of its member agencies who are engaged in the relief and settlement of Hungarian refugees and will distribute the funds it receives to its member agencies on the basis of need. In indicating the American Council as one of the central points to which funds may be sent, there is no intent to discourage anyone from contributing directly to the member agencies of the American Council or to other worthwhile organizations interested in helping Hungarians.

Agencies Registered With ICA’s Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid Actively Engaged in Relief Activities for Hungarian Refugees

American Friends Service Committee, Inc.
20 S. 12th St.
Philadelphia 7, Pa.

American Friends of Austrian Children, Inc.
262 E. 19th St.—9th Floor
New York 3, N. Y.

American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc.
1775 Broadway, Room 697
New York 19, N. Y.

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.
3 E. 54th St.
New York 22, N. Y.

December 3, 1956
The Weaknesses of the Communist Dictatorship

by Allen W. Dulles
Director of Central Intelligence

I thank you for this opportunity to tell you some of the responsibilities of the American intelligence community during these troublous days.

The first job I had after graduating from college was as a teacher in India. While this was longer ago than I like to recall, it still leaves with me a keen appreciation of the vital importance of your work. The land-grant colleges and state universities have had a deep influence on America's educational system. You represent the heart of America.

The task of an intelligence officer during these days is no easy one. To say that the world is in ferment is to put it mildly.

The free world—and in particular the countries we include among the Western democracies—face, on almost a worldwide basis, problems such as these: (1) revolt against the last vestiges of colonialism, (2) uprising within the satellite states of Europe against Moscow domination, (3) the all-out attempt by the Communist bloc to sell its theories and its wares throughout what we call the uncommitted areas of the world, and (4) the conflict between the free world and its program of building up a society based on the principles of freedom and the attempt by the Communist bloc to make over the world in its image.

These and other issues have deepened into acute crises in Poland and Hungary, in Egypt and other Arab States.

The Role of the CIA

The role of the Central Intelligence Agency is to try to gather together the facts—particularly the facts on these crisis situations—and to lay them before our policymakers. These include, in particular, the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and others as they may have a role to play in dealing with our foreign and national security problems.

This agency is one of the newest of the permanent agencies of the Government. I say "permanent" because it is established by a law of a permanent rather than provisional character—namely, the act which set up a Department of Defense, provided for the unification of the armed services, and set up the National Security Council. With the complexities of the modern world and the multiplicity of our national security problems, the agency has, and I believe will continue to have for

---

1 Address made before the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities at Washington, D. C., on Nov. 14.
the foreseeable future, a very definite and essential role to play in our Government structure.

It is probably inevitable, but unfortunate, that in the public mind the name “intelligence” should become linked with the storybook concept of the cloak and dagger. Frankly, I regret that such sensationalism should ever cloud the main and vital function of this agency. This function, to coordinate the work of finding the facts in the international situation without bias or prejudice and to make those facts available to others in our Government that have the infinitely difficult task of charting a policy which will make for peace among nations, helps to build prosperity at home and abroad and raise the standards of living and the levels of understanding among peoples.

When I mention that it is our duty to try to find the facts of the international situation, this statement may seem clear and simple. In fact, it is infinitely complex in execution. Facts have many facets.

One type of fact, for example, relates to what we colloquially call “hardware.” By “hardware” we mean the physical assets a particular country may have. For example, as applied to the Soviet Union, it would mean the size of the armed forces, their equipment, particularly in modern strategic weapons such as aircraft, guided missiles, atomic stockpile, and the like. To know what this constitutes and its disposition within the Communist bloc is one type of fact. Closely related to this, and another important fact, is the overall industrial potential of a country like the Soviet Union.

Then alongside the hardware comes the more difficult assessment of technical competence of the leadership and of manpower. How good are Soviet aviators? How able are Soviet scientists? How well organized is the Soviet government machinery?

Then we come to an assessment of another and more difficult type of fact to analyze: namely, what are the basic intentions of a particular country, how is it likely to react in a given situation? To our policymakers the intentions of a country in a crisis may be more important, and are always more difficult to ascertain, than the amount of its hardware and its overall military might.

Let me illustrate what I mean from a fairly recent and greatly debated issue of about 6 years ago—namely, the intervention of the Chinese Communists in the Korean war in October of 1950.

I can speak about this from an entirely detached viewpoint since at the time I was in private life and an outside observer of events.

At that time it was well known to American intelligence and to our policymakers approximately how many troops and how much equipment the Chinese Communists had close at hand north of the Yalu River on the borders of Korea. Thus we knew about the hardware element. We could also judge within a reasonable margin of error how long it would take these particular troops to intervene in the North Korean struggle.

What we did not know with any assurance was whether or not the Chinese Communists would risk actual intervention and war with the United States. Under these circumstances the intelligence officer has to weigh the pros and cons, to cite all indications of physical preparations and of probable courses of action, and to reach an overall estimate of intentions. In fact, in retrospect I think that my predecessors presented a competent analysis of the situation, though they did not call all the shots.

In the various crises which face us today we have many problems of the same nature. Again we know with reasonable accuracy the hardware which the various contestants in the Middle East have available to put into the struggle if the uneasy cease-fire should be broken. In the case, for example, of Hungary, we knew what forces the Soviet had available and approximately where they were located to throw into that country to put down the spontaneous uprising of those brave people if the Soviet finally elected, as they did, to take the course of ruthless repression.

What we, in intelligence, are constantly seeking to learn are the motivations and the ambitions and the pressures affecting each country whose actions might threaten our own national security and what these pressures may impel a particular country to do.

Problems of the Kremlin

Today I shall try to analyze some of the perplexing problems which the men in the Kremlin must be facing and some of the weaknesses of the Communist dictatorship.

An intelligence officer has no business to be either a prophet of gloom or a congenital optimist. It is all too easy to be overimpressed with Soviet strength and military might if we look only at their war machine and become bemused with a sup-
posed infallibility because the Kremlin can act more swiftly than countries with representative forms of government.

Certainly it is as important to know the weaknesses of an adversary as it is to point up its power and strength.

I am reminded of a story from World War I days when things were going badly with the Western armies in France in 1918. One of the civilian leaders of the Allied Governments called a meeting of some of the top military leaders in France and tongue-lashed them furiously for mistakes he alleged had been made by the military. (Very possibly he was only trying to cover up for civilian mistakes.) When he paused for comment, a general officer at the table said philosophically, "Well, all I can say is they have generals on the other side, too."

Often when we, in the intelligence community, are about to produce a paper showing that the Communists in Moscow are working to carry out some imposing blueprint for foreign or military policy, they pull off a bureaucratic bungle or make some fantastic move that would put in the shade the mistakes made by governments in the free world.

I am inclined to say to the pessimist, "We have to remember that they are human beings on the other side, too." And here it is also well to remember that, by and large, the policymakers in the Kremlin, able, astute, and ruthless as I admit many of them to be, have less inherent knowledge of the outside world than their opposite numbers in any of the major governments of the world.

Sometimes I feel that the men in the Kremlin have little real understanding of the temper of the free world. We rightly say that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing—it is vastly dangerous when it comes to appraising the reactions of the other countries. Here Moscow is dependent, for the most part, not on firsthand knowledge or understanding of the outside world but on reports received from their representatives throughout the world whose freedom to criticize and advise is limited by the interests they have in protecting their jobs and possibly even their heads.

The military might of a dictatorship, as we learned both from Hitler and Stalin, is a formidable thing, but, if we take the same test of long-range political acumen, their power has definite limitations.

During the last 2 years of World War II, I was stationed in Bern, Switzerland, and from there had some opportunity to look behind the facade of the Nazi dictatorship. As long as everything went smoothly in the military field in the early war days, this dictatorship looked invulnerable. As soon as the first blows came against their over-extended position, rifts began to appear. While actual dissension was kept down by an iron hand, it boiled under the surface and erupted in the 1944 attempt on Hitler's life. The essential ruthlessness and consequent instability of their course of action began to be apparent.

The Rigidity of Dictatorships

Now, as the historians are able to turn more light on this situation and to analyze the mass of documented material we have about the Nazi regime, we see that it had within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Dictatorships have a rigidity which gives the false effect of strength. The democracies have a flexibility which sometimes appears a source of weakness but which can stand blows and react in a way that is impossible in dictatorships.

The Soviet Union, over the past year and more, apparently started some moves to temper the rigidity of the Stalinist type of dictatorship. When the history of this period is written, I imagine that historians will agree that the most important document to see the light of day in the year 1956 was the famous secret speech of Khrushchev delivered at the 20th Party Congress on February 25, 1956. The text was published in the free world some 3 months later. The people in the Soviet Union have never had this text given them over the Soviet radio or in the Soviet press. They have had little bits and pieces here and there about Stalin's crimes and misdemeanors but have been largely kept in the dark while millions of people throughout the free world have had the full story.

Here is one of the weaknesses of dictatorship. They dare not tell their own people the truth. In the modern age, even with the millions of dollars the Soviets spend on jamming foreign radio broadcasts, they cannot keep the truth out. Some, but unfortunately not all, of the facts banned by the Soviet Government eventually reach the Soviet people.

Also, when they send their people abroad, even

though generally under careful control, these travelers nevertheless bring back information to others.

When a people begin to discover that their leaders are not telling them the truth, the seeds of mistrust and lack of confidence are sown. These may breed slowly, but they do breed surely. Similarly the Russian people have been told none of the real facts of the Soviet ruthless repression of Hungary. Some day, too, the real truth of this situation will seep over the borders to them.

It was a great gamble that Nikita Khrushchev took when he denounced Stalin and the crimes of the Stalin era. His own fulsome praise of Stalin must have been in the minds of the Soviet people. What can one think of a leader who for years was the trusted lieutenant and the recipient of the favor of the Stalin whom he later denounced as a deviationist and murderer? When a dictatorship deliberately turns upon and degrades its former dictator, it is by that very fact undermining itself.

**Soviet “New Look”**

In essence the Soviet leaders, frightened at the consequences of Stalin’s policy at home and abroad, tried to ease the iron grip of the Stalinist police dictatorship and to give to communism some of the surface attributes of a decent way of life. They hoped in this way to win for the Communist system a greater degree of willing consent of the governed at home and a degree of political respectability to attract new supporters abroad. This is in a nutshell what the latest “new look” and “de-Stalinization” policy is all about.

Superficially this seems to be an astute policy. There is no doubt that it has constituted a subtler threat to innocents abroad who like to think that Communists are solely interested in the welfare of people whose friendship they cultivate.

I say this is a great gamble, however, because Khrushchev and his colleagues are trying to repudiate Stalin and the unpopular characteristics of Stalinist rule without relinquishing the monopoly of power enjoyed by Stalin’s heirs in Moscow or abandoning control of the great neocolonial empire built up on the European border of the U.S.S.R.

This points up the real dilemma which dictatorships are always facing. A dictatorship, as the term implies, means that you tell people what they are to do and you enforce the doing of it. Khrushchev proposed to relax that a little bit at home—to have an 80 percent dictatorship but in that 20 percent margin to allow the people some liberty of action and thought. This raises the basic question as to whether you can have a partial dictatorship.

True, we have heard of benevolent dictatorships, but there the authority of the fuesher or leader remains complete but he only exercises that authority in such a benevolent way as to keep his people temporarily satisfied.

Any relaxation of the iron authority—and that is what, in effect, may have been contemplated under the so-called “new look” in the Soviet Union—raises great problems.

These problems are even more serious in the satellite area where, in effect, an alien rule was foisted upon brave, proud people with long traditions of Western culture and with an intense yearning for freedom. A little relaxation of freedom in the Soviet Union where, after all, Russians were ruling Russians was a very different thing from using the same tactics in Eastern Europe. There Russians were ruling peoples who were once free and came to be dominated and controlled by a hated foreign power.

The consequences of the relaxation of Soviet dictatorship in Hungary have been poignantly pointed up these last few days. The Hungarian people were not content with half liberties, qualified freedom. The prospects frightened the Kremlin and caused an abrupt reversal of policy, with consequences that it is hard to estimate.

In trying to crush the Hungarian revolution the Kremlin in effect repudiated an official declaration which the Moscow Government had made on the 30th of October. This followed Hungary’s first bold bid for freedom, which Moscow apparently accepted. The Soviet Government said that it was necessary to make a statement in connection with events in Hungary. It admitted serious shortcomings, expressed deep regret that development of events in Hungary had led to bloodshed. It admitted that the further presence of the Soviet Army elements in Hungary could serve as a cause for even further deterioration and stated that the Soviet Government has instructed its military command to withdraw the Soviet Army units from Budapest as soon as this is recognized as necessary by the Hungarian Government. It agreed to negotiate the whole question of the presence of Soviet troops in the territory of Hungary.

---

2 For text, see Bulletin of Nov. 12, 1956, p. 745.
It seemed that a miracle had happened, that what the pessimists had always predicted was impossible had occurred. It seemed that an uprising of people largely unarmed could prevail even over tanks and modern implements of war, not because the revolting people were stronger but because no butcher could be found who would dare use all the might of modern weapons to crush a people rising in wrath and seizing freedom with both hands.

When dictatorship was thus put to the test, undoubtedly the men in the Kremlin who debated the issue reached the conclusion that their control not only in Hungary but throughout the whole Soviet domain was at stake. There was a complete reversal of their short-lived policy of tolerance. All promises made were broken. The dictatorship became a dictatorship again, not benevolent but ruthless. If this is any guide to what may happen in the U.S.S.R., we may be back again to the days of ruthless Stalinism.

Soviet Education

But it is not alone in the satellites that dictatorship is put to its harsh test. In the Soviet Union itself they have a long-range problem which goes to the very heart of their ability to keep dictatorial control in the hands of a few men in the Kremlin.

In order to compete with the Western world in the field of science and industry, which was vitally important for their economic growth and their rearmament program, it was essential for the Soviet to speed up the education of their people, especially in the scientific and technical field. After Stalin’s death the regime encouraged more objectivity in scientific inquiry and put on the shelf some pseudoscientists such as Lysenko. After all, they had found out early in the game that in the present nuclear age one could not fool around with scientists who tailored their art to the whims of Marxism.

Here we immediately see that the Communists, in escaping one difficulty, were necessarily running into another that may be of even greater dimensions in the long run.

Obviously, the Soviet leaders could not limit their educational processes to the scientific fields, and more and more young men and women are graduating from schools which correspond to our high schools and colleges and are taking advanced degrees comparable to our degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy. Even with all the indoctrination in Communist teaching which they give to their young students it is impossible to prevent education from developing the critical faculties which every thinking human being possesses.

Education is a most dangerous drug for dictators, and Soviet leaders may be creating a situation in the U.S.S.R. which eventually—not tomorrow, but sometime—will cause pressures for further liberalization of political life, still less police coercion, greater economic benefits for the Russian people, and more effective consultation of the wishes of the governed.

Some 18 months ago, on June 1, 1955, in an address at Columbia University I did some speculating about the dilemma which the Soviet was then beginning to face as a result of the broadening of their education system and then suggested that “man’s desire for freedom must break any bonds that may be placed around him,” and I ventured to make this prediction: “In introducing mass education the troubled Soviet leaders have loosed forces dangerous to themselves. It will be very difficult for them henceforth to close off their own people from access to realities of the outside world.”

I concluded: “A hard choice faces the perplexed, and probably unharmonious, group of men in the Kremlin. They lead a people who surely will come to realize the inevitability of the great precept: ‘And Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.’”

It is knowledge of the truth that a dictatorship cannot tolerate unless, of course, the truth happens to be all favorable to them. That rarely happens.

We have seen instance after instance of this. Only those foreign publications are tolerated in the Soviet Union which they approve or which, being of a technical variety, have no bearing on the great political issues of the day. As I mentioned before, they have done everything possible to prevent foreign broadcasts from reaching the Soviet people. Today there are a thousand jamming stations in the Soviet Union.

But I believe it can be truthfully said that in the modern age dictatorship is fighting a losing battle in trying to block all the avenues through which truth permeates to the farthest corners of the world.
The Uprising of Youth

As we review the events in Hungary and Poland and elsewhere in the Soviet orbit, we find another weakness of a dictatorship which many even in the free world did not anticipate.

I suspect that the leaders in the Kremlin felt that the relatively long period during which they had held and indoctrinated their people had insured them to follow and obey without question the dictates from Moscow. For almost 40 years now the Soviet system has controlled the U.S.S.R., and for 10 years or more they have held the satellites under iron discipline. During all this time the new generations have been indoctrinated year by year in Marxism and Leninism with an over-dose of Stalinism. Their bibles have been the writings of Marx, Lenin, and, until recently, Stalin. They have been largely cut off from the outside world. Under these circumstances how could the younger generation—and it is among the youth especially that revolt appears—have known anything about freedom and liberty? How could they aspire to new and different and better things when they never had tasted and enjoyed them?

But in fact, by their ardent pursuit of freedom, youths in Poland, Hungary, and elsewhere are disproving the Kremlin's confident expectation that, as Dostoyevsky had written, "Tyranny is a habit capable of being developed, and at last becomes a disease. . . . The man and the citizen disappear for ever in the tyrant."

We now find—and can take infinite encouragement from the fact—that this theory is false. Over recent years it has been the youth who have defected from tyranny to freedom. It has been the youth who have risked their lives and sacrificed them in order to achieve a freedom that they never have enjoyed but which instinctively they yearn for and are ready to die for. You will recall the young Polish aviators who have flown their planes to freedom in the West. There was a group of young men who recently seized a Hungarian plane and brought it to safety in Germany. It was youth and those who toiled with their hands who sparked the movements in Poland and in Hungary, and it is youth and the workers who manned the barricades in the streets of Budapest, as well as soldiers who would no longer serve an alien master.

The gravest danger which a Communist dictatorship faces today is the uprising of youth against tyranny. No amount of Communist indoctrination and Marxist education has served to alter the basic urge to assert the right of free expression.

A few human beings, it is true, can be brainwashed and lose for a time any sense of right and wrong, and the desire to assert themselves. One thing you cannot do is to brainwash a whole nation.

If we go back through history to the earliest times, we will find that the most distinguishing feature of man is the instinctive revolt against tyranny, the instinctive longing for liberty. If a dictator fails to recognize and yield to these forces, in time he will fall. And yet if he does answer this call, in the long run the liberties he may grudgingly have given will prove his undoing.

William H. Jackson Resigns Post as Special Assistant to President

The White House on November 20 announced the resignation of William H. Jackson as Special Assistant to the President on national security affairs. For the text of Mr. Jackson's letter of resignation and the text of the President's reply, see White House press release dated November 20.1

Visit of Indian Prime Minister

Statement by James C. Hagerty
Press Secretary to the President

White House press release dated November 19

The President of the United States of America has renewed his invitation to the Prime Minister of India to pay a visit to the United States, and the Prime Minister has accepted. He proposes to reach Washington on the 16th of December and will proceed to New York City on the 20th of December.2

1 For an announcement of Mr. Jackson's appointment, see BULLETIN of Feb. 13, 1956, p. 248.
2 For an exchange of correspondence between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India regarding the postponement of the Prime Minister's visit, see BULLETIN of July 9, 1956, p. 53.
The International Geophysical Year: A Twentieth-Century Achievement in International Cooperation

by Wallace W. Atwood, Jr.

For a period of 18 months, commencing July 1, 1957, more than 5,000 scientists from 56 countries will be engaged in the most ambitious study yet attempted of man’s environment. From the North Pole to the South Pole, in every continent, from the depths of the oceans to the unknown regions hundreds of miles above the earth’s surface, vast resources of human knowledge and ingenuity will be concentrated on the task of uncovering some of the many secrets still held by the planet on which we live. This project, known as the International Geophysical Year, or the IGY for short, will represent an outstanding achievement not only in the advancement of science and man’s control over his environment but also in international cooperation and understanding.

The beginnings of the IGY go back 75 years to the First Polar Year held in 1882–83. Fifty years later, in 1932–33, scientists of 12 nations carried through the Second Polar Year, and it was anticipated that future polar years would be organized every 50 years from then on. However, the rapid development of science during the ensuing 20-year period changed this picture. By 1950 three facts stood out. Much more basic information was needed promptly. Modern scientific instruments and techniques could facilitate its acquisition. And the information could be obtained most effectively through the cooperative efforts of scientists throughout the world.

Early in 1950 a small group of scientists meeting informally at Washington, D.C., suggested that the Third Polar Year be held 25 years after the Second. This group pointed out that the United States and the scientists of the world could not wait until 1982 to replenish their warehouse of scientific data on man’s physical environment. They observed that a period of intense solar activity was predicted for 1957–58 and that this would provide unusually good opportunities for scientists to observe geophysical phenomena in the earth’s atmosphere. In the succeeding months the proposal of this small group was brought before several international scientific organizations and was strongly endorsed by all of them.

At a meeting of the Executive Board of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) in October 1951, a special committee was formed, later to become known under its French title, Comité spécial de l’année géophysique internationale (Csagi). It was charged with the responsibility of drawing up preliminary plans for the undertaking. Membership of this Committee was drawn from the four international scientific unions concerned with geophysical and related sciences and from the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). In 1952, at the general assembly of ICSU, the scope of the “Year” was expanded to include not only the north polar region (as in the First and Second Polar Years) but the entire earth. All countries were invited

---

*Mr. Atwood, author of the above article, is Director of the Office of International Relations of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council.*

1 One of the members of this group was Lloyd V. Berkner, who later became vice president of the international committee for the IGY. In 1949 Mr. Berkner, president of Associated Universities, Inc., was asked by the Secretary of State to survey the role of the Department in science. He submitted a report on “Science and Foreign Relations” which became the basic reference on science policy for the Department.
by Icsu to establish national committees of scientists to prepare national programs which their countries would carry out as part of an overall program to be coordinated by Csagi.

Development of the United States Program

In February 1953 the U.S. National Committee for the Igx was formed by the National Academy of Sciences, which adheres to Icsu on behalf of the United States. This Committee was charged with responsibility for development and conduct of the American program. Four months of intensive planning ensued, and in July of the same year, at a meeting of the Csagi at Brussels, the American program was discussed and revised in the light of programs proposed by other countries. In 1954 and again in 1955 and 1956, the programs developed by scientists of participating countries were examined at meetings of the Csagi, and out of these sessions a worldwide program was evolved. All participating countries agreed to carry out their own investigations in accordance with mutually agreed scientific criteria, and all agreed to exchange the data so obtained with all other countries.

Very early in the planning for U.S. participation in the Igx the National Academy of Sciences recognized that implementation of the U.S. program would require substantial financial support from the Federal Government. For this reason, it was agreed that the Academy, which is a non-governmental body, would be responsible for developing and carrying out the scientific program and the National Science Foundation, which was established by the U.S. Congress to encourage and support science and scientific research in the United States, would obtain the Federal funds needed. Thus, U.S. participation in the Igx became a joint responsibility of the Academy and the Foundation. Requests for support were submitted to Congress by the Foundation, and a total of $39 million was appropriated to implement the American program. These funds are being dispersed by the Foundation upon the recommendation of the Academy and with the approval of the National Science Board.

On December 1, 1954, the first phase of the U.S. program was launched with the dispatch of the U.S.S. Atka to the Antarctic to study sea-ice conditions and to establish a site for an Igx station in Little America. Since then additional U.S. ships and planes have gone to Antarctica and scientists have installed many of their instruments in anticipation of the Igx observations. During the fall months of 1956 (spring in the Antarctic) ships have been carrying scientists and operational personnel to Antarctica to man the seven U.S. Igx stations during 1957 and 1958.

While the United States has been preparing for its Antarctic program, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, France, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. have been busily engaged establishing their Antarctic bases. By February 1957 there will be approximately 56 Igx stations in the Antarctic region; the population of this huge but little-known area of the world will total approximately 600.

Progress in the development of other research programs to be conducted by the United States has more or less paralleled that of the Antarctic program.

This spectacular Antarctic phase of the Igx program and the daring expeditions making news in the press today are familiar to most Americans and probably to most of the people in the world. So is the artificial-satellite phase of the U.S. Igx program that will project high into the upper

Twelve nations will man more than 50 scientific stations in the South Polar region in 1957–58. Three international conferences were held to coordinate the scientific and operational aspects of the Antarctic program. Ar—Argentina; A—Australia; B—Belgium; C—Chile; F—France; GB—Great Britain; J—Japan; NZ—New Zealand; N—Norway; SA—South Africa; R—USSR; US—United States.
The geophysical research satellite to be launched by the United States during the IGY will reach an altitude of 300 to 1,000 miles and will travel approximately 18,000 miles an hour. It will circle the earth once every 90 minutes during flight. The path of this manmade moon, measuring about 20 inches in diameter and weighing less than 22 pounds, is shown on the map above. Because of the rotation of the earth the path will be displaced about 25 degrees with each successive transit around the world. The airborne laboratory will contain miniature electronic equipment to record and transmit scientific data to ground stations. Radio and optical tracking devices located on four continents will observe the satellite throughout its flight.

Reaches of the atmosphere manmade vehicles to hurl around the earth at the phenomenal speed of 18,000 miles an hour and to send back to the earth new knowledge about outer space. These efforts are indeed newsworthy because they represent audacious attempts to penetrate into domains of science hitherto unexplored by man.

Important as these activities are, they represent but a fraction of the program of study and research planned for the 18 months of the IGY. The United States alone is planning investigations in 13 scientific fields: aurora and airglow, cosmic rays, geomagnetism, glaciology, gravity, the ionosphere, longitude and latitude determinations, meteorology, oceanography, seismology, and solar activity, as well as rocket and satellite studies of the upper atmosphere. These studies will be carried out in the United States, the Antarctic, the Arctic, the Equatorial Pacific, and the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. The United States will cooperate with other nations in joint projects throughout North and South America and in Antarctica.

Some of the phenomena to be observed include the pressure, temperature, wind speed, and humidity of the atmosphere at altitudes up to 100,000 feet. Measurements will be made by balloons carrying instruments which will radio information back to an extensive chain of observation stations. The movement of deep ocean currents, about which very little is known, will be studied, and fluctuations in the size of glaciers will be
measured. The ionosphere will be subjected to intense study by a carefully planned system of observing stations using radio “sounding” techniques, by which radio waves are projected vertically and the “echoes” from the ionized layers of the atmosphere measured and analyzed. Observations of solar activity will record the occurrence of sunspots and solar flares, and this information will be correlated with other phenomena such as activity in the ionosphere and the auroras. Cosmic rays, geomagnetism, and seismology are other subjects that will receive their due share of the attention of the scientists.

The use of rockets in the study of the upper atmosphere has made possible for the first time direct observation at ultrahigh altitudes. Hitherto, conventional balloons have been used up to a maximum height of 24 miles. Above this height indirect observations, such as those provided by radio soundings, have had to be used with a corresponding reduction in the value of the information gained. Now the use of the Aerobee-Hi rocket with a vertical range of 200 miles and “rockoons,” rockets carried by balloons on the first stage of their journey and then fired automatically, promises great advances in our knowledge of the high atmosphere.

**Application of New Scientific Information**

The data yielded by these gigantic efforts and the analyses of the information made available will be useful in the further buildup of the fund of scientific knowledge essential to the better understanding of the earth we live in and the forces acting in it, on it, and around it. Indeed, the IGY will give a far greater impetus to the progress of basic geophysical science than either of the two previous polar years were able to impart.

The knowledge that will result from the IGY will have very practical value. Meteorological studies will result in a far more accurate understanding of the forces that make our weather. Adequate data from the Antarctic and the charting of mass air movements such as the jet streams will enable the weather forecaster to increase the reliability of his predictions. Knowledge of mass air movements will benefit the development of international civil aviation. The study of glaciers will tell us a great deal about the gradual warming of the climate, the results of which can be seen in changes in vegetation and the rise in level of the oceans occasioned in large part by the melting of glaciers. A better understanding of the upper atmosphere will make it possible to improve long-range radio communications. Auroral disturbances and disturbances in the ionosphere due to solar flares and sunspots sometimes make the transmission of radio signals over long distances impossible. Data from a worldwide system of observation stations will make possible the delineation of patterns of ionospheric behavior that will aid greatly in the prediction of the quality of radio reception for a given period and in the selection of alternate frequencies and “radio routes” by which communication could be effected, should normal channels be blocked. These are but a few of the immediate benefits that will be realized.

**An Adventure in International Science**

When one considers that the U.S. part of the IGY program that has been briefly sketched here is only a part, though an integral part, of the larger program comprising the coordinated efforts of practically all geophysicists of the world, one appreciates that the International Geophysical Year is indeed a world project. Not only will it reach into every corner of the earth, known and

Tentative plans call for the United States and the U.S.S.R. to observe the distribution of sea-ice in the Arctic Ocean on polar and transpolar flights in 1957-58. The flight lines indicated on the map represent proposed routes to be flown during the daylight months of the IGY.

---

*For the text of a U.S. note to the U.S.S.R. proposing reciprocal aerial observation of Arctic ice in connection with the IGY, see *ibid.*, Oct. 1, 1956, p. 508.*
unknown, plumbing it from the very core to the outermost limits of the atmosphere 800 miles into space, but those who will man the seismological stations on remote Pacific islands, trek across the wastelands of the Antarctic to measure the thickness of the polar icecap, or participate in any one of thousands of individual projects will represent almost every nation in the world capable of contributing talent to this truly international undertaking.

But it could not be otherwise. The forces of nature do not recognize boundary lines. We are all familiar with the cold waves that sweep in from Canada, blessed in the summer and not so welcome in the winter. Nothing we in the United States can do will prevent these influxes of air masses from regions far distant. We would not even know they were coming were it not for meteorological information supplied by the Canadians. But, on the other hand, the Canadians themselves are at the mercy of weather from outside their country. The same cold wave that comes across our northern border may be the result of a storm off the east coast of Asia which, after passing through Canada and the United States, may go on to become a storm in the Atlantic and dump millions of tons of snow or rain on Western Europe.

In short, there is no such thing as North American meteorology, or European geophysics, or South American oceanography. The U.S. meteorologist needs meteorological data from all parts of the world; the British geophysicist would be greatly handicapped if he had to base his theories on observations confined to his own country; and the Brazilian who studies the oceans off his coast would be lost without information obtained by his colleagues in North America, Europe, and Africa.

All this is true in the day-to-day progress of scientific knowledge. It is doubly true for the IGY. Without the coordination of information from all who participate, the value of the contributions of individual countries would be greatly reduced. One project for the more precise determination of latitude and longitude will entail astronomical observations at more than 20 IGY stations around the world. Today it is possible for an island to be misplaced on a map by as much as several miles. The new studies, which depend for much of their value on the integration of data from many different points on the earth's surface, may narrow this margin of error down to a few feet.

During what are called Special World Intervals, communication centers in the United States, Alaska, Japan, Australia, and the U.S.S.R. will alert all IGY stations when periods of unusual solar, magnetic, auroral, or ionospheric activity are expected, to insure that as much effort as possible is concentrated on the observation of these phenomena.

One of the finest examples of international cooperation, especially when viewed in the light of present-day barriers to free flow of information, is the agreement reached by all countries participating in the IGY that data collected will be made available to scientists of all countries. To facilitate the collection and distribution of IGY data the Csagl endorsed the establishment of World Data Centers in the United States, the U.S.S.R., and Western Europe. Plans for the U.S. center are well advanced. It will begin to function as soon as data begin to flow in shortly after July 1, 1957.

An Adventure in International Relations

International cooperation on this scale does not just happen, nor is it developed overnight. For more than 50 years scientists have come together periodically at international congresses to discuss their work. Early in the 20th century they started to form international nongovernmental organizations, called unions, to provide continuity for their joint undertakings between congresses. Today scientists participate in the activities of these unions through their principal national scientific bodies, which adhere to the unions on behalf of their respective countries. In the United States adherence to these scientific unions and to the International Council of Scientific Unions is achieved through the National Academy of Sciences. The latter represents the interests of the U.S. Government and U.S. scientists at the general assemblies and congresses of these scientific organizations. The annual membership dues of the United States are paid by the Department of State.

Founded in 1932 as the successor to an earlier organization known as the International Research Council, Icsr is responsible with its member unions for the initiation and development of the IGY. Icsu is demonstrating the possibilities
Distribution of the nearly 2,000 IGY stations has been carefully planned by CSAGI and the countries participating in the IGY. In order to obtain a continuous cross section of atmospheric and other geophysical phenomena from the Arctic to the Antarctic, five meridional pole-to-pole chains of stations have been established. These more or less continuous chains are located within the zones shown on the map above. To insure maximum possible world coverage, other networks of stations have been created in the Arctic, Antarctic, and Equatorial regions.

which actually exist today for furthering the welfare of the peoples of the world through cooperative undertakings. It is doing so by utilizing experience and techniques built up through years of encouraging scientific activity on a worldwide scale and coordinating scientific progress through its member unions and the governments of adhering countries.

Interest in the IGY is not confined to the scientific community. Intergovernmental organizations and the governments of the countries whose scientists are active in the IGY have recognized the stake they have in this enterprise and have provided substantial financial and other assistance. Thus, WMO has been concerned with the planning from the start and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has contributed a part of the cost of the central secretariat set up by ICSU. Governments not only have been generous with money but have provided the ships, aircraft, personnel, and equipment to transport scientists and equipment to remote corners of the world; the rockets to be used in the exploration of the upper atmosphere have all been made available through governments. This list could be expanded.

A very important contribution to the U.S. program is being made by the Department of Defense in the form of technical aid and logistic support. The satellite program is a good illustration of the military contribution to the IGY. The propelling rockets and instruments will be supplied by the Department of the Navy, and the launching will take place at Patrick Air Force Base in Florida.

The Department of State and the diplomatic missions abroad have greatly facilitated the planning of those phases of the IGY program which have called for formal intergovernmental agreements, e.g., the establishment of earth-satellite tracking stations in Central and South America. In addition, the Department has provided valuable advice and counsel on many aspects of the worldwide program and has expedited the processing of documents necessary for international travel and for the exchange of scientific personnel with other participating countries. Continuous
liaison between the Department and the National Academy of Sciences on matters relating to the IGY is maintained through the Department's Office of the Science Adviser and the Academy's Office of International Relations.

Although the IGY was planned as a scientific undertaking, it is in reality a magnificent achievement in international cooperation. Even though the scientific results of the IGY fall short of expectations, which is quite unlikely, the experiences gained during the years of planning and execution of the program will fully justify the effort. Valuable exchanges of scientific information have been initiated, agreements have been reached on difficult procedural matters, many close friendships have been established, and the scientists of more than 55 nations have learned that they can work together despite differences in national traditions, social institutions, political objectives, and economic status. The success of the IGY will be measured not only in terms of its contribution to science but, even more important, in terms of its contribution to the furtherance of international cooperation. In a letter to the chairman of the National Science Board in 1958, President Eisenhower said that the International Geophysical Year would "very materially strengthen our bonds with the many cooperating nations and make a constructive contribution to the solution of mutual problems."

For all who are associated with the IGY, as individuals and as members of the scientific community, the support given to this adventure of discovery by peoples and governments is highly encouraging. Scientists of the United States are proud that their own country is advancing so freely the moral and material support needed for the success of this bold and promising undertaking.

U.S. To Assist Afghanistan To Rebuild Habibia College

The International Cooperation Administration announced on November 17 that Afghanistan has accepted an offer of the United States to provide Habibia College at Kabul, the capital of Afghanistan, up to $100,000 worth of building materials to help rebuild a wing of the college which was recently destroyed by fire.

The funds to defray the foreign-exchange cost of the imported building materials will be provided by ICA as part of the U.S. program of economic assistance to Afghanistan and as an expression of the friendship of the United States for the Afghan people.

Habibia College is the oldest secular educational institution in Afghanistan and the alma mater of a large proportion of the leaders of that country. ICA said it was hoped that rebuilding of the wing could be started at the earliest possible time.

Investigation on Imports of Butter Oil and Butter Substitutes

White House press release dated November 17

The President on November 17 directed the U.S. Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation into the effects of imports of butter oil and butter substitutes on the Department of Agriculture's price support program for milk and butterfat and on the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic milk and butterfat.

The President's action was taken in response to a recommendation from the Secretary of Agri-
The Tariff Commission's investigation, which will be made pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, will relate specifically to butter oil and butter substitutes containing 45 percent or more of butterfat and which are dutiable under paragraph 709 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

President's Letter to Edgar B. Brossard, Chairman of Tariff Commission

Dear Mr. Chairman: I have been advised by the Department of Agriculture that there is reason to believe that butter oil and butter substitutes containing 45 percent or more of butterfat, which are dutiable under Paragraph 709 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, are practically certain to be imported under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with the Department's price support program for milk and butterfat, or to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic milk and butterfat.

The United States Tariff Commission is therefore directed to make an immediate investigation under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, to determine if there is a need for import restrictions on butter oil and butter substitutes containing 45 percent or more of butterfat, which are dutiable under Paragraph 709 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The Commission's findings should be completed as promptly as practicable.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Request for Views Concerning Wool-Fabric Tariff Quota

Press release 591 dated November 19

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

The Committee for Reciprocity Information on November 19 issued notice that it will receive views from the public on possible means for applying the recently established tariff quota on certain wool fabrics. The tariff quota was proclaimed by the President on September 28, 1956, under the terms of the note applying to the concession made in 1947 by the United States on woolens and worsteds under items 1108 and 1109 (a) of Part I Schedule XX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Subsequent to the invocation of the wool-fabric reservation and to the establishment of a tariff quota on imports of certain of these fabrics the U. S. Government has received a number of suggestions regarding implementation of the quota. It has been proposed that there be some form of allocation of the quota.

The U. S. Government agencies concerned have given preliminary consideration to the matter and have concluded that for the remainder of 1956 there should be no change in the method of allocation as announced on September 28, 1956, i.e. the 3.5-million-pound tariff quota will remain on a global basis for the last 3 months of 1956. Furthermore, after preliminary study of the possibility of allocation of the quota by supplying country for 1957, the Government agencies concerned are of the view that the disadvantages of such an arrangement would outweigh the advantages.

A quarterly allocation of the tariff quota for 1957, not broken down by countries but applied globally, may, however, have more merit than the proposed country allocation. Such quarterly allocations may lead to more orderly marketing than would be the case with an annual quota and may be helpful to importers and domestic users of the fabrics without unduly affecting the competitive position of the various suppliers. Preliminary examination indicates that quarterly quotas could be either equal or unequal based on the previous pattern of trade.

Before giving further consideration to the matter, the interdepartmental trade-agreements organization would appreciate receiving the views of all interested persons with regard to the possible effect the distribution of the annual tariff quota into four parts would have on U. S. trade. This indication of interest in exploring the possibilities of quarterly quotas does not preclude the submission of views on other possible methods of applying the tariff quota.

Letters or briefs should be submitted to the Com-

committee for Reciprocity Information, which is the interdepartmental committee established to receive views on trade agreement matters. It is requested that any such views be submitted by the close of business on December 10, 1956.

All communications on this matter, in 15 copies, should be addressed to The Secretary, Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington 25, D. C. If any interested party considers that his views cannot be adequately expressed to the committee in a written brief, he should make this known to the secretary of the committee, who will then arrange for oral presentation before the committee.

TEXT OF NOTICE:

COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Request for Views regarding Possible Allocation of Wool Fabric Tariff Quota.

Closing date for submission of written statements December 10, 1956.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information hereby gives notice that it will receive views regarding the possible allocation of the annual tariff quota, established by a proclamation of the President on September 28, 1956 (Proc. No. 3160, 21 F. R. 7593), on woolens and worsteds under items 1108 and 1109(a) of Part I Schedule XX (Geneva) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The purpose of receiving the views of interested parties is to assist the interdepartmental trade agreements committee in its consideration of possible means for applying the annual tariff quotas which under the terms of the proclamation of September 28, 1956, are to be determined annually beginning in 1957. The Committee is particularly considering the possibility of a system of quarterly allocation of such annual tariff quotas. The submission of views with respect to such a system of allocation, as well as with respect to other possible means of applying the tariff quota, is invited.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information hereby gives notice that all views should be submitted in writing not later than the close of business, December 10, 1956. Such written statements should be addressed to “Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington 25, D. C.” Fifteen copies of written statements, either typed, printed or duplicated, should be submitted, of which one copy shall be sworn to. If any interested party considers that his views cannot be adequately expressed to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in a written statement, consideration will be given to a request for oral presentation before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Written statements submitted to the Committee, except information and business data proffered in confidence, shall be open to inspection by interested persons. Information and business data proffered in confidence shall be submitted on separate pages clearly marked “For Official Use Only of the Committee for Reciprocity Information.”

All communications regarding this notice should be addressed to the Executive Secretary, Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, Washington 25, D. C.

By direction of the Committee for Reciprocity Information this 19th day of November 1956.

Edward Yardley,
Secretary,
Committee for Reciprocity Information.

President Decides Against Increase in Tariff on Lighter Flints

White House press release dated November 13

The President has declined to accept the recommendation of the U.S. Tariff Commission for an increase in the tariff on imports of ferrocerium (lighter flints) and all other cerium alloys.

The President made known his decision against invoking the “escape clause” of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, in identical letters to the chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees. He said that it did not appear to him “that imports of lighter flints have, as the law provides, ‘contributed substantially towards causing or threatening serious injury’ to the domestic industry.” The President said, “Such difficulties as the United States industry has encountered appear to me to be due rather to an approximately 40 percent decline in U.S. consumption of lighter flints, from 138,000 pounds in 1951 to 83,400 pounds in 1954, and to a sharp decline of about 90 percent in United States exports, from 86,100 pounds in 1951 to 8,000 pounds in 1954.” The President continued, “Imports on the other hand in 1954 were
only slightly more than 5,000 pounds and represented only 6.8% of the domestic consumption of lighter flints. Imports have increased since the Commission filed its report but they still represent a relatively small proportion of domestic consumption."

Earlier this year the President deferred action on the U.S. Tariff Commission’s report of its investigation into lighter flints while the Attorney General, at the President’s request, investigated a legal issue which had emerged during consideration of the escape-clause case in the executive branch. The Attorney General recently reported to the President that his inquiry had not developed facts warranting the filing of any proceeding by the Department of Justice.

The Tariff Commission made its investigation pursuant to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

President’s Letter to Chairmen of Congressional Committees

November 12, 1956

Dear Mr. Chairman: As you know, in its report to me on its escape clause investigation relating to imports of ferrocerium (lighter flints) and all other cerium alloys, the United States Tariff Commission found (1) that such imports were causing serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products and (2) that this injury resulted in part from a tariff concession, effective January 1, 1948, which reduced the duty on such imports by 50 percent. The Tariff Commission in its report recommended that the mentioned concession be withdrawn in full.

During intensive study of this matter within the Executive Branch a question relating to the legal aspects of the competitive situation in the domestic industry emerged. Accordingly, I asked the Attorney General to undertake a thorough exploration of this legal question and to advise me definitively with respect thereto.

I have now heard from the Attorney General and he has advised me that the facts developed in his inquiry do not warrant the filing of any proceeding by the Department of Justice.

After consulting with interested departments and agencies of the Executive Branch, and after reviewing this case again in the light of latest available information, I have decided, on the facts and the law, that this case does not present sufficient grounds for escape clause relief.

When an industry is apparently in straitened circumstances due to a variety of causes it is almost always difficult to assess the degree to which imports may have contributed, if at all, to the industry’s problems. Mindful of this consideration and of the Commission’s findings in this case, it nevertheless does not appear to me that imports of lighter flints have, as the law provides, “contributed substantially towards causing or threatening serious injury” to the domestic industry. Such difficulties as the United States industry has encountered appear to me to be due rather to an approximately 40 percent decline in United States consumption of lighter flints, from 138,000 pounds in 1951 to 83,400 pounds in 1954, and to a sharp decline of about 90 percent in United States exports, from 86,100 pounds in 1951 to 8,000 pounds in 1954. Imports on the other hand in 1954 were only slightly more than 5,000 pounds and represented only 6.8% of the domestic consumption of lighter flints. Imports have increased since the Commission filed its report but they still represent a relatively small proportion of domestic consumption.

It is the firm policy of the United States to seek continuously expanding levels of world trade and investment. Any departure from this established policy must of course, therefore, be taken only if predicated upon sound evidence and reason. In my judgment such sound evidence and reason are lacking in this case for there is a very serious question that increased imports are contributing substantially towards causing or threatening serious injury.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

December 3, 1956
United States World Trade Fair

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the United States World Trade Fair is to be held at New York, New York, from April 14 to April 27, 1957, inclusive, for the purposes of exhibition, promotion, and sale of foreign products and services to the American trade and to the public; and

Whereas the Congress, by a joint resolution approved July 27, 1956, has authorized the President of the United States of America, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in such United States World Trade Fair; and

Whereas the participation by the States of the Union and foreign countries in the United States World Trade Fair will promote foreign and domestic commerce and will serve as a means of fostering good will among nations:

Now, therefore, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, do hereby invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in the Coliseum in New York, New York, from April 14 to April 27, 1957, inclusive.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this sixteenth day of November in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred fifty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

By the President:

HERBERT HOOVER, JR.
Acting Secretary of State

World Bank Makes $1.6 Million Loan for Nicaraguan Power Development

The World Bank announced on November 15 a loan of $1.6 million for electric power development in Nicaragua. The loan will supplement a loan of $7.1 million made in July 1955 to finance the foreign-exchange costs of constructing a 30,000-kilowatt thermal power plant and expansion of the distribution system in Managua and transmission lines to 15 outlying towns.

Grace National Bank of New York is participating in the loan, without the World Bank’s guaranty, to the extent of $101,000, representing the first two maturities falling due in October 1959 and April 1960.

The loan was made to the Empresa Nacional de Luz y Fuerza of Managua and is guaranteed by the Republic of Nicaragua. Empresa is an autonomous government corporation which supplies power to the Managua area. The loan is for a term of 15 years and bears interest of 4 3/4 percent, including the 1 percent commission charged by the bank. Amortization will begin October 1, 1959.

The new loan was made to cover the additional foreign exchange needed for the Managua power project. The total cost of the project will be approximately the same as had been originally estimated—$10.6 million—but after the award of contracts for equipment and construction, it was found that the foreign-exchange component was larger than had been estimated.

Construction of the foundations for the power plant and building started in May 1956. The first 15,000-kilowatt unit should be ready for commercial operation in March 1958 and the second 15,000-kilowatt unit 5 months later. The Managua distribution system is scheduled for completion before the end of 1957 and the transmission lines by February 1958. When completed, the project will double electric generating capacity in Nicaragua and help to meet the demand for power in the Managua and Pacific coastal plain areas, the most populous and productive in the country.

Bank loans in Nicaragua now total $23 million. They have been made for electric power, agriculture, road transport, and improvements at Corinto, the main seaport on the Pacific.

After having been approved by the bank’s executive directors, the loan documents were signed by Julio C. Morales, Chargé d’Affaires ad interim of the Embassy of Nicaragua in Washington, on behalf of the Republic of Nicaragua, by Humberto Salvo, General Manager of Empresa Nacional de Luz y Fuerza, on behalf of the borrower, and by W. A. B. Iliff, Vice President, on behalf of the World Bank.

## Calendar of Meetings

### Adjourned During November 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Sugar Conference: 2d Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 4-Nov. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Special Committee on Question of Defining Aggression</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Oct. 8-Nov. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATT Contracting Parties: 11th Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Oct. 11-Nov. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pacific Commission: 16th Session</td>
<td>Nouméa, New Caledonia</td>
<td>Oct. 18-Nov. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Improvement of National Statistics: 4th Session</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Oct. 22-Nov. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Executive Board and Program Committee</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Oct. 22-Nov. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation: 2d Meeting</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Oct. 22-Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECAFE Subcommittee on Trade: 2d Session</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Oct. 29-Nov. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 1st Meeting of Consultative Subcommittee on Economic Aspects of Rice</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Oct. 29-Nov. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO Executive Board: 45th Session</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>Oct. 31-Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sugar Council: 10th Meeting</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 1 (1 day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. General Assembly: 1st and 2d Emergency Special Sessions</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Nov. 1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Electric Power Committee: 4th Session of Working Party on Storage and Processing of Rice</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Trusteeship Council: Standing Committee on Petitions</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Nov. 5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO International Rice Commission: <em>Ad Hoc</em> Working Group on Storage and Processing of Rice</td>
<td>Wellington, New Zealand</td>
<td>Nov. 5-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan): Preliminary Working Group</td>
<td>Palmerston, New Zealand</td>
<td>Nov. 6-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th International Grassland Congress</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Nov. 6-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO International Conference on Airport Charges</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. Economic Power Power Committee</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Nov. 8-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripartite Danube Conference (France, U.K., U.S.)</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Nov. 12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Cocoa Study Group: 1st Meeting</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECE Timber Committee: Joint FAO/ECE Working Party on Forest and Forest Products Statistics</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>Nov. 12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO International Rice Commission: 5th Session</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Nov. 12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAO Special Caribbean Regional Air Navigation Meeting</td>
<td>Antigua, Guatemala</td>
<td>Nov. 13-27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Commission: Conference on Town and Country Development</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>Nov. 14-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Parliamentary Union: 45th Conference</td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>Nov. 15-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZUS Council: 4th Meeting</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Nov. 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan): Officials Meeting</td>
<td>Wellington, New Zealand</td>
<td>Nov. 19-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Regional Conference for Latin America: 4th Session</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Nov. 19-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO Governing Body: 133d Session</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Nov. 20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECOSOC Technical Assistance Committee</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Nov. 26-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In Session as of November 30, 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Pacific Fur Seal Conference</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Nov. 28, 1955-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO General Conference: 9th Session</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>Nov. 5-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. General Assembly: 11th Session</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Nov. 12-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N. ECLA Trade Committee: 1st Meeting</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>Nov. 19-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

In Session as of November 30, 1956—Continued

ITU International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIT): Preliminary Study Group.
Customs Cooperation Council: 9th Session.
1st Inter-American Technical Meeting on Housing and Planning.
U.N. ECE Housing Committee: 13th Session and Working Parties.
Inter-American Travel Conferences: Permanent Executive Committee.

Scheduled December 1, 1956-February 28, 1957

ICT Panel on Aircraft Rescue and Fire-fighting Equipment at Aerodromes.
FAO Plant Protection Committee for Southeast Asia and Pacific Region: 1st Meeting.
ITU International Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIF): 18th Plenary Assembly (Final Meeting).
U.N. ECE Committee on Agricultural Problems: 8th Meeting.
U.N. ECE Steel Committee and Working Parties.
Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan): Ministerial Meeting.
UNESCO Executive Board: 46th Session.
ITU International Telegraph Consultative Committee (CCIT): 8th Plenary Assembly (Final Meeting).
Caribbean Commission: 23d Meeting.
Symposium on Tropical Cyclones.
FAO European Contact Group on the Uses of Isotopes and Radiation in Agricultural Research: 1st Meeting.
U.N. ECE Coal Committee.
U.N. ECE Inland Transport Committee.
U.N. ECAFE Railway Subcommittee: 5th Session of Working Party on Railway Track Sleepers.
ITU International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIT): First Plenary Assembly of New CCIT (former CCIT and CCIF combined).
U.N. Economic and Social Council: Resumed 22d Session.
NATO Council: Ministerial Session.
ICAO Special North Atlantic Fixed Services Meeting.
ICAO Panel on Visual Aids to Approach and Landing.
U.N. ECOSOC Transport and Communications Commission: 8th Session.
FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: Working Party on Coconuts and Coconut Products.
WMO Commission for Climatology: 2d Session.
WMO Regional Association I (Africa): 2d Session.
Conference for Coordination of Very High Frequency Mobile Frequencies in Certain High Traffic Areas of the North and Baltic Seas.
19th International Red Cross Conference.
UPU Executive and Liaison Committee: Airmail Subcommission.
ICAO Panel on Future Requirements of Turbo-Jet Aircraft: 2d Meeting.
U.N. Refugee Fund Executive Committee: 4th Session.
Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives.
U.N. ECAFE Inland Transport Committee: 6th Session.
Review of 11th Session of Contracting Parties to GATT

Press release 582 dated November 20

Several issues of primary importance to the future work of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade were considered during the 11th regular session of the Contracting Parties. The session began on October 11 and closed on November 17, 1956, at Geneva, Switzerland. During the session, arrangements were made for the Contracting Parties to hold comprehensive consultations during 1957 with most of the countries maintaining import quotas for balance-of-payments reasons. This will be the first general examination of such quantitative restrictions since the general agreement was initiated in 1948.

In response to a request by the Government of Switzerland, a procedure was agreed upon which will permit the provisional accession of Switzerland to the general agreement if tariff negotiations with that country can be successfully concluded. The tariff negotiations with Switzerland will probably take place sometime in 1957 after the Swiss Government has instituted a new tariff law. These new negotiations will not involve reductions in any existing United States duties.

Preliminary discussion was held with regard to the relationship of the general agreement to current negotiations at Brussels on a European common market or customs union among Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. A similar discussion took place with regard to studies at Paris which may lead to a free-trade area between members of the proposed customs union and various Western European countries, such as the United Kingdom. In view of the preliminary nature of the Brussels and Paris work, it was not possible to discuss the substance to any great extent. It was agreed, however, that, if these plans mature, such discussions would take place at a future time, and procedures for the consultation were established.

For urgent fiscal reasons, the Brazilian Government felt that substantial changes were necessary in its tariff law. The Brazilian Government considered the necessity for such changes so overwhelming that it would have to withdraw from the general agreement unless some arrangements were made for a modification of its tariff commitments. After extensive discussions, arrangements were made whereby Brazil will be able to give effect to its new tariff promptly but will be required to enter into tariff negotiations so that other countries may obtain appropriate adjustments.

The way was also cleared under which Nicaragua, a Contracting Party, and four neighboring states which are not Contracting Parties can form a Central American free-trade area.

In addition, the Contracting Parties:

- took action on matters pertaining to the newly created France-Tunisia Customs Union and the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland;
- conducted their regular balance-of-payments consultations with the five countries which consult annually;
- received and reviewed reports on actions which various governments have taken pursuant to waivers;
- examined technical questions in customs administration which have been referred to them; and
- reviewed a number of trade disputes brought to their attention by parties to the dispute under the "complaints" procedure of the general agreement.

The Contracting Parties also discussed several other trade matters, including disposal of surplus agricultural products, discrimination in transport insurance, and consultations on trade in primary commodities.

The session just concluded was a regular annual

December 3, 1956

---

1 For a statement made at the opening session by Herbert V. Prochnow, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs and chairman of the U.S. delegation, see Bulletin of Oct. 29, 1956, p. 683.
meeting during which the Contracting Parties discussed various matters which had come up under the administration of the general agreement. Sir Claude Corea, High Commissioner for Ceylon in the United Kingdom, was elected chairman of the Contracting Parties, while P. A. Porthomme, Belgian Ambassador to Switzerland, and Andres Vargas Gomez of Cuba were elected as vice-chairmen, until the beginning of the 12th session. Sir Claude Corea replaced Dana Wilgress, Canadian Ambassador to the North Atlantic Council, who had served as chairman for several years.  

The following 35 countries are presently Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade:

- Australia
- Austria
- Belgium
- Brazil
- Burma
- Canada
- Ceylon
- Chile
- Cuba
- Czechoslovakia
- Denmark
- Dominican Republic
- Finland
- France
- Federal Republic of Germany
- Greece
- Haiti
- India
- Indonesia
- Italy
- Japan
- Luxembourg
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Norway
- Pakistan
- Peru
- Rhodesia and Nyasaland
- Sweden
- Turkey
- Union of South Africa
- United Kingdom
- United States
- Uruguay

Following are more detailed reports on the principal matters dealt with in the session just ended.

**Expanded Consultations on Balance-of-Payments Import Restrictions**

The decision to undertake in 1957 a comprehensive examination of balance-of-payments import restrictions is the result of a proposal by the United States that invitations to consult be extended to all countries now imposing import quotas for balance-of-payments reasons.

In the past, only five countries have consulted annually with regard to the discriminatory aspects of their restrictions. In addition, there have been a few cases where countries have consulted regarding intensification of their import restrictions. The Contracting Parties have also regularly reviewed, on the basis of a questionnaire, the use of import restrictions by Contracting Parties. There has been, however, no general examination of import restrictions through the consultative process.

Two years ago, when amendments to the general agreement were negotiated, the need for a general survey of import restrictions and for regular consultations on a comprehensive basis was recognized and provided for in the revised agreement. The revisions are not yet in effect.

The adoption of the U.S. proposal will help to fill the gap that results from the delay in putting the revised provisions into effect. It does not take the place of the proposed new rules and procedures, but it does offer a means of examining existing import restrictions against the background of the generally improved international financial developments of recent years.

The following countries are to consult: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Ceylon, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Sweden, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom. A few of the economically less-developed countries applying restrictions were not included in the current consultation list.

A Consultations Committee of 13 governments has been appointed to conduct the consultations. Contracting Parties not represented on the Committee but having an interest in one or more of the consultations may also participate on their own motion or by invitation. The International Monetary Fund will also be invited to participate.

The consultations will be held at Geneva in three groups: about half of the countries are scheduled to consult in June or July 1957; a second group, immediately before the 12th session of the Contracting Parties; and a small group, in the early part of the 12th session.

The consultations will cover four main areas: (1) the nature of the country’s financial difficulties and prospects; (2) alternative measures to import quotas which might be used to correct the difficulties; (3) the system and methods of import controls in force; and (4) the effects of the restrictions on other Contracting Parties. The Consultations Committee will submit a report on these matters for each consultation to the Contracting Parties at their 12th session.

**Other Actions on Import Restrictions**

During the session, the Contracting Parties conducted their annual consultations on discrimi-
natory import restrictions with Australia, Ceylon, New Zealand, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and the United Kingdom. In each case, some progress was noted in the reduction of discrimination against dollar goods during the past year. Ceylon, in particular, made a major move in September 1956 when it removed its monetary ceilings on the licensing of dollar goods and established a de facto regime of nondiscrimination, which results in the automatic licensing of virtually all imports from the dollar area.

In addition, the U.S. delegation held bilateral consultations with the delegations of 13 countries: Australia, Brazil, Ceylon, Denmark, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and the United Kingdom. These discussions covered import restrictions maintained by these countries on specific commodities which created a hardship to U.S. producers or were unduly discriminatory toward U.S. goods. In each case the U.S. delegation suggested that the other country consider whether a relaxation of the restriction could be made without disrupting that country’s balance-of-payments position. Industrial products were discussed with eight countries, agricultural products with five, and fisheries products with four.

Results of the discussions were generally favorable. Several assurances of immediate favorable action were obtained; in some instances the prospect of fairly early reduction in the level of such restrictions was indicated; in a few instances the countries indicated a need for the continuance of the restrictions. In each case, however, a full and frank discussion of the restrictions, the reasons for their maintenance, proposals for their elimination, or the need for their continuance served to provide a basis for mutual understanding and for further consultations in the future.


Accession of Switzerland

Switzerland, an important trading nation, has never been a party to the general agreement. It has been in process of revising its tariff and has not been in a position to enter into tariff negotiations, which is the normal requirement for accession to the agreement. In addition, because of its constitutional requirement for the protection of domestic agriculture and certain other national policies, the Swiss Government had felt that it could not accept fully certain of the obligations of the general agreement.

It is expected that the first of these obstacles to accession will soon be removed. The new Swiss tariff will be brought into effect sometime in 1957, and Switzerland believes it will be able to undertake tariff negotiations soon thereafter. Switzerland therefore submitted to this session of the Contracting Parties a request that procedures leading to its accession to the agreement be initiated. This was on the understanding that a period of provisional association, roughly comparable to that temporarily afforded Japan prior to its accession in 1955, might be arranged and that during this period Switzerland might maintain certain reservations regarding its obligations under the agreement, while seeking solutions for the problems requiring the reservations.

The Contracting Parties approved the Swiss request to enter into tariff negotiations with a view to provisional accession to the general agreement. These negotiations will be held at some mutually convenient date in 1957, based upon the new tariff when it has been approved by the Swiss Government. Upon the successful completion of tariff negotiations, a declaration will be opened for signature, giving effect to the concessions and providing for Switzerland’s provisional accession to the agreement. The Contracting Parties indicated their intention to agree that Switzerland’s acceptance of the declaration is valid even though accompanied by reservations with respect to certain provisions of the agreement.

The first of these reservations will apply, within limits, to article XI, which prohibits the use of import quotas except in certain specified circumstances. It will reserve to the Swiss Government the right to impose agricultural import restrictions in accordance with certain existing legislation and to continue its controls over imports of two or three types of heavy trucks. The latter restriction is also required by law and is designed to limit spare-parts requirements in a period of defense mobilization.

At their first session after the signature of the declaration, the Contracting Parties will invite Switzerland to participate in the work of the Contracting Parties. Following the entry into force of these provisional arrangements, Switzerland will enter into consultations with the Con-

December 3, 1956
tracting Parties to find solutions, compatible with the principles of GATT, for the problems dealt with in the reservations. The provisional arrangements will be effective for a period of 2 years from their acceptance by Switzerland subject to possible renewal, or until such date as Switzerland accedes to the agreement definitively, whichever is earlier.

In the formulation of these procedures, the United States made it clear that it will not be able to enter into negotiations with Switzerland for reductions in U.S. rates of duty.

**European Customs Union and Free-Trade Area**

France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux countries are negotiating for the formation of a common market or customs union. Concurrently, a study is under way in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation on the feasibility of associating other OEEC countries with the common market through a free-trade area. (A free-trade area is like a customs union in that it involves the elimination of tariffs and other trade barriers between the countries comprising the area but differs in that it does not involve the establishment of a common tariff applicable to imports from outside the area.)

These developments are of interest to the United States and other Contracting Parties outside the proposed arrangements because of both the long-run political and economic benefits which may flow from them and their possible impact upon existing patterns of trade.

In order to protect the trade interests of outside countries, the general agreement establishes requirements which must be satisfied by Contracting Parties entering into customs unions or free-trade areas. Specifically, tariffs and other protection afforded under the new arrangement shall not be higher or more restrictive than they were before; tariff preferences for outside countries shall not be increased; and the new arrangement, which may go through a transitional stage, shall enter into full effect within a reasonable period of time.

The plan for a European customs union is still in the negotiating stage, and the related proposal for a free-trade area is in the stage of technical examination of its practicability. While it was recognized that it was premature to examine details of the proposals at the session, there was an extensive debate on the procedures which should be followed to insure that the Contracting Parties are advised on any formal plans for a customs union and free-trade area far enough in advance to permit them to make a meaningful review of the details and to make recommendations.

The Contracting Parties received assurances, on behalf of the six countries negotiating a common market, that the principles of the general agreement regarding customs unions would be observed and that any treaty agreed upon would be submitted for the consideration of the Contracting Parties in the period after its signature but before its ratification.

Similarly, the Contracting Parties received assurances that the OEEC committee studying a possible European free-trade area was under instruction from the OEEC Council to consult the Contracting Parties at an appropriate time. In the meantime, the secretariat serving the general agreement has been given an opportunity to participate, on an observer basis, in the present preparatory work in the OEEC. Since further action may be required on this matter before the next regular session, the Intersessional Committee has been instructed to follow developments, to act for the Contracting Parties in any consultations which may be arranged with the OEEC, and to report to the 12th session.

**Brazilian Tariff**

The Contracting Parties granted a waiver to Brazil from its tariff-binding obligations under the general agreement to the extent necessary to permit the Brazilian Government to place in force a revised tariff immediately following its enactment by the Brazilian Congress, probably early in 1957. The duration of the waiver is limited to the time required for completion of tariff negotiations to replace the present schedule of Brazilian tariff concessions annexed to the general agreement and for the entry into force of the new concessions. It is anticipated that a period of 1 year will be sufficient. Pending the entry into force of the results of the negotiations, the other Contracting Parties will be free to suspend tariff concessions which they initially negotiated with Brazil.

The tariff revision was necessary because the existing tariff was based on obsolete nomenclature and had lost its force because of extreme inflation in Brazil. In addition, Brazil needed to reform its fiscal system.

In presenting its request to the Contracting Parties, the Brazilian Government gave assur-
ances that during the period covered by the waiver (i.e., until the tariff negotiations are completed and the results are in force) the operation of the new tariff would not result in any significant overall increase in the cost of imports in the Brazilian market, would not alter the existing pattern of imports, and would not reduce the volume of imports as determined by the availability of foreign exchange. The Brazilian Government stated its belief also that new and simplified exchange procedures, which it intends to place in operation concurrently with the new tariff, will substantially reduce the discriminatory aspects of its import system.

The Brazilian Government gave assurances also regarding the enactment of a new excise law which would eliminate the discriminatory effect of present excise taxes. The Brazilian Government undertook also to study its consular and customs formalities with a view to their simplification and expressed confidence that at least the requirement of a consular invoice could be eliminated.

The decision of the Contracting Parties granting the waiver to Brazil included also provision for establishing a tariff negotiations committee to make arrangements for the forthcoming tariff negotiations and to consider questions of general concern to the negotiating parties.

Central American Free-Trade Area

The Contracting Parties approved a proposed interim arrangement looking toward the ultimate establishment in Central America of a free-trade area, as a part of a broader plan of ultimate political union. Under the proposed arrangement, tariffs and other restrictions on commerce among Nicaragua, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Honduras would be eliminated on substantially all the trade among them within 10 years after the draft Central American Free-Trade and Economic Integration Treaty entered into force.

Nicaragua expects that a definite plan and schedule for completion of the five-state free-trade area can be drawn up after the free-trade treaty enters into force and is submitted to the Contracting Parties to the general agreement for their review by September 1, 1960.

A free-trade area is already in force on the part of Nicaragua and El Salvador. In addition, Nicaragua expects to conclude additional bilateral free-trade treaties with Costa Rica and Guate-
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Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland. The agreement of the Contracting Parties was required because of the provisions in the general agreement otherwise limiting increases in tariff preferences. The United States abstained on this decision and reserved its right under the St. Germain Treaty of 1919, which provides for equality of treatment in the Congo Basin area.

**Customs Administration**

The International Chamber of Commerce, which has from time to time referred a number of requests to the Contracting Parties directed toward the simplification and standardization of customs formalities, had submitted two proposals for consideration at this session. With respect to the first, the Contracting Parties amended an existing recommendation for facilitating the issuance of certificates of origin. The other was a proposal that a set of guiding principles be adopted on marks of origin. The Contracting Parties will consider this proposal further at their 12th session. The Contracting Parties also noted that additional progress had been made during the past year in the abolition of consular formalities. They deferred until the 12th session further consideration of an agreed definition of nationality of origin.

**Trade Disputes**

A longstanding complaint against certain discriminatory taxes which Brazil imposes on imports was disposed of. The pending legislation to reform Brazil's tariff and fiscal structure will result in imported and domestic products being treated on an equal basis for tax purposes.

Settlement of another complaint was anticipated when France announced that a bill had been introduced rescinding the increase in its stamp tax on customs receipts which has been the subject of a U.S. complaint.

The United States brought a complaint against both France and Chile for newly established internal taxes on automobiles which fall with particular force on American cars. France has imposed a tax on cars rated (for tax purposes) over 16 horsepower, which falls almost exclusively on imports and most heavily on imports from the United States. Chile has established a steeply progressive tax on automobiles which particularly affects cars with a value of over $1,500. All imports of American cars fall in this category. As a result of U.S. representations, the Chilean Government is considering legislation to amend the tax to remove its discriminatory feature.

The complaint against Chile will be kept on the agenda for the next session, and the Intersessional Committee was authorized to act on the U.S. complaint against France if results are not obtained from the direct representations which the United States has made to the French Government.

The Danish Government entered a complaint against the payment of a subsidy by the United States on exports of poultry to the German market. There will be consultations with the United States on this matter in which the Netherlands will also participate. Denmark reserved the right to raise the issue again before the Contracting Parties.

**Reports on Operations Under Waivers**

The United States submitted its second annual report under the waiver it has received to eliminate any conflict between its obligations under the general agreement and agricultural import fees and quotas imposed under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. The report dealt not only with the changes in restrictions over the past year (a relaxation of the quota on peanuts and a broadening of the restrictions on cotton) but also supplied information on each product still subject to import restrictions and outlined the efforts that are being made to correct the problem of agricultural surpluses.

In the course of the working-party review of the report, particular interest was shown in the possibilities of reducing surpluses through the soilbank program and in the progress of special studies by the U.S. Government of its price-support and surplus-disposal programs.

The Netherlands was again authorized to restrict imports of wheat flour from the United States to 60,000 tons per year as compensation for impairment of tariff concessions received from the United States by this country's import restrictions on dairy products. Although the Netherlands has not used this authorization at any time, the United States still continued its restrictions on dairy products and the Netherlands Government wished the authorization to be continued.

The Contracting Parties also reviewed the first annual report submitted by Belgium under a waiver granted in 1955 permitting Belgium to
maintain temporary import quotas on a number of agricultural products. In this connection, the United States explored what could be done to improve the position of U.S. agricultural products in the Belgian market. As a result, U.S. apple and pear exporters, while still confronted with Belgian quotas, should be in a better position to compete in the Belgian market now because of the removal of a number of uncertainties over Belgian administrative procedures. In particular, it was made clear that traders at any time during the year could enter into contracts for apples and pears with the assurance that licenses would be issued automatically by the opening of the quota-free period.

The Contracting Parties also conducted their annual review of the operations under the waiver granted the six member states of the European Coal and Steel Community and of the relations to the Community of outside countries requiring access to its supplies or markets for coal and steel.

Commodity Problems

After extensive negotiations beginning with the 9th session of the Contracting Parties in 1954–55, the Contracting Parties finally concluded at this session that it was impossible to develop an agreement which would establish principles and procedures for negotiation of agreements stabilizing prices of particular primary commodities. At the present session a resolution was agreed on under which the Contracting Parties reaffirmed that trade aspects of commodity problems could be discussed. It also provides that, after examination of the difficulties of an individual commodity, the Contracting Parties might suggest to the appropriate international organization that an international conference be held. If no such organization exists, the Contracting Parties might call the conference itself. Participation in such a conference would be left for each country to decide for itself.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

Housing Committee, Economic Commission for Europe

The Department of State announced on November 23 (press release 596) that Daniel F. Hamady, assistant to the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, will serve as the delegate for the United States to the 13th session of the Housing Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (Ece), which is to convene at Geneva, Switzerland, on November 26, 1956. William Zeckendorf, Jr., vice president of Webb and Knapp, Inc., realtors, New York City, has been designated the alternate U.S. delegate.

The Housing Committee is one of the principal subsidiary organs established by the Ece for the purpose of reviewing the developments in the field of housing in Europe with a view to recommending action which might be taken by the member governments in their respective housing programs. Much of the work of the committee is carried on through a series of working parties concerned with such matters as assistance to less industrialized countries, the cost of house building, and housing policies.
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TREATY INFORMATION

Agreement With Austria Regarding Certain Dollar Bonds

Press release 583 dated November 21

Foreign Minister Leopold Figl of Austria and Acting Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., signed a treaty on November 21 which, when ratified, will result in the establishment of a mixed United States-Austrian tribunal in New York City to determine the validity of certain dollar bonds of several Austrian issues. These include both public and private issues for which the corporate trustees, fiscal agents, or paying agents are U.S. financial institutions. Many of these Austrian dollar bonds had been acquired by the issuers for eventual retirement. As a result of the war, these bonds were retained uncanceled in Austria or Germany and therefore appear on their face to be valid obligations. A great many of these bonds were stolen or disappeared in Germany or Austria during World War II or immediately thereafter.

The Austrian Government prepared a list of the serial numbers of the missing bonds and the Austrian Parliament passed a law declaring them invalid in Austria. Under the terms of the new agreement with Austria, any holder of a bond listed in the annex thereto (which is a list of the bonds invalidated in Austria) may present such bonds to the tribunal within 18 months from the effective date of the treaty for determination whether they were properly included on the list of missing bonds. If the tribunal finds in favor of the bondholder, he will be given valid bonds in exchange for the ones improperly listed. Rights of enforcement in the listed bonds become barred upon expiration of an 18-month statute of limitation.

At the outbreak of World War II, the Securities and Exchange Commission requested brokers and dealers to refrain from effecting transactions in securities covered by the agreement, and this request is still in effect. It is anticipated that after the new agreement has been ratified and has become effective, brokers and dealers will be able to resume trading in valid Austrian securities but not in those securities which are listed in the annex to the treaty. The Austrian issuers are prepared to resume payment on valid securities as soon as the agreement is in effect.

Information regarding the numbers of the Austrian dollar bonds listed in the annex to the treaty may be obtained from the Embassy of Austria, 2343 Massachusetts Ave., NW., Washington, D. C., and the Austrian Consulate General, New York City.
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Whaling

Protocol amending the international whaling convention of 1946 (TIAS 1849). Open for signature at Washington from November 19 through December 3, 1956. Enters into force on the date ratifications or adherences have been deposited by all the contracting governments to the 1946 convention. Signature: Australia, November 19, 1956.
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BILATERAL

Austria


France

Agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy. Signed at Washington June 19, 1956. Entered into force: November 29, 1956 (date on which each Government notified the other that it had complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements).


Italy

Yugoslavia


DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Resignations

Robert C. Hendrickson as Ambassador to New Zealand. For text of Mr. Hendrickson’s letter to the President and the President’s reply, see White House press release dated November 19.

Clare Boothe Luce as Ambassador to Italy. For text of Mrs. Luce’s letter to the President and the President’s reply, see White House press release dated November 19.

Recess Appointments

President Eisenhower on November 24 appointed James David Zellerbach to be Ambassador to Italy.
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The Search for Disarmament

Publication 6398

The Search for Disarmament, a 35-page pamphlet, discusses several aspects of the compelling problem of disarmament, "the limitation, regulation, and control of arms." The pamphlet, based on an address by Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, covers the following topics:

- the nature and urgency of the problem;
- disarmament as a safeguard of the national security;
- disarmament as an integral part of national policy;
- major periods of negotiations;
- the present status of disarmament negotiations;
- prospects for disarmament.

Copies of The Search for Disarmament may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at 20 cents each.
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U.S. Views on Problems of Hungary and the Middle East

by Deputy Under Secretary Murphy

I think that the Joint Distribution Committee is an outstanding example of the kind of partnership which has existed for many years between the people of this country and their Government. I do not believe it is lacking in modesty as an American to say that the world has come to look upon the United States in time of war or catastrophe as the big nation of the helping hand and the warm heart. In the minds of some this may be translated in terms of government, but most of us know that it is not only acts of government which achieve this but often primarily the initiative and the activities of volunteer agencies such as yours. And these activities have gained for our country the thanks, the admiration, and the affection of needy and troubled people throughout the world.

We know that for more than 40 years the “Joint” has provided a continuing reminder of the generosity and sympathy of Americans for those in need. Your committee’s history teems with examples of the kind of unselfishness which has earned for you the title of a “Jewish Red Cross” or, as former President Hoover once said, as an outstanding example of “human engineering.”

Thus you have skillfully supplemented Government programs by vast humanitarian projects of your own. And because you have done this on a voluntary basis, your contribution has meant more than just the healing of the sick and the saving of lives; it has given hope to the hopeless and a measure of security to the helpless and the harassed. Thus you enjoy a worldwide reputa-

tion, and I should like to bear witness from what I have seen and heard in various world areas of your efforts on behalf of refugees, of your relief and medical programs, of work in behalf of displaced persons and for the needy in many places. I have no doubt that your efforts have saved the lives of many thousands and that you have earned the heartfelt gratitude of many others. In so doing, you have acted in the best traditions of the American ideal and in keeping with the nobler instincts of humanity.

Perhaps I could take advantage of the opportunity you have provided to spend a few minutes discussing one or two problems which have been engaging our attention recently. They, of course, have a certain impact on the work of the committee. Several months ago we were deeply concerned over Egypt’s abrupt and arbitrary seizure of the Suez Canal Company. At the same time, we were watching with active interest the ebb and flow of the de-Stalinization program in Eastern Europe. Developments in both of these areas moved with rapidity and came to a climax in the latter part of October. It might be useful to spend a few minutes sifting out the meaning of these happenings for the purpose of defining whatever constructive elements there may be in the situation.

Before doing that, however, I would like to stress one central fact. At times, both in the relations of individuals as well as nations, honest differences of opinion occur regarding the method of solving problems or achieving objectives. It does not mean because such differences arise that traditional and cherished friendships and understanding are irreparably damaged. Quite the contrary. Out of such differences often come even closer cooperation and understanding. One of the

---

1 Address made at the annual dinner of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, New York, N.Y., on Nov. 29 (press release 603).
basic elements of American foreign policy is a system of collective security which of necessity the free nations of the world have constructed as an inevitable reaction against the aggressive intentions and acts of international communism during the postwar years.

This system of ours is not merely a selfish device intended to benefit only the United States. It is also a necessity for our allies. One of the major elements in that system of collective security is the North Atlantic Treaty alliance, a keystone of our foreign policy. Nothing that has happened in the recent past should or must be allowed to disturb that alliance, including as it does our oldest and dearest friends. Whatever misunderstandings of the moment there may be, these are passing. The North Atlantic Treaty alliance will remain a successful barrier to Soviet expansion.

Apart from alliances, we have other close friends in the international field whom we cherish. We do not propose to be distracted from such friendships by passing occurrences, even though we find ourselves in disagreement over methods which may be invoked. Often differences occur between two or more friends of this country and with the best of intentions. It is not easy for the third party to be helpful in the reconciliation of such differences or always to please all the parties. We can only do the best possible under the circumstances.

Soviet Repression in Hungary

And throughout our dealings in the international field we can never for a moment relax our attention from the overshadowing danger hanging over the free world. It is manifest like flashes of lightning from time to time, as in the case of the Soviet repression in Hungary.

Your membership, I know, has a constructive interest in the problems of Eastern Europe. In 1914 when the Joint Distribution Committee was founded a considerable portion of the world’s Jewish population lived in Central and Eastern Europe. You have devoted tremendous and effective efforts to resettle many of these people and to alleviate the privations and sufferings of those who remain. The Nazi barbarism in this area was a tragedy having an enormous impact on you and on all Americans. Today the actions of the Soviet Union are the cause of the greatest concern, especially since many had hoped only a short while ago that some respect for law, some tolerance, and even some regard for the individual were beginning to appear on the part of the Soviet leadership.

After the meeting last February of the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, these hopes were crushed. Khrushchew, head of the Soviet Communist Party, seemed to admit in his famous secret speech what the world had long known about Stalinism. In denouncing the horror and harshness of Stalin’s rule, the Soviet leaders seemed to say that things might be different and that there was an intention to act as a respectable member of the world community.

On November 4, in Budapest, Soviet guns and Soviet armor crushed these hopes. On October 28 the Soviet press was praising the Nagy government to the skies. On October 30 the Soviet Government issued a formal statement apologizing for the blood already shed in Hungary, admitting that the continued presence of Soviet troops “can serve as a cause for even greater deterioration of the situation,” and expressing willingness to discuss the withdrawal of Soviet forces with the Hungarian Government. That Government took Moscow at its word and opened negotiations on November 1 with Soviet authorities in Budapest for this withdrawal. Nagy, who, it should not be forgotten, was after all an oldtime Communist, committed what seems to be termed a crime in the Soviet vocabulary. He sought to be responsive to the desires of his people not only for independece from Soviet domination but for a measure of political freedom.

Then, before negotiations terminated, Soviet troops were pouring into Hungary over the Carpathian frontier. Nagy was assured that this was a routine replacement of troops. On November 4 Moscow struck, violating the most elementary rules of international conduct. Soviet authorities simply arrested the Hungarians appointed by their Government to negotiate the Soviet withdrawal. Soviet troops went into action throughout Hungary, and almost as an afterthought, 2 hours later, Hungarian Communist Janos Kadar announced that he and five others took it upon themselves to proclaim that they had formed a government for 10 million Hungarians.

Throughout the United Nations consideration of the Middle East crisis, Soviet spokesmen indignantly accused the British and French of “bypassing” the United Nations, of flouting its will,
and of "violating standards of international law." These accusations, of course, ignored the sequence of events in the Middle East and the responsiveness of the U.K. and of France to the resolution of the General Assembly relating to the cease-fire in Egypt, the process of the withdrawal of forces from that area, and the admission of the United Nations forces. At the same time, the United Nations has never been "bypassed" more cruelly and its decisions flouted more brazenly than in the Soviet disregard of the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, with overwhelming majorities, on November 4 and 9.2

The Soviet Union remains in defiance of the resolutions. Thus, the Soviet rulers have ignored the world organization's call to "desist forthwith from all armed attack on the peoples of Hungary and from any form of intervention . . . in the internal affairs of Hungary." They have not made even a pretense of complying with the United Nations' solemn injunction against the "introduction of additional armed forces into Hungary" and its call for a withdrawal of all of the Soviet forces "without delay from Hungarian territory." They have contented themselves with warmed-over clichés about Fascist reactionaries in Hungary instigated by vague elements abroad, especially American, seeking thus to draw an anemic red herring across the trail of their bankrupt policy in Hungary. They cannot admit what is clear to the world: that what happened in Hungary was a spontaneous uprising of workers, farmers, intellectuals, students, and in fact an entire population against foreign tyranny.

For almost 2 years the Soviet leaders and their vast propaganda machine have professed deep sympathy with the desires of various countries for neutrality. At last year's conference of Heads of Government in Geneva, Bulganin even sought to have the subject of neutrality placed on the agenda, saying that "should any nation desiring to pursue a policy of neutrality and non-participation in military groupings . . . raise the question of having their security and territorial integrity guaranteed, the great powers should accede to these wishes." What a mockery of these professed sentiments has been made by Soviet conduct in Hungary! It was precisely Premier Nagy's proclamation of his country's neutrality, his appeal to the great powers in the United Nations for its guaranty, and his announced intention to quit the military grouping known as the Warsaw Pact that brought the mailed fist of Soviet military power on the scene.

During the Middle East crisis the Soviet Union has been particularly bitter about what it calls an attempt to restore colonialism in the area. Egypt's only crime, according to Moscow, was that it was upholding its freedom and independence. No country, Moscow has proclaimed in communique after communique, should interfere in the affairs of another. But in Hungary there never has been a more brutal use of force by a big power to impose on a small nation an unwanted government and a discredited system. This is the Soviet version of colonialism.

How can we analyze the reasons actuating the Soviet leadership to undertake military repression in Hungary? I for one doubt that they were actuated by simple desire to enjoy a military operation. These are very practical and hardheaded men. Was it the reaction of men who are either frightened or desperate over the failure of their system of domination? Was it their obsession with a policy of security in depth? Or was it anxiety that the Hungarian explosion was a prelude to the breakdown of that system? As yet we can only speculate as to their reasoning.

Whatever the reasoning, the profound effect of their action not only in non-Communist but in Communist groups throughout the world will be lasting and damaging to the Soviet system.

**Soviet Treatment of Jews**

The Soviet Union has always posed as a champion of racial minorities. Even disregarding its policy toward Israel, however, its treatment of its own Jewish population belies its claim of racial nondiscrimination.

It is true that the lot of the Soviet Jew is somewhat easier than before. No official pogroms disguised under various labels have been carried out in the post-Stalin period. Some of the Jewish writers and intellectuals executed or imprisoned as a result of the "cosmopolitan purge" of 1948-49 and earlier purges have been rehabilitated. During the past year, some minor concessions have been made in the practice of Judaism as part of a less stringent approach to religion. A small number of Soviet Jews have been allowed to emi-
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2 For texts, see Bulletin of Nov. 19, 1956, p. 803 and p. 806.
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grate to Israel. A few Yiddish-language artists have been permitted to appear on the stage, and the works of Jewish writers are again being published though only in Russian translation. Nevertheless the basic policy of restriction and harassment remains as before.

Several months ago Khrushchev and Madame Furtseva, candidate member of the Communist Party Presidium, disclosed that a strict quota is placed on the number of Jews entering higher educational institutions and holding white-collar jobs. In other words, it is admitted that the notorious quota system of the Tsarist government denounced earlier by the Soviets is still in effect. Former Soviet citizens report that certain Soviet schools and ministries pursue a policy of excluding Jews entirely.

The Soviet Jew has little hope of escaping the discrimination and stigma directed at him, thanks to the contradictory policy of the regime which singles him out as a Jew while at the same time trying to assimilate him. On the one hand, the Soviet Jew is denied his own cultural institutions (Hebrew- and Yiddish-language publications, schools, libraries, and theater) on the ground that he is supposedly not interested in them and is being assimilated. Jewish children are cut off from religious instruction and their faith attacked. At the same time, in accordance with the Soviet practice of indicating ethnic groups, individual passports are stamped with the word "Jew." He remains a Jew to be discriminated against despite the denial to him of his culture and history and the assault on his religion.

**General Assembly Resolutions**

In the Middle East your Government has taken the lead in efforts to meet the immediate situation. As you know, the United Nations General Assembly has passed by overwhelming majorities a series of important resolutions. These resolutions called for a cease-fire in Egypt, which is in effect; for withdrawal of foreign military forces from Egyptian territory, which is in progress; for a return to the armistice lines; and for reopening of the Suez Canal to world commerce. These resolutions forbid the introduction of military goods into the area, and they established an international United Nations Emergency Force, which is now assembling in the area to assist the United Nations Secretary-General in carrying out the terms of the resolutions. Ambassador Lodge has worked day and night in harmony with the able Secretary-General of the United Nations in carrying forward an effective implementation of these resolutions.

But your Government is not solely concerned with the immediate problems. It looks forward to the day when peace and stability will be established in the Middle East, and it sees in the present situation, as unhappy as many of its aspects may be, an opportunity to press forward to a solid and permanent solution of the major problems besetting the area. To this end the United States submitted on November 3 two draft resolutions for the consideration of the General Assembly. One of these calls for the establishment of a group with broad powers and responsibilities. Among the proposed terms of reference of that group is the proposition that the underlying causes of tension in the area must be removed and a final settlement between the parties to the General Armistice Agreements must be achieved "in order to secure a just and lasting peace."

We would hope that a new and more flexible spirit could be developed among the countries directly involved. If that can be done, surely there should be nothing insoluble in a problem such as the Jordan water supply, the refugee question, or for that matter the question of frontiers. This assumes, of course, an honest recognition that the State of Israel is a fact of life. The United States wants to contribute to that new spirit of understanding just as it wishes to work for a better standard of living in the area, which will be possible once a general settlement is achieved.

In drafting these two resolutions, we envisaged the establishment of bodies composed of responsible world citizens who would have behind them the full moral authority of the vast majority of the nations of the world speaking through the United Nations General Assembly. We wish to make it possible for them to draw upon all the considerable resources of the charter of the United Nations and to give them full freedom to decide within the framework of the charter as to the best means of bringing this tremendous influence to bear on the problem.

These two draft resolutions have now been carried forward from the emergency to the regular

---
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session of the General Assembly. They can be put before the plenary session of the Assembly for consideration when the circumstances of the actual situation in the Near East warrant. The President on November 7 said: 

It is our belief that as a matter of highest priority peace should be restored and foreign troops, except for United Nations forces, withdrawn from Egypt, after which new and energetic steps should be undertaken within the framework of the United Nations to solve the basic problems which have given rise to the present difficulty. The United States has tabled in the General Assembly two resolutions designed to accomplish the latter purposes, and hopes that they will be acted upon favorably as soon as the present emergency has been dealt with.

I think that the actions taken by the General Assembly and the views expressed there reflect the will and determination of the free world to work for peace based on justice in the Middle East. By continuing to mobilize this common intent and this common determination we have the best opportunity of overcoming the obstacles to peace.

Obstacles to Peace in Middle East

The obstacles to peace in the Middle East are many and well known, but two of them deserve special mention. It has become apparent that the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East would run counter to Soviet objectives. The Soviets are clearly planning a procession of events starting from reduction of Western influence and proceeding to the eventual incorporation of the nations of the area into the Soviet orbit. In contrast, U.S. policies support the political independence and territorial integrity of the states of the Middle East. Recent United Nations actions amply demonstrate to all who wish to know that the vast majority of the free people of the world share these beliefs.

Another obstacle to peace in the Middle East in the past has been the attitudes of the parties directly concerned toward the whole concept of peace. There has not, in my opinion, been comprehensive study of all the implications of what peace would necessarily involve or of the steps which each must take to achieve it. In this situation again we feel that by acting in the United Nations framework we have the best opportunity of adjusting attitudes to realities and providing the necessary impetus to a process which in its final stages depends for its success on the will and capabilities of the peoples of the area. I recall the views of the Secretary of State on this very point as expressed over a year ago: 

Both sides suffer greatly from the present situation, and both are anxious for what they would regard as a just and equitable solution. But neither has been able to find that way.

This may be a situation where mutual friends could serve the common good. This is particularly true since the area may not, itself, possess all of the ingredients needed for the full and early building of a condition of security and well-being.

I wish that I had been able to give some reassurance today that the bases for our concern over developments in the Middle East are disappearing and that the path ahead lay smooth and straight. We must not, however, permit ourselves for one moment to underestimate the perils that lie before us or to relax our vigilance and our determination for peace. I would hope, however, that others share my conviction that a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East must be achieved in accordance with the practices and principles which mankind has striven so long to codify—that the rule of law can bring peace with justice to the lands where the Law had its beginning.

Thus many aspects of our present-day world are troubled and complex. Our objectives are constructive solutions of trying problems. We do not despair of achieving such solutions. In seeking them there should be a word of recognition of the devotion which the Joint Distribution Committee has in its furtherance of humanitarian goals. Two world wars and their untold sufferings have brought forth tremendous accomplishments by your organization in meeting the needs of Jewish communities overseas. I know that you will continue to work for the creation of conditions which will make a just and lasting peace possible. That will require the best exercise of the talents of all of us. We in Washington feel we can count on your continued cooperation and understanding.

---


President and Secretary Dulles
Review World Situation

STATEMENT BY JAMES C. HAGERTY
PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated November 27

The President will confer on Sunday [December 2] with the Secretary of State, who will come to Augusta that morning on his way from Key West to return to his office in Washington on Monday.

The President and the Secretary will review the international situation and will also discuss the Secretary’s participation in the forthcoming meeting of the Ministerial Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Paris. The Secretary will leave for the meeting on December 8.

The President considers that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as always, is a basic and indispensable element of American defense alliances against the continuing Soviet Communist threat to the peace and security of the world.

As the President has previously pointed out, differences that have arisen between the United States and her traditional friends and allies are those arising from a particular international incident. These differences in no way should be construed as a weakening or disruption of the great bonds that have so long joined our Nation with the United Kingdom and the Republic of France and our other allies in assuring that peace, justice, and freedom shall prevail.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated December 2

President Eisenhower and I reviewed the world scene. We discussed United States foreign policies in relation thereto.

The President is particularly concerned with the external rule which they deeply resent, and many live in fear under the shadow of a similar fate.

These nations and peoples, we believe, should be allowed their own free choice of government with no servitude to any other.

The President and I feel that this situation ought increasingly to engage the attention of the United Nations in the discharge of its charter mission to promote peace with justice. A particular responsibility, we believe, lies upon those members of the United Nations which by adhering to the Atlantic Charter pledged themselves to the principle of self-government for those who had been forcibly deprived of it, and the assurance of a peace which would give freedom from fear.

The President and I discussed fully the position the United States will take at next week’s meeting in Paris of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Ministerial Council, which I plan to attend.

Recent events have created some strain as between members of the North Atlantic Treaty. However, there have been constructive measures to overcome such differences as have existed, and the coming Council meeting affords an opportunity to rebuild a unity and strength.

The need for this has been tragically demonstrated by Soviet action in Eastern Europe, particularly in Hungary. There is compelling reason to make the North Atlantic Treaty Organization within the area of its particular concern a stronger and more effective body. Thereby it can more surely achieve the treaty’s proclaimed goal of safeguarding the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of the North Atlantic Treaty peoples.

Last spring it was proposed that consideration be given to developing the nonmilitary aspects of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council activities with a view to achieving a greater measure of unity and fellowship. As a result the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council last May designated the Foreign Ministers of Canada, Italy, and Norway to study the matter. The United States has been cooperating with them through Senator Walter F. George, special representative of the President. The Committee of Three has now made a report which will come before next week’s meeting of the Council for action. There is thus presented a welcome opportunity to assure greater unity, greater strength, and more effective pursuit of the goals to which the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is dedicated.
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Department of State Bulletin
U.S.–Hungarian Friendship

Remarks by President Eisenhower

I want to tell you that our country feels privileged in inviting you to the United States. We hope you have found nothing but courtesy and hospitality since you arrived.

The sufferings your people have gone through recently have served, from our standpoint at least, one good purpose—to make stronger the friendship we have always felt for your country and to bring us closer together in our hearts.

Recently, of course, the news from your country was particularly disturbing and shocking. Many thousands of your people have been taken from their homes by force and sent into exile at bayonet point.

This is the ultimate tyranny can do to a people. I want to tell you that this country not only resents it deeply but we will never agree that this is the kind of thing one country may do in justice to another.

We shall continue in our efforts to try to help those who are coming out, and, as you know, we have offered to send in supplies of food and medicine and other assistance to help those still in the country. We will continue to do that, and we will be very, very glad to do so. And so, finally, for your courtesy in coming down from Camp Kilmer to see me and to give me a chance to talk to you directly, my very grateful thanks.

More Hungarian Refugees

Offered Asylum in U.S.

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated December 1

The President announced on December 1 that the United States will offer asylum to 21,500 refugees from Hungary. Of these, about 6,500 will receive Refugee Relief Act visas under the emergency program initiated 3 weeks ago. The remaining 15,000 will be admitted to the United States under the provisions of section 212 (d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. When these numbers have been exhausted, the situation will be reexamined.

The President emphasized that the flight of refugees into Austria had created an emergency problem which the United States should share with the other countries of the free world. Because of this emergency, those refugees who seek asylum in the United States will be brought here with the utmost practicable speed.

The President pointed out that the immigration visas available for Hungarian escapes under the Refugee Relief Act are practically exhausted and that the emergency compels the only other action which is available, namely, action under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which authorizes admission on parole.

Persons admitted into the United States on parole have no permanent status in the United States, but the President will request the Congress in January for emergency legislation which will, through the use of unused numbers under the Refugee Relief Act, or otherwise, permit qualified escapees who accept asylum in the United States to obtain permanent residence.

The President also stated that it was his intention to request the Congress to include in such legislation provisions which would allow at least some of the escapees who have proceeded to other countries for asylum to have the opportunity to apply for permanent resettlement in the United States, having in mind particularly the fact that many of those refugees undoubtedly have relatives here.

The President pointed out that other nations have already made increasingly generous offers of asylum and have waived the ordinary restrictions imposed upon immigration.

The President said that he had directed the Secretary of Defense to work out arrangements for the transportation of these refugees to the United States in accordance with agreements to be made with the Austrian Government and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

In making his announcement, the President said that providing asylum to these Hungarian refugees would give practical effect to the American people’s intense desire to help the victims of Soviet oppression. It will also materially assist the Government of Austria, which has responded so generously to the refugees’ needs, to carry out its policy of political asylum.
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General Assembly Action on the Middle East Question

Following is a statement made in plenary at the 11th regular session of the U.N. General Assembly on November 24 by U.S. Representative Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., during debate on the Middle East question, together with texts of two reports to the Assembly by Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold and three resolutions adopted on November 24 and 26. For statements by Ambassador Lodge in the first emergency special session, see Bulletin of November 19, 1956, p. 787.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE

U.S. delegation press release 2528 dated November 24

The General Assembly has before it the report of the Secretary-General regarding the presence and functions of the United Nations Emergency Force in Egypt and the clearing of the Suez Canal. We approve his statement and his report.

In his report the Secretary-General has requested authority from the General Assembly to seek practical arrangements and to negotiate the agreements necessary for clearing the Suez Canal. We believe the Assembly should promptly give this authority.

The United States also believes that the Secretary-General's aide memoire regarding the United Nations force should be approved by the General Assembly.

The translation into specific terms of the general principles laid down by the General Assembly concerning the nature and functions of the United Nations Emergency Force is both delicate and urgent. The United States agrees there should be continuing discussions on an urgent basis between the Secretary-General and the governments directly concerned to settle these matters in accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General enjoys our full confidence as he proceeds with these talks.

The United States has three further observations to make regarding the Secretary-General's report:

First, the United States believes the work of clearing the canal by the United Nations should begin as soon as it is physically and technically possible. We do not agree that the withdrawal of foreign forces should await the clearing of the canal. At the same time we do not believe that the beginning of the clearing process must await the completion of the withdrawals. The Secretary-General's arrangements for the clearing process can begin now, and we believe he will be able to make these arrangements under the relevant General Assembly resolutions without any delay in the clearing operation. Each day that the canal continues closed adds to the serious material damage already suffered by many United Nations members and therefore makes the opening of the canal even more vitally important.

Second, it is equally vital that the rest of the United Nations force be moved into the area as soon as possible and in thoroughly adequate strength. Everything that can be done to accelerate this movement should be done. The building up and staging of the United Nations Emergency Force is a matter of most urgent priority. While much has been done, all concerned must continue to do everything necessary to insure the rapid deployment of the United Nations force in the area.

Third, we believe that the withdrawal of French, British, and Israeli forces must advance without delay. We hope that the announcements on withdrawals already made by the United Kingdom, France, and Israel foreshadow speedy compliance with the General Assembly's resolution for withdrawal of all non-Egyptian forces.

Fourth, let me recall that in the explanation of our vote on the November 7 resolution we stated:

\[ \text{\footnote{U.N. doc. A/3375.}} \]

\[ \text{\footnote{U.N. doc. A/3376. The Secretary-General had also submitted a report on administrative and financial arrangements for the U.N. Emergency Force (U.N. doc. A/3383) and a report on compliance with the Assembly resolutions of Nov. 2 and 7 (U.N. doc. A/3384 and Add. 1 and 2).}} \]
"We understand that the withdrawal will be phased with the speedy arrival of the international United Nations force. We hope this phased operation, as contemplated by the resolution, will begin as soon as possible—and the sooner the better." We therefore continue to believe that the withdrawal of French, British, and Israeli forces should proceed promptly along with the phased arrival of the United Nations Emergency Force.

The United States is convinced that any progress toward the settlement of more basic issues which interest us so much—and concerning which we have sponsored two resolutions which are pending—depends on full and quick compliance with the General Assembly's recommendations. We want to press on with the consideration of ways and means to expedite these settlements. That is yet another reason why every effort must be made to move ahead.

The situation is still precarious. If any government acts in a way which is contrary to United Nations policy, the situation will get worse. The whole matter is a collective responsibility of the General Assembly. No single government can dictate terms for its solution. But if we maintain our momentum, comply faithfully with the pertinent General Assembly resolutions, and give the fullest support to the Secretary-General, conditions of peace and security can come into existence. Let us go at the job with optimism and faith and not insist that every "i" be dotted and every "t" be crossed before we move.

We think the following progress has been made:

First, a cease-fire is in existence.

Second, the United Nations has agreed upon the creation of a United Nations Emergency Force to secure and supervise the cease-fire. This force is physically present in the area and is growing from day to day.

Third, the Government of Egypt has requested the assistance of the United Nations in clearing the Suez Canal.

Fourth, Israeli forces are reported to be pulling back from the canal area, and some are now reported to have been withdrawn from Egyptian territory. There has as yet been no announcement of a complete withdrawal behind the armistice lines.

Fifth, France has announced the beginnings of withdrawal of their forces.

Sixth, the United Kingdom has announced plans for withdrawal of one battalion of their forces. We welcome this announcement. We also especially appreciate all that the distinguished Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. [Selwyn] Lloyd, said here yesterday concerning his Government's desire to cooperate with the United Nations. Such cooperation, we are sure, will contribute in important measure to a solution of these grave problems.

For the above reasons we shall vote for the 6-power resolution of which we are a cosponsor, document A/3386. Although we do not think it is necessary, the resolution contained in document A/3385 expresses sentiments which are in every respect consistent with our policy, and we shall therefore vote for it too.

REPORTS BY U.N. SECRETARY-GENERAL

Basic Points for Presence and Functioning in Egypt of U.N. Emergency Force

U.N. doc. A/3375 dated November 20

After the adoption, 7 November 1956, by the General Assembly of the resolution concerning the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force, the Government of Egypt was immediately approached by the Secretary-General through the Commander of the Force, Major General E. L. M. Burns, in order to prepare the ground for a prompt implementation of the resolution.

The Government of Egypt had, prior to the final decision of the General Assembly, accepted the Force in principle by formally accepting the preceding resolution on the establishment of a United Nations Command. Before consenting to the arrival of the Force, the Government of Egypt wished to have certain points in the resolutions of the General Assembly clarified. An exchange of views took place between the Secretary-General and the Government of Egypt in which the Secretary-General, in reply to questions addressed to him by the Government of Egypt, gave his interpretations of the relevant General Assembly resolutions, in respect to the character and functions of the Force. At the end of the exchange, he gave to the Advisory Committee a full account of the interpretations given. Approving these interpretations, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Secretary-General should proceed to start the transfer of the United Nations Emergency Force.

On the basis of the resolutions, as interpreted by the Secretary-General, the Government of Egypt consented to the arrival of the United Nations Force in Egypt. The first transport of troops took place on 15 November 1956.
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While the Secretary-General found that the exchange of views which had taken place was sufficient as a basis for the sending of the first units, he felt, on the other hand, that a firmer foundation had to be laid for the presence and functioning of the Force in Egypt and for the continued co-operation with the Egyptian authorities. For that reason, and also because he considered it essential personally to discuss with the Egyptian Authorities certain questions which flowed from the decision to send the Force, after visiting the staging area of the Force in Naples, he went to Cairo, where he stayed from 16 until 18 November. On his way to Cairo he stopped briefly at the first staging area in Egypt, at Abu Soueir.

In Cairo he discussed with the President and the Foreign Minister of Egypt basic points for the presence and functioning of the UNEF in Egypt. Time obviously did not permit a detailed study of the various legal, technical and administrative arrangements which would have to be made and the exchange of views was therefore related only to questions of principle.

The Secretary-General wishes to inform the General Assembly of the main results of these discussions. They are summarized in an "Aide-mémoire on the basis for presence and functioning of UNEF in Egypt", submitted as an annex to this report.

The text of this Aide mémoire, if noted with approval by the General Assembly, with the concurrence of Egypt, would establish an understanding between the United Nations and Egypt, on which the co-operation could be developed and necessary agreements on various details be elaborated. The text, as it stands, is presented on the responsibility of the Secretary-General. It has the approval of the Government of Egypt.

The Secretary-General, in this context, submits below a few indications as to the numerical development of the Force.

As of 20 November 1956 a total number of 696 were at the staging area in Egypt at Abu Soueir. At the same time a total number of 282 were at the staging area in Italy at Naples. According to the present planning a total number of 2,241 will be transferred to Egypt in the immediate future. A further number of 1,260 are to be transferred to Naples or directly to Egypt at times still to be determined.

The extensive practical arrangements, necessary for a successful development of the Force and its activities, are making progress. A report on the situation in this and other technically relevant respects will be presented to the General Assembly as soon as the initial stage is passed.

The initial activities of the Force are determined by the fact that, as yet, no withdrawals have taken place in compliance with the Resolutions of the General Assembly 2 and 7 November 1956. In pursuance of these two Resolutions I shall report to the General Assembly on this matter as soon as I receive clarifications from the Governments concerned. I am sure that the General Assembly, in view of the great urgency, will wish to give their immediate attention to the matter raised in this report so as, by consolidating the basis for the presence and functioning of the Force in Egypt, to contribute to speedy progress towards the ends it has set for the United Nations activities in the area.

ANNEX

Aide Mémoire on the Basis for Presence and Functioning of UNEF in Egypt

Noting that by cablegram of 5 November 1956 addressed to the Secretary-General the Government of Egypt, in exercise of its sovereign rights, accepted General Assembly resolution 394 of the same date establishing "a United Nations Command for an emergency international force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with all the terms of the Resolution of the General Assembly of 2 November 1956";

Noting that the General Assembly in its Resolution 395 of 7 November 1956 approved the principle that it could not request the Force "to be stationed or operate on the territory of a given country without the consent of the Government of that country" (paragraph 9 of the Secretary-General's report of 6 November 1956, A/2302):

Having agreed on the arrival in Egypt of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF);

Noting that advance groups of UNEF have already been received in Egypt,

The Government of Egypt and the Secretary-General of the United Nations have stated their understanding on the basic points for the presence and functioning of UNEF as follows:

1. The Government of Egypt declares that, when exercising its sovereign rights on any matter concerning the presence and functioning of UNEF, it will be guided, in good faith, by its acceptance of the General Assembly Resolution 394 of 5 November 1956.

2. The United Nations takes note of this declaration of the Government of Egypt and declares that the activities of UNEF will be guided, in good faith, by the task established for the Force in the aforementioned Resolutions; in particular, the United Nations, understanding this to correspond to the wishes of the Government of Egypt, reaffirms its willingness to maintain the UNEF until its task is completed.

Arrangements for Clearing Suez Canal

U.N. doc. A/2376 dated November 20

In the course of the recent hostilities in Egypt great damage was done to the Suez Canal. The Canal is now out of function, and considerable efforts of a most urgent character are needed to clear it from obstructions.

In its resolution of 2 November 1956, the General Assembly urged that steps be taken to re-open the Suez Canal. Immediately upon the adoption of the resolution the Secretary-General proceeded to explore the technical possibilities of engaging the services of private firms for assistance in the clearing operation. For that purpose the Secretary-General addressed himself to the Governments of Denmark and of the Netherlands. On the basis of replies received, contacts were made with a number of private firms.

* For text, see ibid.
During the visit of the Secretary-General to Cairo, 16–18 November 1956, he had an opportunity to discuss the matter directly with the Government of Egypt. In view of the urgency of clearing the obstructions of the Suez Canal, and the scope of the task, the Government of Egypt addressed to him a request for assistance from the United Nations in arrangements for this purpose, as a matter of high priority. The Government of Egypt considered that the work should be started immediately upon withdrawal of non-Egyptian forces from Port Said and the Canal Area. The Secretary-General considers it possible to pursue negotiations and, in agreement with the Government of Egypt, to arrange for the necessary survey of the conditions in the Canal without delay.

TEXTS OF RESOLUTIONS

Reiteration of Call for Withdrawal of Forces

U.N. doc. A/Res/410

The General Assembly,

Having received the report of the Secretary-General on compliance with General Assembly resolutions 997 (ES-I) and 1002 (ES-I) of 2 and 7 November 1956, recalling that its resolution 1002 (ES-I) called upon Israel immediately to withdraw its forces behind the demarcation lines established by the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel of 24 February 1949,

Recalling further that the above-mentioned resolution was adopted by the United Nations on 14 November 1956, in conformity with previous resolutions,

1. Notes with regret that, according to the communications received by the Secretary-General, two-thirds of the French forces remain, all the United Kingdom forces remain although it has been announced that arrangements are being made for the withdrawal of one battalion, and no Israeli forces have been withdrawn behind the armistice lines although a considerable time has elapsed since the adoption of the relevant General Assembly resolution;

2. Reiterates its call to France, Israel and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to comply forthwith with resolutions 997 (ES-I) and 1002 (ES-I);

3. Requests the Secretary-General urgently to communicate the present resolution to the parties concerned, and to report without delay to the General Assembly on the implementation thereof.

Approval of Basis for Presence of Emergency Force in Egypt and Authorization To Proceed With Clearing of Canal

U.N. doc. A/Res/411

The General Assembly,

Having received the report of the Secretary-General on basic points for the presence and functioning in Egypt of the United Nations Emergency Force,

6 Adopted by the General Assembly on Nov. 24 by a vote of 63 to 5 (Australia, France, Israel, New Zealand, U.K.), with 10 abstentions. The resolution originally introduced (U.N. doc. A/3385) was proposed by 21 Asian-African nations, including Egypt; however, Egypt was not among the sponsors of the revised draft (U.N. doc. A/3385–Rev. 1).

7 U.N. docs. A/3384 and Add. 1 and 2.

8 Proposed by Canada, Colombia, India, Norway, the United States, and Yugoslavia (U.N. doc. A/3386); adopted on Nov. 24 (by a show of hands) 65 to 0, with 9 abstentions.
Having received also the report of the Secretary-General on arrangements for clearing the Suez Canal,

1. Notes with approval the contents of the aide-mémoire on the basis for the presence and functioning of the United Nations Emergency Force in Egypt, as annexed to the report of the Secretary-General;

2. Notes with approval the progress so far made by the Secretary-General in connexion with arrangements for clearing the Suez Canal, as set forth in his report;

3. Authorizes the Secretary-General to proceed with the exploration of practical arrangements and the negotiation of agreements so that the clearing operations may be speedily and effectively undertaken.

Financing the U.N. Emergency Force

U.N. doc. A/Res/412

The General Assembly,

Having decided, in resolutions 1000 (ES-I) and 1001 (ES-I) of 5 and 7 November 1956, to establish an emergency international United Nations Force (hereafter to be known as the United Nations Emergency Force) under a Chief of Command (hereafter to be known as the Commander),

Having considered and provisionally approved the recommendations made by the Secretary-General concerning the financing of the Force in paragraph 15 of his report of 6 November 1956,\footnote{Adopted by the General Assembly on Nov. 26 by a vote of 52 to 9 (Soviet bloc), with 13 abstentions. The draft resolution was submitted as an annex to the Secretary-General’s report on administrative and financial arrangements.}

1. Authorizes the Secretary-General to establish a United Nations Emergency Force Special Account to which funds received by the United Nations, outside the regular budget, for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the Force shall be credited, and from which payments for this purpose shall be made;

2. Decides that the Special Account shall be established in an initial amount of $10 million;

3. Authorizes the Secretary-General, pending the receipt of funds for the Special Account, to advance from the Working Capital Fund such sums as the Special Account may require to meet any expenses chargeable to it;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to establish such rules and procedures for the Special Account and make such administrative arrangements as he may consider necessary to ensure effective financial administration and control of that Account;

5. Requests the Administrative and Budgetary Committee of the General Assembly and, as appropriate, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, to consider and, as soon as possible, to report

on further arrangements that need to be adopted regarding the costs of maintaining the Force.

U.S. Support for Baghdad Pact

Press release 694 dated November 29

The President of Pakistan, the Prime Ministers of Iraq, Turkey, and Pakistan, and the Foreign Minister of Iran in their recent meeting at Baghdad have reaffirmed their determination to further a peaceful and lasting settlement of current Middle Eastern problems.

In recent days we have indeed seen grave threats to the peace and security of the world. The action of the United Nations has brought the fighting in the Near East to an end, and the world community has a new opportunity to work in accordance with the United Nations Charter to resolve serious underlying problems and to assist the nations in the area to maintain their integrity and independence.

Recent events have provided an opportunity for a new demonstration of the valuable contribution to peace and security which can be made by nations which have organized for regional cooperation under the United Nations Charter. In their dedicated efforts to maintain peace, representatives of Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, and Turkey have within past weeks met, first in Tehran and then in Baghdad, in order to bring to bear both their influence and wisdom in the interest of the nations of the free world. Throughout the period of the crisis, these countries clearly revealed their faith in the charter and their determination that the peace, not only of the area in which they find themselves but of the whole world, must be preserved.

The United States has, from the inception of the Baghdad Pact, supported the pact and the principles and objectives of collective security on which it is based. Through its own bilateral arrangements with pact members in the Middle East area and its active membership in certain of the pact’s committees, the United States has revealed its readiness to assist in measures to strengthen the security of those nations.

The United States reaffirms its support for the collective efforts of these nations to maintain their independence. A threat to the territorial integrity or political independence of the members would be viewed by the United States with the utmost gravity.
Controlling the International Traffic in Arms and Technical Data

by Leonard H. Pomeroy

Control over the international traffic in arms, which for many years has been a responsibility of the Department of State, is exercised by that Department with the objective of furthering both world peace and national security. Trading in arms and munitions is quite different from dealing with the commodities that figure in ordinary world trade such as cotton, wheat, automobiles, and the like. The arms traffic involves items designed primarily to kill or incapacitate. Thus, the need to exercise close supervision over the international movement of arms becomes readily apparent.

During the First World War there was a tremendous increase in munitions output, and vast surplus stocks remained at the war's end. These surplus stocks seemed very attractive to ambitious political groups and would-be dictators.

The increasing need to control the movement of these surpluses, so as to prevent armed conflict from breaking out in various parts of the world, finally became evident. A considerable part of these surpluses was of U.S. origin and, naturally, we were anxious to cooperate with other nations in achieving some sort of watertight supervision.

In our effort to work together with other friendly countries, the United States participated in the negotiation of both the St. Germain convention of 1919 and the Geneva convention of 1925. These conventions succeeded in strengthening controls over arms traffic, but there still remained room for improvement.

Soon after World War I munitions makers began to be accused of stimulating international arms races. Partly because of fear that the munitions makers might actually be engaged in such activity, the Senate in the early thirties appointed a special investigating committee to go into the whole arms question. As a result of these investigations a more definite arms policy was adopted by our country. This took the form of tightening controls through the licensing of arms traffic crossing our borders.

With new records in munitions production established during and after World War II and with newly developed techniques of warfare, the need to regulate arms traffic as a matter of policy became even more vital to our national security. The importance of such regulation was heightened by the fact that, following both world wars, the aggressor nations made disarmament by the Allies ineffective and unsafe. In the 1920’s and 1930’s it was the German Wehrmacht and Japan. In the 1940’s and 1950’s the Communists have seen fit to keep us all in a state of nervousness and fear.

The outbreak of a third world war has been prevented up to now through the rearming of our friends who make up Nato, Anzus, and Seato,

---

2 Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War, signed June 17, 1925; for text, see ibid., 1925, vol. I, p. 61.

---

Mr. Pomeroy is Special Assistant to the Director of the Office of Munitions Control. His article is based on an address which he made before the American Chemical Society at Atlantic City, N. J., on September 18.
those combinations of non-Communist countries in the North Atlantic and Pacific for mutual defense against aggression. Of course, another deterrent has been our programs of foreign military and economic aid. But the need for regulation of arms traffic remains.

**Control of Technical Data**

The Department of State not only regulates the export of arms and munitions under a licensing system but also controls exports of technical data or information relating to arms, ammunition, and implements of war. This type of control is a very important one.

Years of experimentation and development lie behind modern weapons and modern war materials. By the time a new weapon is put into use, it is obsolete on the drawing board. Thus, the possession of plans, specifications, and performance data is often more important from a military standpoint than the finished article itself.

In the immediate postwar period, when no export control over military information of this kind was attempted, the Soviets bought up in this country and sent home to Russia shiploads of technical literature of all kinds. Thus, they were able to obtain with little effort information on production and processing techniques which they otherwise would have had to spend years in developing.

In instituting export controls over technical data, the United States did not reverse its policy of encouraging the free exchange of technical information of all kinds. We still encourage the free use by private and industrial scientists of developments in our university and industrial laboratories; we negotiate with foreign governments to provide protection abroad for American inventors and to arrange for reciprocal rights. But when it comes to sending abroad information on new developments and processes relating to munitions of war, we now insist upon a prior examination.

In other words, we want to have a say in the matter. This is accomplished through the export licensing system.

Under Executive order of the President, licensing jurisdiction has been given to the Secretary of State. Whenever technical data relating to articles on the United States Munitions List—which includes military chemicals, gases, and explosives—are to be exported, a license must be obtained from the Department’s Office of Munitions Control. No fee is charged for this review, which actually protects the exporter because it assures him that the export has the approval of the United States Government.

Industrial research has come to be recognized as one of the motivating forces behind our Nation’s progress, and the chemical industry in this country plays a most important part in forming the basis of our national strength and security.

**Role of Chemical Industry**

All armaments are, in a sense, chemical in that they are fashioned from materials which are themselves the product of chemical processes. Also, all the important factors involved in chemical armament—that is, raw materials, manufacturing facilities, and technical personnel—are essentially the same as in any form of armament. For instance, it was pointed out by Augustin M. Prentiss in his book *Chemicals in War* that the relationship between certain chemical compounds and certain war gases is so close that the only difference is the last step. Hence, every industrial chemical plant can be readily converted for war manufacturing if that ever becomes necessary.

To assure that our military services are kept abreast of developments in the chemical laboratories of America, it is important that our Government be given the first opportunity to ascertain whether newly developed processes in specific cases have implications for our national defense and security.

Many American firms have contacts with overseas companies and scientists who are engaged in scientific research and development projects. These contacts often result in an interchange of technical information with foreign nationals—information which may be of military significance.

When is such information of military significance? The State Department’s Office of Munitions Control is responsible under law to advise in this matter and to ascertain whether the military and foreign-policy interests of the United States would be adversely affected if specific munitions articles and military technical information were sent abroad or made available to foreign nationals.

In the interest of limiting Government action to those cases which have implications for our national security, specific exemptions are provided.
for the exportation of certain published materials and of materials which already have been reviewed by this Government. Sales literature pertaining to articles already exported under license from the Department of State also is exempted, as is any published literature which is sent to a non-Communist country.

Manufacturers who enter into licensing agreements with foreign firms for the production of their products overseas are requested to clear the agreements in advance with the Department of State. By so doing they are exempted from the specific export licensing requirements with respect to technical data which the foreign manufacturer needs in order to manufacture the product.

Because the Government appreciates the special problems faced by industry, it tries to avoid unnecessary redtapest. On the other hand, the Government needs the cooperation of industry in giving our military services the full benefit of America's scientific genius and in preventing new developments in American chemical laboratories and factories from bolstering the military capabilities of our potential enemies.

In the fields of chemicals, explosives, and gases a close interrelationship is apparent between many commercial products and those which are essentially military in nature. This close interrelationship becomes of special importance with respect to new developments and technical data pertaining to such developments.

The U.S. Munitions List and State Department export controls are intended, however, to cover only those articles which are important to our national-security interests. But when those interests are at stake, controls become essential, both in the interest of our country's safety and in the interest of fair and uniform treatment of all concerned. These controls have become increasingly vital in the post-World War II period.

During the early postwar period, when the Allies disarmed, the Soviets responded by increasing their military strength and capacity. Their policy is unmistakably clear to all thinking peoples of the free world. The threat of Soviet aggression, subversion, and espionage has brought the nations of the free world together in order to protect themselves. These free nations now know that they must take steps to protect their military secrets and their latest military developments and discoveries in the military technical fields.

As part of this effort, the United States has recently clamped down on indiscriminate shipment abroad of military information of all kinds. We have set up a requirement that all unpublished technical information on munitions of war be reviewed from the point of view of our own security and that of our allies. In the process we are trying hard and, I believe, with considerable success to avoid doing anything that might hamstring individual effort and initiative.

ANNEX

Following is a list of chemical agents included in the U.S. Munitions List.

I. CHEMICAL TOXICOLOGICAL AGENTS AND GASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Compound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyanogen chloride</td>
<td>CNCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen cyanide</td>
<td>HCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphosgene</td>
<td>ClO₂C₂Cl₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorine</td>
<td>F₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisite gas</td>
<td>Cl₂(CH₂CH₂Cl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard gas</td>
<td>(dichlorodiethyl (ClCH₂CH₂)₂S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylcarbarylamine chloro</td>
<td>Cl₂HNC₂Cl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosgene</td>
<td>COCl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamant (diphenylaminochloroarsine)</td>
<td>(Cl₂H₂)₂H₂N₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibromodimethyl ether</td>
<td>Br₂C₂H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichlorodimethyl ether</td>
<td>Cl₂C₂H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphenylchloroarsine</td>
<td>(Cl₂H₂)₂A₂Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphenylicyanarsine</td>
<td>(Cl₂H₂)₂A₂CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylidibromoarsine</td>
<td>Cl₂H₂A₂Br₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethyldichloroarsine</td>
<td>Cl₂H₂A₂Cl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyldichloroarsine</td>
<td>Cl₂H₂Br₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenyldibromoarsine</td>
<td>Cl₂H₂A₂Cl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenyldichloroarsine</td>
<td>Cl₂H₂A₂Cl₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyanodimethylaminophosphine oxide</td>
<td>(CH₂)₂N₂F₂CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoroisopropylmethylphosphate oxide</td>
<td>(CH₂)₂H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoromethylphosphine oxide</td>
<td>(CH₂)₂H₂F₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloroacetophenone</td>
<td>Cl₂H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helium gas</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chemical toxicological agents designated on the United States Munitions List, most of them under category VII, include a number of specific chemical compounds and gases which had been developed and were extensively used in industry before World War I and then were adapted to military use during that war.

Cyanogen chloride, hydrogen cyanide, and phenylcarbarylamine chloride are systemic toxic agents or gases which pass from the lungs into the blood stream and then act primarily on the nerve centers, causing death by paralysis of the central nervous system.

Lung injurant compounds causing death by asphyxiation, such as diphosgene, phosgene, dibromodimethyl ether, and dichlorodimethyl ether, also were used exten-
sively during World War I and were derived from chemical compounds fairly well-known prior to that time.

Vesicant gases, such as mustard and Lewisite gas, in addition to being toxic, readily penetrate clothing and cause bodily burns. Ethyl dibromoarsine, ethyl dichloroarsine, methyl dichloroarsine, phenyl dibromoarsine, and phenyl dichloroarsine are all vesicant gases. The three oxide gases following are nerve gases, causing paralysis of the central nervous system.

Chloroxenophenone or tear gas (category XI (h)) can be used both in warfare and to quell civil disturbances. Helium gas (category XI (l)) is valuable in metallurgy and in atomic research, as well as for inflating lighter-than-air aircraft.

II. PROPELLANTS

Propellants and the following ingredients:
- Hydrazine
- Unsymmetrical dimethylhydrazine
- Hydrogen peroxide over 85% concentration
- Nitroguanadine or picrite
- Nitrocellulose with nitrogen content of over 12.20%

Solid propellants:
1. Single base—nitrocellulose
2. Double base—nitrocellulose, nitroglycerin
3. Triple base—nitrocellulose, nitroglycerin, nitroguanadine
4. Composite—nitroglycerin, ammonium perchlorate, nitrocellulose, plastics, or rubbers

Liquid propellants:
1. Mono-propellants—hydrazine, nitrate, and water
2. Bi-propellants—hydrazine-fuming nitric acid (HNO₃)

Propellants, which are included in category VIII of the Munitions List, may be either solid or liquid, and the following ingredients are considered militarily important: hydrazine, unsymmetrical dimethylhydrazine, hydrogen peroxide over 85% concentration, nitroguanadine or picrite, nitrocellulose with nitrogen content of over 12.20%.

Solid propellants are of four types: single base—used largely in small arms ammuniition; double base (nitrocellulose, nitroglycerin)—used primarily for rockets and guns; triple base (made up of nitrocellulose, nitroglycerin, and nitroguanadine)—used primarily for artillery ammunition; and composite base, commonly used in rockets—nitroglycerin, ammonium perchlorate, nitrocellulose, plastics or rubbers, are components.

Liquid propellants are of two types: mono-propellants, usually made up of a mixture of fuel and oxidizer, and bi-propellants, which are hypergolic, i. e. fuel and oxidizers are added separately and ignite on contact.

Propellants are important elements in any shell or projectile, whether it be primarily a chemical or explosive shell or projectile.

III. MILITARY HIGH EXPLOSIVES

Ammonium picrate
Trinitrotoholene
Pentamethytritol tetranitrate (penthrite, pentrite or PETN)
Trismethylene trinitramine (RDX, cyclonite, hexogen or T4)
Tetryl
Black soda powder
Potassium nitrate powder
Hexahydroxiphenylamine
Trinitroanisol
Trinitronaphthalene
Dinitronaphthalene
Tetranitronaphthalene
Trinitroxyline

Military high explosives are listed in the United States Munitions List under category VIII. The first four items are commonly used as high-explosive fillers in shells. Tetryl is commonly used as a booster charge. The next eight items are important military ingredients in high explosive compounds.

IV. MILITARY PYROTECHNICS

Military pyrotechnics, which are included in the Munitions List under category XI (f), have a great variety of important military uses, including battlefield illumination, target identification, signals, smoke candles, tracers, and illuminating shells. They are constantly being improved, and the military pyrotechnics of today are far superior to those of World War II.

Agreement on Grand Turk Ocean Research Station

Press release 595 dated November 27

An agreement was signed at Washington on November 27 between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom, in consultation with the Government of the Turks and Caicos Islands, providing for the establishment of Grand Turk of a joint U.S. Navy and Royal Navy Oceanographic Research Station.

Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy signed for the U.S. Government, and Sir Harold Caccia, the British Ambassador, for the British Government.

During the Second World War the Allied navies often found themselves at a severe disadvantage in dealing with enemy submarines because of lack of information about water conditions in the Atlantic and Caribbean. As a result, since the war the Royal Navy and the U.S. Navy have had a continuing program of oceanographic research designed to provide detailed information about currents, temperatures, salinity, and other similar factors.

This program involves ships working in various ocean areas throughout the year. However, because of the rapid advances which today are taking place in the field of electronics, it may be possible to obtain at least part of the required information more effectively and expeditiously from shore stations. Research stations have been set up in an effort to explore this possibility.

For reasons of logistic and administrative convenience, it has been agreed that the stations should be manned and supported by the U.S. Navy.
The Atom Is Still With Us

by James J. Wadsworth
Deputy U. S. Representative to the United Nations

When I accepted the invitation to address you today, my task seemed clear and simple. It was then in late September. The International Conference on the Statute of the Atomic Energy Agency had just opened and was making headlines because of the conspicuous degree of agreement that was evident. The groundwork had been carefully laid through months of intensive negotiations; compromises had been reached; conflicting points of view reconciled on all major questions.

The Indians were not entirely happy. The Swiss had some amendments they wanted to introduce; so did the Philippines, Mexico, and a few others. But the big powers in atomic energy were in basic agreement. And, of course, the countries which have not yet developed an atomic energy industry were eager to have international aid and guidance. The view was widely shared that a new international atomic energy agency would be of great benefit to the world.

This view was to grow in the weeks ahead and to come to a climactic conclusion when 81 nations voted their approval of the statute for the new agency. The prospects of international collaboration for peace never seemed brighter. A spirit of harmony and good will permeated the meeting, and the statute was signed by representatives of 70 nations with high praise and with high hope.  

A week later, Hungarians were fighting in the streets of Budapest for their freedom. Soviet troops moved in to restore order. The great betrayal followed. After promising to withdraw, Soviet tanks moved into that beautiful city, ruthlessly and cruelly stamping out resistance wherever the Hungarian freedom fighters had gained the upper hand.

By the end of that fatal week, the Soviet Union was in flagrant violation of United Nations pledges and resolutions. It had refused to grant to the Hungarian people the basic human rights and freedoms so eloquently proclaimed by the charter of the United Nations. When the Security Council recommended an immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces, the Soviet Union vetoed the resolution.  

The Soviet Union refused—and continues to refuse—to allow its puppet regime in Hungary to receive impartial United Nations observers. When ordered to end the inhuman deportations, the Soviet Union not only failed to comply but abducted the former head of the Hungarian Government. In all these ways the Soviet Union has defied the United Nations and has become a sinister threat to the peace.

At almost the same moment that the Soviet Union was shattering the peace in Hungary, Britain, France, and Israel were also resorting to force, attempting to settle their differences by bullets instead of by words. Provocations they had, but this does not obscure the fact that the United Nations Charter pledges all members to “settle their international disputes by peaceful means” and “in

1 Address made at Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford, N. J., on Nov. 28 (U.S./U.N. press release 2531).
2 For text of the statute, see Bulletin of Nov. 19, 1956, p. 820.
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such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

These breaches of peace have presented us all with so many urgent, immediate problems that not much attention has been given in recent weeks to the International Atomic Energy Agency. Staff officers, for example, who were assigned to work out the details of the new agency's financial, personnel, and legal structure have been drafted to work out the logistics of the United Nations Emergency Force for the Middle East. My own sole concern of late has been to do everything possible within the framework of the United Nations to help the people of Hungary and to restore some order in the volcanic Middle East.

For these reasons, my task is very much more difficult today than I had expected. But the atom is still with us. As solutions are approached and tested on the critical issues before us, our thoughts will inevitably revert back to the long-range peace-building function of atomic energy. A large number of countries have already mentioned the need to push forward with plans for the Atomic Energy Agency. Countries as different as Czechoslovakia and Denmark have made this point, to me personally, as have Brazil and Switzerland. In a recent major address at the United Nations, our own Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., referred to both the atoms-for-peace agency and to disarmament as matters which should be discussed at this session of the General Assembly.4

**Long-Range Goals**

We used to say in the days of World War II: In time of war we must prepare for the peace to come. So today I think we should remember that in time of tension and crisis we should continue to give thought to the long-range goals of peace. That is why I am glad to hear that you here at Fairleigh Dickinson College are devoting serious study to the problem of disarmament. And that is why I commend to you a thorough study of the statute of the new Atomic Energy Agency. It has many important implications for everyone who is studying the practical aspects of the control of armaments.

At the bottom of our thinking in the days when we were working out the statute for the agency, we had several fundamental truths in mind—and they are as valid today as they ever were.

First, by practical cooperation an atmosphere of confidence among nations is created. This in turn can lead to a relaxing of tensions and a decreased need for armaments. Our vision is of cooperation in atomic energy as a bridge and an avenue to peace.

Secondly, we must recognize that no nation has a monopoly of atomic knowledge; it is bound to spread widely throughout the world. And every atomic power plant is a potential weapons-material producing plant. It is better, therefore, to assist in the development of peaceful atomic industries, with proper safeguards, rather than let atomic energy develop in a haphazard way, leading to mutual suspicion and the building of military stockpiles in many nations.

Thirdly, by testing international controls over the use of fissionable materials supplied for peaceful purposes, we will be experimenting with techniques of international inspection and control. These experiments may turn out to be the first step toward international armaments inspection and control.

And finally, if we can increase the power resources that are available to nations which are confronted with power shortages, we can decrease the economic forces which have contributed to wars in the past.

With these long-range goals in mind, let me go over with you some of the important provisions of the new Atomic Energy Agency's statute.

First of all: What will the agency do? The answer to this question can be found in the stated objective "to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world."" Specifics, the agency will have authority to do the following things:

- It will encourage and assist research on and development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.
- It will make available atomic materials.
- It will foster the exchange of information and training of scientists and experts.
- It will establish and apply health and safety standards.
- It will establish and administer safeguards to insure that the materials or assistance given by the agency are not used to further any military purpose.

And it has authority to acquire and establish plants and facilities for carrying on its work.

This is a very brief summary, but even so it is evident that the agency will have broad scope and authority. It will be able to do almost anything found useful by its members in the peaceful application of atomic energy. The actual extent of its work will depend on the decisions made by its members, through the Board of Governors and through the General Conference. These decisions in turn will depend on the costs the members are willing to bear and the materials and facilities made available to the agency by its members.

Membership will be open to all members of the United Nations or any of the specialized agencies—a sum total of over 87 potential members. Each member will have one vote, according to the principle of equality. We believe this principle of equality is useful since it underscores the vital interest every nation has in atomic development and the responsibility every member has to see that atomic energy is put to work for the good of mankind.

The Board of Governors of the agency has an admittedly complex structure. While each country has one vote, some countries are virtually permanent members and naturally the atomically advanced nations have a predominant influence on the Board. Members most advanced in the technology of atomic energy will be named each year by the outgoing Board from eight specified geographic regions. In this group must be the five nations everyone would recognize as the world’s leaders in atomic technology. Two members who are large producers of nuclear source materials must also be named from a group of four specified countries; also, one member noted as a supplier of technical assistance. The General Conference is then to elect 10 members, with due regard to geographical distribution.

Needless to say, it took many long discussions to arrive at this formula for the Board of Directors. It represents a political solution aimed at maintaining the principle of equality, yet recognizing the fact that some nations are far ahead of others in atomic development.

Safeguards and Controls

Besides the constitution of the Board of Governors, the other most difficult section of the statute was the section dealing with the safeguards that should be applied in order to insure that agency assistance and materials are not used for military purposes. This is the famous article XII.5

Nobody wanted an absence of all controls; but some countries, the nonatomic nations, represented most eloquently by India, at first argued that the controls were too onerous or too rigid. In the course of the debate many misconceptions were clarified, and I think the article as it finally emerged was a better definition of what we all had in mind than the one in the original draft. It spelled out more precisely the degree of control needed at various stages of atomic processing, recognizing that the inspection of the movement of raw material need not be as precise as the inspection of chemical processing plants. It also made more precise the disposition of fissionable materials bred in reactors fueled by agency materials or constructed with agency assistance. The statute requires the deposit with the agency of all such fissionable materials in excess of what is immediately needed. Materials so deposited will be returned to the countries where they were bred for further peaceful uses whenever there is a need for them.

A staff of inspectors is authorized to implement the safeguards provided for in the statute—and noncompliance will be met immediately by a whole series of sanctions having to do with agency assistance.

This, then, is the statute as it came out of the crucible of the many discussions before and during the conference on the statute.

Just when the next steps will be taken to complete plans for the practical operation of the new agency, I do not know. But I see no reason why the original timetable should not be met. The work that needs to be done right now is largely administrative and budgetary. The Preparatory Commission can work out these details, as was originally planned, between now and next summer.6 Just as the international weather turned from fair to stormy in the space of a week, the storms can subside and the sun can shine again in a similarly quick transition.

I personally believe that the United Nations will surmount its present difficulties. Today it is

5 For remarks by Ambassador Wadsworth on Nov. 15 on the draft of article XII, see ibid., Nov. 19, 1956, p. 815.
6 For announcement of Ambassador Wadsworth’s appointment as U.S. representative on the Preparatory Commission, see ibid.
demonstrating its vitality and its utility. So far, it has prevented world war III. This is its overriding objective. If it did nothing more than that, it would be worthy of our gratitude and generous support.

The world's history is made up of mankind's continuous struggle to reconcile man's individualism with his social needs. To this end governments have been constituted. Even the best-run governments must tolerate, at times, strikes among competing groups; weaker governments not infrequently have riots and sometimes civil wars.

The United Nations is no government at all; so it can hardly be blamed if it cannot keep all of its members law-abiding all of the time.

The need of mankind in our atomic century is for cooperation and moral responsibility. It is my conviction that the unifying forces are greater than the divisive forces. We must work with this hope and in this faith. The atom is still with us; it is the most important factor that will influence the future of all of us here today. If we are not to be destroyed by its misuse, we must go forward in our exploration of its potential for good.

Accelerating the Development of Nuclear Power Abroad

Following is a series of announcements released by the White House on November 17 regarding the program for making uranium fuel available for power and research reactors abroad. Included are a statement by President Eisenhower; a statement by Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; a summary of background facts; and a summary of terms and conditions governing international transactions in special nuclear materials.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

This Nation attaches highest importance to the development of nuclear power both at home and abroad. We are determined that this product of man's inventiveness shall be made available to serve the people of the world.

We have taken many actions to this end. We have initiated and actively supported the formation of an International Atomic Energy Agency, we have negotiated bilateral agreements for cooperation with 37 countries, and we have expressed our support for European efforts to form an integrated atomic energy community. On February 22, 1956, I announced that I approved the recommendations of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to make available 20,000 kilograms of uranium 235 for distribution abroad.2

Today I have approved further important actions by the United States Atomic Energy Commission. These actions will set the terms and conditions on which nuclear fuel will be available under agreements for cooperation. These and other actions are designed to enable other nations or groups of nations to have firm assurance of the fuel supplies necessary to the continued operation of nuclear power installations, and thus to facilitate arrangements for financing.

Under these new actions, the United States will make available to other nations supplies of nuclear fuel at prices identical with those charged by the Atomic Energy Commission under our domestic nuclear power program. One of the steps I have approved is an offer to purchase at specified prices plutonium and uranium 233 produced in reactors abroad that are fueled with material furnished under our agreements for cooperation. The materials so acquired by the United States will be used solely for peaceful purposes.

Today's actions, summarized in the attached statement by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, will permit closer estimate of net nuclear fuel costs and will add firmness to the planning now under way in friendly nations for

1 For the text of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, see BULLETIN of Nov. 19, 1956, p. 820.
2 Ibid., Mar. 19, 1956, p. 469.
nuclear power, thereby accelerating their atomic power development.

It will be our policy, of course, to seek to conduct our operations in support of nuclear power development abroad in consonance with the policy of the International Atomic Energy Agency, in whose endeavors we shall take our full part.

We shall strive ceaselessly to attain the day when the uses of the energy of the atom fulfill mankind's peaceful purposes.

**STATEMENT BY MR. STRAUSS**

With the approval of the President, the Atomic Energy Commission is taking six additional steps to accelerate the development of nuclear power abroad under the Atoms for Peace program.

These steps include:

a. Establishment of a schedule of charges for uranium 235 furnished by the Commission to other nations or groups of nations for use in power or research reactors under agreements for cooperation. The schedule sets charges for various degrees of enrichment; for example about $16 per gram of uranium 235 at 20 per cent enrichment. The charges are the same as those made by the Commission to domestic users.

b. Adoption of a policy under which assurances can be made to nations with agreements for cooperation that the Commission—within the limits of the amounts of material made available from time to time by the President—is prepared to furnish uranium 235 in specified quantities based on estimated fuel requirements of a given power installation over a fixed period, beyond the present term of 10 years. Such commitments would, of course, be subject to observance of all terms and conditions of the covering agreement for cooperation. In carrying out this policy, it is recognized, the present term of agreements for cooperation would require extension.

c. Establishment of prices to be offered by the Commission for plutonium and uranium 233 produced in reactors abroad which are fueled under agreements for cooperation. These prices are the estimated fuel value of these special nuclear materials when a practicable method of using them for fuel develops from the research now being carried on. For plutonium metal, it is $12 per gram; for uranium 233 nitrate, it is $15 per gram of U-233. Material so acquired by the Commission will be used only for peaceful purposes.

d. Decision by the Commission that it stands ready to purchase during the period ending June 30, 1963, at the above mentioned prices, all plutonium and uranium 233 produced in reactors abroad which are fueled with material obtained from the United States. Under existing authority in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, such purchases will, of course, be made on an annual basis and subject to the availability of appropriations.

e. The Commission expects to recommend at the forthcoming session of the Congress legislation to provide authority to the Commission, with the approval of the President, to establish guaranteed prices for periods not in excess of seven years for plutonium and uranium 233 which is delivered to the Commission and which has been produced in reactors abroad fueled with material supplied by the United States. Such authority will enable the Commission to provide the same assurance to foreign nuclear power programs that the seven year guarantee period for prices under existing law provides to the domestic nuclear power program.

f. Decision to consider exchange of United States uranium 235 for source material (for example uranium ore or concentrates) from nations with agreements for cooperation.

The steps taken today will be of material assistance to the foreign nuclear power program. The information and assurances given are necessary for estimating cost of power, for justifying the capital required and for assuring operation of special nuclear power plants over a period of years.

Attached is a summary of the general terms and conditions for governing international transactions in special nuclear materials under agreements for cooperation together with general background information of the new actions approved today. The announcements made today and the attached terms and conditions apply to agreements for cooperation under the Atoms for Peace Program.

The policies and undertakings to seek new authority which have today been approved by the President should substantially promote the advance of the free world toward abundant nuclear power. The Commission will continue to explore additional means to encourage the development of nuclear power.
There are obstacles to be overcome. Skilled manpower is presently in serious shortage. Large capital resources are required. The best technology remains to be worked out area by area.

But I am confident that steps being taken in the United States and the progress being made by our friends abroad, are speeding the day when electrical energy from the atom will help lighten man's burden of work and lift the standards of living of peoples everywhere.

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND FACTS

1. The enriched uranium which will be supplied as needed under the schedule of charges will be taken from the 20,200 kilograms of uranium 235 made available by President Eisenhower in 1954, 1955 and 1956 for use in fuel for power and research reactors abroad and from such additional amounts as may be made available subsequently. (The 5,000 kilograms for the International Atomic Energy Agency's initial operations plus the amounts matching contributions of other nations also will be drawn from quantities made available by the President.)

2. The new schedule of charges supersedes the charge of $25 per gram of uranium 235 in uranium enriched to 20% announced on August 8, 1955 for the leasing of fuel for research reactors abroad. Under the new schedule, the charge for uranium 235 at 20% enrichment will be equivalent to slightly more than $16 per gram. (The detailed schedule of charges is included in the attached “General Terms and Conditions.”) The same schedule applies to the charges for enriched uranium made available to domestic users.

3. The Commission's newly established prices for plutonium and uranium 233 which it may acquire from foreign reactors operating with fuel obtained from the United States under agreements for cooperation are based on the estimated value of these substances as nuclear fuels.

4. The charge of $40 per kilogram for normal uranium metal, and of $28 per pound for heavy water, as announced at the Geneva Conference on August 8, 1955, remain unchanged. Under the new schedule, the charges for uranium 235 range from an equivalent of $5.62 per gram for 72% enrichment—fuel barely enriched over the normal seven-tenths of one percent found in nature—to $17.97 per gram for 90% enrichment.

5. The conditions of transfer under the new schedule differ from those prevailing under the "Geneva price". While the earlier charge was for uranium as metal, the new schedule of charges is for uranium hexafluoride (UF₆). The cost of conversion to metal or other forms will be borne by the user.

6. Also, the former charge applied to transactions essentially limited in each case to six kilograms of uranium 235 contained in uranium with an enrichment not to exceed 20%. At that time, the quantity made available for use abroad in research reactors was only 200 kilograms of uranium 235.

7. The new schedule of charges applies to transactions of this type as well as to much larger transactions with other nations or groups of nations. Economies will be achieved in preparing and handling large quantities of material. The schedule applies as well to any Commission repurchases of enriched uranium returned to the Commission from abroad and will also be used in calculating charges to be applied to leased fuel for use, consumption, and isotopic depletion or dilution. Appropriate adjustments will be made for processing costs incurred by the Commission in reclaiming the material in the form of UF₆.

8. Commitments thus far made to other nations approximate 1,700 kilograms of uranium 235. The three power reactor agreements recently concluded with Switzerland, the Netherlands and Australia involve supplying approximately 1,500 kilograms of uranium 235 over the next 10 years.

9. Sale or lease transactions with other nations under the new prices will involve for the most part reactor fuel containing 20% uranium 235 or less. However, in five agreements concluded so far, relatively small quantities of 90% fuel are authorized for use in materials testing reactors. This is the highest degree of enrichment quoted in the new schedule.

10. In addition to sale or lease of uranium 235, the Commission is now undertaking, as noted in the announcements, to consider arrangements under which it would supply uranium 235 in exchange for source material such as uranium ore or concentrates. The basis for exchange and the quantities involved on each side would be worked out on a case-by-case basis.

11. The announcements made today and the attached terms and conditions apply to agreements for cooperation under the Atoms for Peace Program. The arrangements under which 5,000 kg. of U-235 will be made available to the IAEA will be agreed with the Agency.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS GOVERNING INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS IN SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS

I. Agreements for Cooperation.

Special nuclear material may be distributed outside the United States only pursuant to an agreement for cooperation.

The term of present agreements for cooperation in power reactor technology and fueling stands at 10 years. However, recognizing that the provision of fuels must be guaranteed for a longer period in order to facilitate financing and operation, the Commission will now consider extending agreements beyond 10 years.

II. Form of Transactions.

In general, special nuclear material distributed abroad under research agreements will be leased and that distributed under power agreements will be sold. The con-
tract of sale or the lease, as the case may be, will contain terms relating to delivery, form of material, quantity and price. The pertinent document will also contain procedures for assaying material and such other provisions as may be appropriate or necessary in a given case.

III. Form of Material.

All quoted prices relate to enriched uranium as uranium hexafluoride (UF₆).

IV. Charges.

The charges for uranium in the form of UF₆, in the various degrees of enrichment, shall be in accordance with a schedule adopted by the Commission for use in transactions both at home and abroad. Although these prices are subject to adjustment, it is the intention of the Commission to maintain them as stable as possible. The schedules are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight Fraction U-235</th>
<th>Official Charge Dollars per kilogram of Uranium</th>
<th>Dollars per Gram of U-235 Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0972</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>117.00</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>131.25</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>145.50</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>235.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>287.00</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>435.00</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>535.00</td>
<td>13.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>616.50</td>
<td>14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>698.25</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>862.50</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>1,028.00</td>
<td>15.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>1,195.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>1,362.00</td>
<td>17.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>1,529.00</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>1,696.00</td>
<td>18.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>1,863.00</td>
<td>18.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1,930.00</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>2,097.00</td>
<td>19.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>2,264.00</td>
<td>20.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>2,431.00</td>
<td>20.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>2,598.00</td>
<td>21.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>2,765.00</td>
<td>21.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>2,932.00</td>
<td>22.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>3,099.00</td>
<td>22.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>3,266.00</td>
<td>23.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>3,433.00</td>
<td>23.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
<td>24.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above schedule will also provide the basis for use charges to be applied to leased fuel, as well as in calculating charges for uranium 235 consumption and isotopic depletion or dilution in leased fuel, and for any AEC repurchases of enriched uranium returned from abroad. Appropriate adjustments will be made for processing costs incurred by the AEC in reclaiming the material in the form of UF₆.

The schedule does not include any costs that may be incurred by the Commission as a result of activities conducted under agreements for cooperation to safeguard uranium 235 distributed abroad. If it later becomes necessary to add a surcharge to the charge schedule on account of such expense, that surcharge will be moderate.


The following prices shall be applied in any Commission purchases of plutonium or uranium 233 produced abroad for the period ending June 30, 1963, through the use of fuel obtained from the Commission under agreements for cooperation:

For plutonium metal—$12/gram.
For uranium 233 nitrate—$15/gram of uranium 233.

The above are based on the estimated values of plutonium and uranium 233 as reactor fuel. Since, initially, material is expected to be delivered in forms other than the above, the prices to be paid will be the above, less the cost of conversion to the specified form. Material so acquired by the Commission from nations with agreements for cooperation, as noted in today’s announcement, will be used only for peaceful purposes. To assure this, in any case where such material cannot, during its reprocessing, be kept separate from material produced in the United States, an equal amount of U.S. material will be reserved for peaceful uses.

VI. Enrichment of Material.

Uranium distributed abroad will be limited to 20% enrichment in uranium 235, with the exception that six (6) kilograms of uranium 235 enriched up to 90% may be made available for use in materials testing reactors under power agreements, and gram quantities of uranium enriched above 90% in uranium 235 may be made available for research purposes under research or power agreements.

VII. Quantity.

a. Research agreements:

Generally, up to 6 kilograms of contained uranium 235 will be made available under research agreements. However, in some cases, the Commission may increase this amount, by way of amendment to an agreement, up to 12 kilograms. The reference here is to the amount of material being utilized in reactors within the cooperating country at any one time. In addition, the Commission will make available such further quantities as, in its opinion, are necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the cooperating country or while fuel elements are in transit.

b. Power agreements:

The amount of material allocated under a power agreement generally refers to the required operating inventory plus the net amount of uranium 235 to be consumed over the life of the agreement. The amount of uranium en-
riched in the isotope uranium 235 in the custody of a cooperating country shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary to assure continuous operation of each defined reactor project undertaken.

VIII. Reprocessing.

When special nuclear material received by a cooperating country from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission. Cost of such reprocessing will be borne by the users of the material.

IX. Safeguards and Controls.

All agreements for cooperation contain appropriate safeguards and controls against diversion of special nuclear material to other than peaceful purposes and contain all of the guarantees required by Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.3

3 Section 123 reads as follows:

"Sec. 123. Cooperation with other nations.—No cooperation with any nation or regional defense organization pursuant to sections 54, 57, 64, 82, 108, 104, or 144 shall be undertaken until—

"a. the Commission or, in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 144b, the Department of Defense has submitted to the President the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with its recommendation thereon, which proposed agreement shall include (1) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; (2) a guaranty by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement for cooperation will be maintained; (3) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to such agreement will not be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose; and (4) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material or any Restricted Data to be transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement for cooperation;"

"b. the President has approved and authorized the execution of the proposed agreement for cooperation, and has made a determination in writing that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and

"c. the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with the approval and the determination of the President, has been submitted to the Joint Committee and a period of thirty days has elapsed while Congress is in session (in computing such thirty days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days)."
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International Atomic Energy Agency

First Yearly Progress Report of the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation to the General Assembly

U.N. doc. A/3363 dated November 17

The General Assembly, at its tenth regular session, established by resolution 913 (X) the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation consisting of the following members: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, India, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America. The Committee held its first session at Headquarters from 14 to 23 March 1956. The Committee elected Dr. C. E. Eddy of Australia as its Chairman and Professor Carlos Chagas of Brazil as its Vice-Chairman. The discussions at the first session were principally concerned with the scope and organization of the work.

The Committee divided the scope of its work under five main headings as follows:
2. The effects of irradiation by internally absorbed isotopes and the effects of external radiation.
3. Natural radiation levels.
4. Exposures during medical procedures and occupational exposure.
5. Environmental contamination.

The conclusions reached at the first session were transmitted to States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies by the Secretary of the Committee on 9 April 1956. The Committee decided to invite States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies to submit certain classes of information, especially those involving physical measurements, under the categories listed above.

In response to this invitation twenty-four Governments and one specialized agency submitted fifty reports to the Committee in time for consideration at its second session. These reports are listed by country and title in annex I to the present report.

The Committee, at its first meeting, requested the Secretary-General to arrange for a suitable number of scientists to be added temporarily on a basis of rotation to the Secretariat in order to carry out detailed technical work in preparation for the meetings of the Committee. A small scientific staff was recruited between the first and second sessions of the Committee and was responsible for presenting in a form suitable for the consideration of the Committee at its second session the large body of data submitted by Governments.

The Committee held its second session from 22 October to 2 November 1956. Following the untimely death of its Chairman, Dr. Eddy, the Committee elected Professor Carlos Chagas of Brazil as its Chairman and Professor Zénon Bacq of Belgium as its Vice-Chairman.

At this session the Committee gave consideration to the following aspects of its work:
1. Information already submitted to it by Governments concerning levels of natural irradiation, of environmental contamination and of other man-made sources of radiation exposure.
2. Methods of measuring these levels.
4. Biological effects of small doses of radiation.
5. Disposal of radioactive wastes in the seas and oceans.
6. Preparation of letters to the general and radi-
ological medical press, to be distributed as widely as possible, entitled “The responsibilities of the Medical Profession in the use of X-rays and other ionizing radiation”.

The Committee’s discussions and recommendations concerning the subjects discussed are embodied in the documents listed in annex II to the present report.

The Committee is devoting particular attention at the present stage of its work to the following topics:

1. In view of the tendency of the long-lived radioactive isotope of strontium (strontium-90) resulting from tests of nuclear weapons or from radioactive wastes to become deposited in human bone, the quantitative measurement and significance of the levels of strontium-90 in:
   (a) The stratosphere;
   (b) Deposited radioactive fall-out;
   (c) Air, water, soil and herbage;
   (d) Bones, especially those of children;
   (e) Human urine;
   (f) Principal calcium contributors to human diet.

2. Levels of natural calcium and strontium in soils and foodstuffs, especially the principal calcium contributors to human diet, as these may influence the uptake of strontium-90.

3. Measurement of the levels of caesium-137 in the stratosphere, in the lower atmosphere, in water, on the ground, in foodstuffs, and in man.

4. Levels of shorter-lived radio-isotopes in fall-out, as assessed by present procedures.

5. Measurement of natural levels of irradiation, and corresponding human surveys.

6. Measurement and evaluation of the doses received by the germinal tissue of persons irradiated during medical procedures, as in certain countries these are known to constitute one of the largest artificial contributions to the irradiation of these tissues.

7. Programmes of research on the genetic effects of radiation.

8. Biological effects of small doses of radiation and related fundamental radiobiological research.


In appropriate fields of its work, the Committee is co-operating closely with the Food and Agriculture Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, and the World Meteorological Organization, with the International Commission on Radiological Protection and with the International Commission on Radiological Units and Measurements.

Annex I

Reports Received from Governments and Specialized Agencies in Time for Consideration at the Second Session of the Committee*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>The biological effects of atomic radiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>The hazards to man of nuclear and allied radiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Preliminary report on modern methods for the evaluation of the biological effects of small doses of external radiation or absorbed radioactive materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Report consisting of eight parts, as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Researches on the effects of the H-bomb explosion at Bikini Atoll 1954 on animal industry and sericulture in Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>The radioactive contamination of agricultural crops in Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>A preliminary report of recommendations on the modern methods of estimating the biological activity of small radiation dose,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>The airborne radioactivity in Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>Report on the systematic observations of the atmospheric radioactivity in Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6</td>
<td>On the distribution of naturally radioactive nuclides in Japanese Islands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7</td>
<td>Radiochemical analysis of radioactive fall-out observed in Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 8</td>
<td>Fission products in water area and aquatic organisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>First report on the studies of radioactive fall-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of South Africa</td>
<td>Preliminary report on radioactive fall-out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reports are listed in the chronological order of receipt by the United Nations. [Footnote in the original.]
Radioactive fall-out through September 1955.

Reports by the Atomic Energy Council of the Executive Yuan of the Republic of China.


The Canadian programme for the investigation of the genetic effects of ionizing radiation.

Pathologic effects of atomic radiation.

Levels of strontium-90 in Canada.

Information submitted by New Zealand.

Report consisting of three parts, as follows:

Part 2 - Methods of estimating the biological activity of small doses of radiation.
Part 3 - Disposal of radioactive wastes at the Norwegian Radium Hospital and Norsk Hydro's Institute of Cancer Research.

Report consisting of 15 parts, as follows:

A. Radiation doses to human gonads:

Part 1 - Levels of ionizing radiations originating from natural and artificial sources, with special reference to irradiation of the human gonads.

B. Natural radiations:

Part 3 - Calculation of the ionization due to radioactive substances in the ground.
Part 4 - Studies on naturally occurring ionizing radiations.
Part 5 - Weekly doses from some natural radioactive sources.

C. Whole body radiation:

Part 6 - Measurements of gamma radiation from the human body.

Part 7 - Measurements of low-level radioactivity particularly the gamma radiation from living subjects.

Part 8 - Measurements of gamma-rays of the human body.

D. Environmental contamination:

France

Radioactive fall-out from atomic weapon tests.

Products of simultaneous fission.

Energy distribution of the gamma-dose from mixed-fission-products from Pu$^{239}$.

Records of gamma radiation from the ground and beta radiation from radioactive debris in Sweden.

Increase in gamma radiation from powdered milk and beef 1953-1956.

E. Occupational exposure and dose-meters:

Measurements on radiation protection required in the walls of Roentgen diagnostic rooms.

A versatile instrument for the measurement in r units of radiation doses received by individuals and populations.

Report consisting of twelve parts, as follows:

Part I.1 - Methods of measuring the radioactivity produced by nuclear explosions and nuclear industry.

Part I.2 - Method of monitoring for natural or artificial radioactivity in human beings.

Part I.3 - Measurement of radon.

Part II.1A - Report on the distribution of the natural radioactivity of rocks.

Part II.1B - Work of the Nancy Radiogeological Laboratory in the study of soil and water radioactivity.

Part II.2 - Radioactivity of the waters of French mineral springs.

Part III.1 - Genetic effects of radiation.

Part III.3A - Summary of the principal measurements of the radioactivity of air, water and soil.

Part III.3B - Study of the radioactivity of the air.

Part III.4 - Study of occupational radiation exposure in France in 1955.

Part III.1B - Addendum: Study of the offsprings of patients treated by pelvic radiotherapy.
Biological methods used for detection of effects of small doses of ionizing radiation.

**Czechoslovakia**

Natural radioactivity of water, air and soil in the Czechoslovak Republic (Review of studies).

**Korea**

Report concerning the request for information on natural radiation background.

**Austria**

Information prepared by the Austrian Government relating to the effects of atomic radiation.

**United Kingdom**

The radiological dose to persons in the United Kingdom due to debris from nuclear test explosions prior to January 1956.

**United States of America**

Project Sunshine Bulletin No. 12 (University of Chicago, The Enrico Fermi Institute for nuclear studies).

**United States of America**

Summary of analytical results from the Hasl strontium programme to June 1956.

**Argentina**

Preliminary report on possible methods of estimating the biological effects of small doses of radiation.

**United States of America**

The effect of exposure to the atomic bombs of pregnancy termination in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

**Hungary**

Unusual radioactivity observed in the atmospheric precipitation in Debrecen between 22 April–31 December 1952.

**Belgium**

Report consisting of five parts, as follows:

*Part 1* - Clinical effects of radiations.

*Part 2* - Report on studies of atomic radiation effects, made at the “Laboratoire de physique nucléaire de l'Université de Liège.”

*Part 3* - Resistance and protection of living organisms against radiations.

*Part 4* - Measurement of radioactivity in rain and surface waters.

*Part 5* - Measurement of radioactivity in atmospheric dust.

**Switzerland**

Letter from the “Service federal de l’hygiène publique”, Bern.

**Argentina**

Information summary on the preliminary work carried out in Argentina for the measurement and study of radioactive fall-out.

**Australia**

Report consisting of six parts, as follows:

*Part I* - Human genetics.

*Part II* - Plant genetics.

*Part III* - Radio-biological unit in the University of Adelaide.

*Part IV* - Natural radiation background and environmental contamination.

*Part V* - Occupational exposure in Australia.

*Part VI* - Health and safety precautions in uranium mining and milling in Australia.

**United Kingdom**

Radio-strontium fall-out in biological materials in Britain.

**Germany, Federal Republic of**

Report consisting of two parts, as follows:

*Part 1* - Findings and conditions of organization in the field of atomic radiation.

*Part 2* - Long-term research tasks in the fields of biology and medicine.

**India**

Procedure used in India for collection of fall-out samples and some data on fall-out recorded in 1956.

**India**

External radiation dose received by the inhabitants of monozite areas of Travancore-Cochin, India.

**Brazil**

On the intensity levels of natural radioactivity in certain selected areas of Brazil.

**World Meteorological Organization**

Summary of comments of W. M. O. on procedures for collection and analysis of atmospheric radioactivity data.

**Brazil**

Measurements of long-range fall-out in Rio de Janeiro.

**Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**

On the methods of finding changes arising in the organism under the influence of small doses of ionizing radiation.

**Brazil**

Absorption curve of fall-out products.

**Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**

Content of neutral radioactive substances in the atmosphere and in water in the territory of USSR.

**Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**

Study of the atmospheric content of Strontium-90 and other long-lived fission products.

**Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**

On the behaviour of radioactive fission products in soils, their absorption by plants and their accumulation in crops.
Mexico . . . . . First studies on radioactive fallout.
Japan . . . . . . . . . . The effect of momentary X-ray exposure in a small dose upon the peripheral blood picture.
Japan . . . . . . . . . . Hematological effects of single exposure to small doses of X-rays.
Japan . . . . . . . . . . Morphological changes of platelets in chronic radiation injuries.
Egypt . . . . . . . . . . Preliminary report on environmental iodine-131 measurement in sheep and cattle thyroids, in Cairo.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Preliminary data on the effects of atomic bomb explosions on the concentration of artificial radioactivity in the lower levels of the atmosphere and in the soil.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

A programme of scientific research into the effects of ionizing radiations on the health of the population and future generations.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Summaries of reports presented at the Conference on the long-term effects of ionizing radiation.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Paper dealing with the question of the exchange of cesium, strontium and a mixture of beta emitters in cows.
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REPORTS PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE DURING ITS FIRST AND SECOND SESSIONS

First Session . . . . . Natural Radiation Background.
. . . . . The Effects of Irradiation by internally absorbed Isotopes—
. . . . . The Effects of External Radiation.
. . . . . Exposure during Medical Procedures—Occupational Exposure.
. . . . . Conclusions of the First Session.

Second Session . . . . . The responsibilities of the Medical Profession in the Use of X-rays and Ionizing Radiation (Statement by the Committee—long version).
. . . . . The Responsibilities of the Medical Profession in the Use of X-rays and Ionizing Radiation (Statement by the Committee—short version).
. . . . . Memorandum on the Biological Effects of Small Doses of
. . . . . Ionizing Radiation and their possible Uses as Biological Indicators.
. . . . . Conclusions and Resolutions adopted by the Committee at its second Session.

TREATY INFORMATION

Air Transport Negotiations With the Netherlands

Press release 605 dated November 30

The State Department announced on November 30 that the U.S. Government and the Government of the Netherlands have agreed to resume air transport negotiations on March 18, 1957, at Washington. The consultations between the two countries, which began April 5 of this year, have been adjourned since midsummer.

Friendship Treaty With Korea

Press release 600 dated November 27

A treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation between the United States and the Republic of Korea was signed at Seoul on November 27 (November 28, Seoul time), Ambassador Walter C. Dowling signed for the United States and Cho Chong-hwan, Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, for Korea.

The treaty is designed to provide a comprehensive, integrated legal framework within which general economic relationships between the two countries may develop along mutually beneficial lines.

The treaty contains 25 articles and a protocol which cover in some detail a wide range of subject matter. In brief, each of the two countries:

(1) agrees to accord within its territories to citizens and corporations of the other, treatment
no less favorable than it accords to its own citizens and corporations with respect to carrying on commercial and industrial activities;

(2) formally endorses standards regarding the protection of persons, their property and interests that reflect liberal and enlightened legal and constitutional principles; and

(3) reasserts its adherence to the principles of nondiscriminatory treatment of trade and shipping.

The United States program for the negotiation of treaties of this type constitutes a part of this country's policy for the furtherance of liberal principles of trade and economic relations in general, and particularly for creating throughout the world conditions favorable to private investment for economic development. This treaty follows the same general pattern as the others of the type that have been negotiated since World War II.

The treaty will be transmitted to the Senate at the next session for its advice and consent to ratification and, when the ratification processes of both countries have been completed, will enter into force one month after the exchange of ratifications.

**Current Actions**

**MULTILATERAL**

**Atomic Energy**


*Signature:* Italy, November 15, 1956.

**Copyright**


*Ratification deposited:* Portugal, September 25, 1956.


*Ratification deposited:* Portugal, September 25, 1956.

Protocol 3 concerning the effective date of instruments of ratification or acceptance of or accession to the convention. Done at Geneva September 6, 1952. Entered into force August 19, 1954. TIAS 3324.

*Ratification deposited:* Portugal, September 25, 1956.

**Fisheries**

Protocol amending the international convention for the Northwest Atlantic fisheries of February 8, 1949 (TIAS 2089) by providing that annual meetings of the Commission may be held outside North America. Done at Washington June 25, 1956.

3 Substance of declaration, signed by the Foreign Minister:

"(On behalf of the Government of Israel I declare that Israel recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to all other Members of the United Nations and to any non-member State which becomes a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice pursuant to Article 93, paragraph 2, of the Charter, and subject to reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court in all legal disputes concerning situations or facts which may arise subsequent to 25 October 1951 provided that such dispute does not involve a legal title created or conferred by a Government or authority other than the Government of Israel or an authority under the jurisdiction of that Government.

"This Declaration does not apply to:

(a) Any dispute in respect to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another means of peaceful settlement;

(b) Any dispute relating to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the State of Israel;

(c) Any dispute between the State of Israel and any other State whether or not a member of the United Nations which does not recognize Israel or which refuses to establish or to maintain normal diplomatic relations with Israel and the absence or breach of normal relations precedes the dispute and exists independently of that dispute;

(d) Disputes arising out of events occurring between 15 May 1948 and 20 July 1949;

(e) Without prejudice to the operation of subparagraph (d) above, disputes arising out of, or having reference to, any hostilities, war, state of war, breach of the peace, breach of armistice agreement or belligerent or military occupation (whether such war shall have been declared or not, and whether any state of belligerency shall have been recognized or not) in which the Government of Israel are or have been or may be involved at any time.

"The validity of the present Declaration is from 25 October 1956 and it remains in force for disputes arising after 25 October 1951 until such time as notice may be given to terminate it."

936
Whaling
Protocol amending the international whaling convention of 1946 (TIAS 1849). Open for signature at Washington through December 3, 1956.¹


Wheat

BILATERAL

Burma

Ceylon

Chile

Iceland

Korea
Treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation, with protocol. Signed at Seoul November 28, 1956. Enters into force one month after the day of exchange of ratifications.

Nicaragua

Portugal

Turkey

United Kingdom

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Recess Appointments
The President on November 28 appointed Ellsworth Bunker to be Ambassador to India and to serve concurrently as Ambassador to Nepal.

PUBLICATIONS

Foreign Relations Volume
Press release 595 dated November 23
The Department of State on December 1 released Foreign Relations of the United States, 1942, China. This volume is the first of a series which will cover the record of relations of the United States and China for the years 1942-49.

This volume deals with the first year in which the United States was at war in the Far East, and the subjects treated are for the most part directly related to the war effort. The documents tell of conditions in China which was isolated from the other Allies by Japan’s operations in the South Pacific. They tell also of the problems caused by that isolation and by the early concentration of Allied war effort against Germany.

The present volume tells the story of relations with China chiefly as viewed by the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Treatment of military matters is given as a necessary part of the diplomatic picture. For further study on military affairs, citation is given in the preface to narrative histories published by the Departments of the Army and Air Force. Likewise, matters of primary concern to the Treasury Department and to special wartime agencies are covered only insofar as they were of diplomatic importance.

The major emphasis in this volume is on the following subjects: general wartime relations between the United States and China; political conditions in China, including Sino-Soviet relations and threatened Kuomintang-Communist conflict; negotiations for relinquishing the United States
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of extraterritorial rights in China; financial relations between the United States and China.

Copies of this volume (v, 782 pp.) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., for $3.75 each.

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Disposition of Rights in Atomic Energy Inventions. TIAS 3644. 3 pp. 5¢.


Surplus Agricultural Commodities—Drought Relief Assistance. TIAS 3645. 10 pp. 10¢.


Recruitment of Filipino Laborers and Employees by the United States Army. TIAS 3646. 5 pp. 5¢.


Weather Stations—Cooperative Program on Guadeloupe Island. TIAS 3647. 6 pp. 5¢.


Mutual Defense Assistance. TIAS 3648. 3 pp. 5¢.


Defense—Status of United States Forces. TIAS 3649. 7 pp. 10¢.


Weather Stations—Cooperative Program on Curaçao and St. Martin Islands. TIAS 3650. 7 pp. 10¢.


Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3651. 2 pp. 5¢.


Air Force Mission to Argentina. TIAS 3652. 28 pp. 15¢.


Check List of Department of State Press Releases: November 26-December 2

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press release issued prior to November 26 which appears in this issue of the Bulletin is No. 595 of November 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>11/27</td>
<td>Agreement on Grand Turk navy research station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*599</td>
<td>11/27</td>
<td>Cooper visit to India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>11/27</td>
<td>Signing of friendship treaty with Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*601</td>
<td>11/28</td>
<td>Plant biography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*602</td>
<td>11/29</td>
<td>Bunker biography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>11/29</td>
<td>Murphy: Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>11/29</td>
<td>U.S. support for Baghdad Pact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>11/30</td>
<td>Air transport talks with Netherlands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not printed.
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The Search for Disarmament

Publication 6398 20 Cents

The Search for Disarmament, a 35-page pamphlet, discusses several aspects of the compelling problem of disarmament, “the limitation, regulation, and control of arms.” The pamphlet, based on an address by Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, covers the following topics:

- the nature and urgency of the problem;
- disarmament as a safeguard of the national security;
- disarmament as an integral part of national policy;
- major periods of negotiations;
- the present status of disarmament negotiations;
- prospects for disarmament.

Copies of The Search for Disarmament may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at 20 cents each.

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed $ ............... (cash, check, or money order).

Please send me ........ copies of The Search for Disarmament.

Name: ____________________________

Street Address: _________________________

City, Zone, and State: _________________________
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In the Cause of Peace and Freedom

Address by Vice President Nixon

Nothing in our economic life so well symbolizes our constant desire for perfection and progress as does our annual showing of new models of powerful and comfortable automobiles. When we compare the cars of today with the slow, awkward versions of 50 years ago, we not only see what American ingenuity and skill have accomplished in the past, but we see also an almost unbelievably exciting future in our continued economic development.

If the only problems confronting us today were economic, we might well be satisfied and even complacent as we look to the future. The fact that 60 million Americans are proud owners of these automobiles or earlier models is in itself a symbol of a prosperity that truly has reached all levels of society. For the first time in history we are approaching a state in which poverty and economic exploitation will be abolished in a major industrial nation.

But in the world today there is no place for complacency, no matter how well-founded it may appear. None of us can be blind to the fact that a cloud hangs over our heads. It is a cloud of anxiety and even of fear. We see it as the mushroom-shaped cloud that spells a solemn warning, a warning that this prosperity could be wiped out in an instant in the awful flash of thermonuclear warfare.

Consequently, I believe it would be appropriate to discuss tonight the great events of the last 40 days which will have such a tremendous impact upon our future.

There have been some depressing and alarming comments on those events by some observers of world affairs. The critics of despair and the prophets of doom are telling us that all is lost. Among the dreary conclusions we have recently heard and read are these:

The cause of freedom in Hungary has been crushed forever by Soviet power.

Dictatorial forces are stronger than ever in the Middle East, and the Soviet Union has won a massive victory in that area of the world.

The Atlantic alliance has been irreparably shattered, and the breach between the United States and its European allies and friends may never be healed.

And finally, United States policy is primarily at fault for these disastrous developments.

I do not believe that our foreign policy should be immune from criticism. The bipartisan support given our policies—and it has been a generous and patriotic support in both the House and Senate—does not mean carbon-copy endorsement of every action taken by the administration. And certainly it is the function of the press in a democracy to inform and criticize freely in this field as well as in others.

In all fairness, however, I believe that some of the critics are taking a shortsighted and immature view of the issues. They are shortsighted because they allow the attractiveness of apparent immediate gains to blind themselves to the expense of tragic future losses. And their demand that American policy produce immediate and brilliant successes at all times is a sign of dangerous immaturity.

In this complex and imperfect world, we must be prepared for difficulties and even short-run failures. The most we can hope for is that our

December 17, 1956
basic position is fundamentally right and that it will ultimately prevail. I suggest that we analyze the events of the past few weeks in this spirit.

Turning Point in History

Six weeks ago we were at a turning point in history. In the United Nations Headquarters in New York, the eyes of the world were focused upon the spokesman of the United States. I ask you to visualize the high drama of the scene.

Here was a nation, formerly isolationist, now converted to the idea of collective security. We who rejected the League of Nations were among the founders and supporters of the United Nations. We who only 60 years ago were boasting of our manifest destiny in Asia and Latin America had renounced colonialism and pledged our support to nations formerly held as colonies by major powers.

We had changed, but there were many in the world who doubted the reality of the change. Many nations in Asia and Africa preferred to wait on the sidelines as neutrals in the cold war until they were sure that we were more sincere than the Soviet Union in our profession of friendship and respect for all peoples and for all nations regardless of their size or their strength. Our good friends in Latin America, while trusting us today, had disturbing memories of the gunboat diplomacy of yesterday.

Then we were put to the test. Our friends and allies had bypassed the United Nations and had taken direct military action to settle a dispute. Certainly their provocation was great. By the international standards which were generally accepted 50 years ago, the action they took would have been defended, if not justified. But a new force had come into being, the moral force of the United Nations, all of whose members were pledged to settle their differences peacefully.

In delegation after delegation the question was asked, Would the United States live up to its announced principles, or would it conveniently look the other way? At this turning point in history, Secretary Dulles personally appeared before the General Assembly of the United Nations and announced our position.2

Our stand was direct and simple. We denounced the use of force not sanctioned by self-defense or United Nations mandate. In the debate that followed, our friends used the veto and stopped action by the Security Council. We did not hesitate. We asked for an emergency meeting of the General Assembly, not subject to veto. At the meeting our position was endorsed by practically every country in the world.

The United States had met the test of history. The United Nations had been saved. The rule of law had been upheld—the same law for the powerful and the strong as for the weak and the defenseless.

It is claimed that we took the wrong course of action because the position of a dictator was strengthened, the danger of Soviet influence in the Near East has been increased, and our alliance with our closest friends has been weakened.

Alternative Course

But let us see what our alternative was. If we had failed at this point to stand for the principles which guided our course of action, the usefulness of the United Nations would have been at an end. The standards for conduct of international affairs would have reverted to those in effect before World War I and World War II. Our own moral position before the world would have been hopelessly compromised.

Our position in the eyes of most of the world would have been little better than that of the Communist nations who in their conduct of international affairs have consistently followed the principles that the end justifies the means, that the use of force is justified if it is expedient, and that the mandates of the United Nations are to be followed only where the nation affected concludes that its national interest will be served thereby. The bright hope that nations might find a better way than force to settle international disputes would have been destroyed and the world would have disintegrated into cynical and suspicious power blocs to be wooed and won by a triumphant Soviet using the carrot or club techniques as the occasion warranted.

If we had supported our friends and allies, Britain and France, in Egypt, they might have won a military victory in that area. But they and we would have lost the moral support of the whole world.

Because we took the position we did, the peoples of Africa and Asia know now that we walk with
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2 For text of the Secretary's statement, see Bulletin of Nov. 12, 1956, p. 751.
They limited lasting the 945 Hungary. condemning it. We barous occurred against a choosing right and knew easy action. It was ten times more difficult in the confusion and dizziness of the closing weeks of a political campaign. Lesser men would have sought easy vote-getting solutions on the eve of an election. They chose statesmanship and high moral principle.

It is easy to condemn your enemies when they are wrong. It takes courage to condemn your friends. It is tempting to overlook a little wrong in order to get what appears to be a greater good, but high standards of morality do not sanction the principle that the end justifies the means. We knew that our friends acted under great provocation and that their patience had been strained almost beyond endurance. It would have been easy to look the other way and delay action until it was too late, but the easy way is not always the right way.

The military victory our friends might have won in the Near East would not have solved the problem. Lasting solutions are rarely forged in the ruins of war, and the peace we seek in the Middle East must be lasting. History will give great credit to our President and Secretary of State for choosing the hard road of principle and not the easy way of expediency. Now we, as members of a newly invigorated United Nations, are free to pursue a sound and permanent peace in that area.

Events in Hungary

Let us examine now the events which have occurred in Hungary. Because we stood firmly against the use of force in Egypt, we were in a moral position to condemn the ruthless and barbarous Soviet conquest of that courageous country. We could, without hesitation or cynicism, mobilize the moral force of the world against this monstrous injustice.

The United Nations has no armies that it could send to rescue the heroic freedom fighters of Hungary. There were no treaties which would invoke the armed assistance of the free nations. Our only weapon here was moral condemnation, since the alternative was action on our part which might initiate the third and ultimate world war.

There are those who say that moral force without military action to back it up means nothing. But we should never underestimate the force of the moral judgment of the world. Even the Soviet Union has been compelled to recognize this. It is unable to go before the world standing for the slavery, Communist colonialism, and reliance on force which are basic features of Communist doctrine. No matter how dark its deeds, it sees the need of speaking in terms of freedom for individuals, independence for nations, and peace for the world.

The fact that the men in the Kremlin are writhing in the spotlight of world criticism may have saved the equally heroic peoples of Poland from Hungary’s fate. Poland at least has a limited measure of independence today.

What effect will the events in Hungary have on the world struggle? The shortsighted, snap judgment of too many observers is that the Communists have won a great victory in Hungary. But a more sober, realistic appraisal is that, while the Communists may have won the battle for control of Hungary, they have in the process lost the war for domination of the world which they are so fanatically trying to win.

I am convinced that the events of Hungary will prove to be a major turning point in the struggle to defeat world communism without war.

Let us examine the situation in which the men in the Kremlin now find themselves. Before the Hungarian incident, the Soviet Union itself had confessed that the methods of Stalin had led to failure. Over the past 2 years, the Soviet leaders have tried to win by smiles what they could not win by naked force and unlimited terror. They have sought to make friends of their satellites. Their salesmen of slavery have tried to win over the neutral nations by advocating peace, economic progress, independence, and equality for all peoples. The Iron Curtain had been partially lifted so that visitors might see that the Soviet was not afraid of the critical scrutiny of outsiders.

This program seemed to be making some disturbing progress, but how does it stand today? The lesson of Hungary is etched in the mind and seared in the soul of all mankind. As a result,
Communist parties are breaking up all over the world. The Soviet cannot count on the loyalty of a single satellite country or even of its own troops. Its campaign to win the neutral nations has blown up in its face.

Can it be seriously suggested that any nation in the world today would trust the butchers of Budapest? What has happened in Hungary is a solemn warning to national leaders everywhere that those who invite the Communist in run the risk of the savage slaughter which has been the lot of the freedom fighters of Hungary. They know that the Communists bring with them, not the independence, the freedom, the economic progress, and the peace that they promise, but Communist colonialism, slavery, economic exploitation, and war.

At the same time, the events in Hungary have shown our uncommitted friends why the United States believes so strongly in collective security. We are militarily strong only because we know this is necessary to keep the peace today. While we oppose the use of aggressive force to settle disputes, we recognize the need of strong forces of self-defense so long as the Communist world is committed to its policies of world domination by force and violence.

We enter into alliances to protect weaker nations from a fate similar to that of Hungary. No one today could seriously suggest that Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, or other Soviet satellites were free or independent. On the other hand, nations which have joined with the United States in collective security pacts have found that their independence has in no way been compromised by this association.

As we examine, then, the events of the last 40 days in both the Middle East and Hungary, I think we can reach but one inescapable conclusion. We do not and should not for one moment underestimate the tragedy of Hungary, the precarious situation which still exists in the Mideast, or the great strain which has been placed on our alliance with our friends in Europe. But while we have suffered some losses, a sound foundation has been laid in the process for building a world order based on law rather than force, and for the defeat of communism without war.

We shall realize these objectives, however, only if we do not let things drift and if our leadership is wise, mature, and enlightened.

I believe that the principles upon which our policies should be based have been eloquently stated by the President in recent weeks. On October 31, speaking to the Nation on television, he said,

> . . . The peace we seek and need means much more than mere absence of war. It means the acceptance of law, and the fostering of justice, in all the world. . . . There can be no peace without law. And there can be no law if we were to invoke one code of international conduct for those who oppose us and another for our friends.

One day later, speaking in Philadelphia, he said,

In but a few years we have advanced from an isolationism spurring collective security to our steadfast support of the United Nations, from a sense of self-sufficiency and remoteness from other nations to the vivid awareness that our greatest purpose—a just and lasting peace—can be attained only as all other nations share this peace with us.

Let us apply these principles to the immediate problems which confront us.

Relations With Allies

First, with regard to our alliances, it is essential that we recognize that history may record that neither we nor our allies were without fault in our handling of the events which led to the crisis in which we now find ourselves. Our friends believe that we did not appreciate adequately the provocation which brought about their action and that we did not assume our proper responsibility in working out a settlement of the basic problems existing in that area.

We, on the other hand, felt that we had some legitimate criticisms to make of their policies during this period.

Now is the time for us all to recognize that recriminations and faultfinding will serve no purpose whatever. The cause of freedom could suffer no greater disaster than to allow this or any other incident to drive a wedge between us and our allies.

As mature peoples, we know that we will not always agree even with our closest friends. The test of the strength of an alliance or a friendship is what happens in times of adversity rather than in times of good fortune. Inevitably, if a friendship or alliance survives a period of adversity, it is stronger in the end than it would have been otherwise.

We are proud of our association with Britain and France and of our common dedication to the
principles of freedom and justice which joined us together as allies in both World War I and World War II.

We recognize that they were confronted with a series of aggressive acts short of the use of force, in addition to an ominous military buildup in a nation which they believed threatened their vital interests. In that no man's land between war and peace it is difficult to decide which is the best course of action.

It is to their lasting credit that they accepted the decision of the United Nations when they agreed to a cease-fire and to a withdrawal of their forces even when they believed that this decision was not in their best interests. They refrained from using their overwhelmingly superior armed force to reach their objective at a time when they thought complete victory was within their grasp. They have entrusted the future peace of the Middle East to the international police force provided by the United Nations.

Contrast their action with that of another member of the United Nations, the Soviet Union. Communist leaders flouted the United Nations decision condemning its aggression in Hungary. When confronted with a real crisis, the Communists reverted to type and showed all who cared to see the unlimited cruelty and the cynical rejection of basic human rights which is inherent in their system.

Solving Problems of Near East

Now that our allies have subordinated what they consider to be their national interests to the verdict of the United Nations, we have a solemn obligation to give leadership and support to a United Nations program which will assure the solution by peaceful means of the problems which brought about the armed conflict in that area.

If aggressive force is to be outlawed as an instrument of national policy, other ways must be found to protect the legitimate interests of nations when they are threatened by means short of force.

In addition to the immediate problem of expediting the reopening of the Suez Canal on a basis under which this international lifeline will not be subject to arbitrary closing in the future, the moral, diplomatic, economic, and military strength of the United States and the United Nations must be mobilized toward the realization of these long-range objectives in the Near East.

There must be a firm guaranty of the sovereignty of the states in the area and a just solution of outstanding disputes.

There should be progressive limitation of the armaments of the nations in this area.

There must be generous aid in solving their very real economic problems so that their peoples may rise from the depths of poverty and disease.

We who have had so much should not be indifferent to the harsh economic conditions that have made some people receptive to the siren song from Moscow. We should never become so occupied with short-range political problems that we forget our long-range objective of promoting both peace and prosperity for the nations of the world.

In the past the nations of the Near East, poor and struggling by our standards, used their meager resources to build up military strength. Now we have the unique opportunity to show them what can be done by using these resources to build up the health and welfare of their peoples, instead of wasting them on sterile armaments. We do not want to go back to the armed truce of the last 8 years. We want genuine and solid peace as a foundation for a new era of prosperity for these proud and respected nations.

So long as millions of people in other nations live in poverty and want, our own prosperity is not really secure. We are not secure morally, for we could not feel at ease as a God-fearing people if we did not try to help those who lack the essentials of life while we enjoy its luxuries. Nor are we secure militarily, for unrest and dissatisfaction lead to international tension. Tension in turn can produce war. And a little war may get out of hand and grow into the final war of all mankind, the dreaded atomic war.

An immediate problem which confronts us as a result of the crisis in the Near East is the financial plight our friends in Britain now face. I believe it is in our interest as well as theirs to assist them in this hour of difficulty, and I am confident that there will be strong bipartisan support in the Congress for granting such assistance.

Policy Toward Oppressed Peoples

Turning again to the situation in Hungary, we must continue to take the leadership in offering a haven of security to those courageous people who dared to oppose the Soviet tyranny.
In the United Nations and at every opportunity before the bar of world opinion, attention must be directed not only to the events of the past but to the continuing refusal of both the puppet Hungarian government and the Government of the Soviet Union to conform with the overwhelming verdict of the United Nations.

We must never acquiesce in oppression or slavery any place in the world.

We must offer every assistance and encouragement to the peaceful liberation of enslaved peoples.

If these policies are consistently and relentlessly pursued, they can in the end have only one effect—the inevitable weakening of the bonds of slavery which are now imposed on so many millions of people.

It is commonplace today to say that America is in a position of world leadership. Our military and economic strength has given us this fearful responsibility, whether we want it or not. But our power and the corresponding responsibility have been enhanced by the events of recent days.

Now our leadership is moral as well as military and economic. And the challenge to this generation is that we measure up to the expectation of history in this decisive hour. The call today is for vision and greatness, not only on the part of your Government but on the part of every American in all walks of life.

Today we need progress in international relations just as dramatic as the progress expressed by our new automobiles. Whether we like it or not, the diplomacy of the 19th century is as outmoded today as are the automobiles of 50 years ago. In an atomic age there is no place for military aggression, colonial exploitation, or power imperialism. These methods never were morally right, but today they are far more dangerous than they were at other times. The nation that starts a little war today may set off a chain reaction that could destroy our civilization.

For the future of the world, and for the security of our children and their children, we must strive as never before for peace based on justice and law. A code of law and moral principles that apply equally to all nations of the world must be the foundation of this peace. Its superstructure must be military and economic strength. And the architect of this peace must be the United Nations, fully supported by this Nation, in their effort to make the rule of law and justice supreme on this earth.

For us to meet adequately our world responsibilities will require not only mature principle and diplomacy on the part of our Government but courage, dedication, and sacrifice on the part of our people.

**Importance of Neutrals**

The struggle for the world will be finally determined by what happens to the millions of people now neutral who are trying to decide whether they will align themselves with the Communist nations or with the free nations.

What we say to them as a government is tremendously important, but what we are as a people can be even more important. Our Government can tell them that we stand for what they want—independence, freedom, economic progress, and recognition of their equal dignity as human beings.

But no matter how eloquently we speak, our case will be made infinitely stronger if we practice at home what we preach abroad.

That is why it is vitally necessary that we mount a winning war against the few remaining areas of poverty which exist in our own country.

That is why it is equally necessary that we continue to make decisive progress in the removal of the last vestiges of discrimination and prejudice which exist in the United States and which the foes of freedom abroad use so effectively against us. Just as we uphold equality before the law for all nations of the world, so we must uphold equality before the law for all peoples in the United States, whatever their race or national origin.

America has faced many challenges before and has met them with success. Today we face what may be the supreme challenge of our history. If we can apply the same genius, drive, and determination which has built the tremendous industrial and economic might evidenced by the great industry which you represent, we shall meet this challenge and win the struggle for peace and freedom for all mankind.

**Coordinator of Hungarian Relief**

President Eisenhower on November 28 designated Tracy B. Voorhees of New York City as his representative in connection with this country's Hungarian refugee relief and resettlement activities. The President asked Mr. Voorhees to set up effective machinery to assure full coordination of the work of volunteer and Government agencies.
U.S. Protests Soviet Army Action Before Legation in Budapest

Statement by Lincoln White
Acting Chief of the News Division

The Soviet Chargé d’Affaires, Mr. Sergei R. Striganov, called on Deputy Under Secretary Murphy this morning at our request. Mr. Murphy informed the Chargé that we are deeply concerned by Soviet military action in Hungary. The same concern, Mr. Murphy pointed out, has been reflected by a great majority of nations in the United Nations who have gone on record in calling for a cessation of Soviet intervention in Hungary, with respect to the return of deportees, etc.

Mr. Murphy pointed out that an incident, possibly minor in itself but nevertheless reflecting the deplorable situation in Hungary, has just been reported to us by our Legation in Budapest. On Tuesday and Wednesday [December 4 and 5] there were peaceful demonstrations of Hungarian civilians, mostly women, in front of various legations in Budapest, including the American Legation. That Legation, Mr. Murphy emphasized, is on Hungarian territory and not Soviet territory.

According to the information reaching us, the lives and safety of these demonstrators were endangered by the intervention of tanks of the Soviet Army. Not only did the tanks threaten the demonstrators, but it is reported that they drew up on the sidewalk directly in front of the American Legation, thus endangering the lives of helpless civilians in front of the Legation and interfering with free access to and from the building.

Mr. Murphy stated that we protest this unwarranted Soviet military action in Budapest, constituting as it does an interference with our diplomatic mission accredited to Hungary. This, Mr. Murphy concluded, may be a small matter in comparison with the other acts of the Soviet Union in Hungary during the past month, but the United States asks that it be brought immediately to the attention of the Soviet Government.

Mr. Striganov asked if we were aware of the Soviet position in the United Nations. He was told that we were fully aware of that position, but Mr. Striganov was again asked to communicate this immediately to his Government. He said he would.

Made to correspondents on Dec. 6.

U.N. Human Rights Day, 1956

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release

Today, December 10, the United States together with many other nations will observe Human Rights Day. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights overwhelmingly approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations 8 years ago has rightly been hailed as an important milestone along the road that leads to worldwide recognition of the inherent dignity of man.

This year the free world has the most compelling reasons for observing Human Rights Day with renewed awareness and resolution, but it has little cause to “celebrate” that day.

The recent outbreak of brutality in Hungary has moved free peoples everywhere to reactions of horror and revulsion. Our hearts are filled with sorrow. Our deepest sympathy goes out to the courageous, liberty-loving people of Hungary.

The terror imposed upon Hungary repudiates and negates almost every article in the Declaration of Human Rights.

It denies that men are born free and equal in dignity and rights and that all should act in the spirit of brotherhood.

It denies the right to life, liberty, and security of person.

It denies the principle that no one shall be subjected to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.

It denies that no person shall be arbitrarily arrested, detained, or exiled.

It denies that all are equal before the law and entitled to its equal protection.

It denies the right to fair and public hearings by an independent and impartial tribunal.

It denies the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

It denies the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

It denies the right to freedom of peaceful assembly.

It denies that the individual may not be held in slavery or servitude.

It denies that the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government.

That these human rights have been so flagrantly repudiated is cause for worldwide mourning.

But the human spirit knows, as Thomas Jefferson said, that the God who gave us life gave us
liberty at the same time. The courage and sacrifices of the brave Hungarian people have consecrated that spirit anew.

Not only government but the people of many nations have reacted in spontaneous sympathy. I am proud of the generous response of our voluntary agencies, humanitarian organizations, and of State and local governments—but I am especially proud of what so many of our people have done, and are doing, as individuals.

We shall continue to offer shelter to the homeless, as we shall go on feeding the hungry and providing medicine and care for the sick.

On this Human Rights Day, it is for each one of us to recognize anew that we are brothers in our Father's house and each is truly his brother's keeper. We cannot shed that responsibility, nor do we want to do so. Let us resolve on this day that the world shall never forget what tyranny has done to our fellow man in Hungary.

Each in his own way, let us do all that we can to reaffirm, in word and in deed, our faith in the cause of freedom everywhere in the world.

So doing, these honored dead "shall not have died in vain."

TEXT OF PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS December 10, 1956, marks the eighth anniversary of the proclamation by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all nations and all peoples, and will be observed by members of the United Nations as Human Rights Day; and

WHEREAS December 15, 1956, marks the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of our Bill of Rights as the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim December 10, 1956, as United Nations Human Rights Day, and do call upon the citizens of the United States to join with peoples throughout the world in its observance. Let us on this day study the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaimed by the United Nations and the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States, and thereby renew and further fortify our conviction that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with fundamental and inalienable human rights.

Particularly, on this United Nations Human Rights Day, let us take to heart the lessons the Hungarian people have written in their blood and in their sacrifice and in their indomitable will to be free: That those who have
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once known freedom and the free exercise of human rights value them above life itself; That decent men and women everywhere are stirred to a deep and enduring sympathy for the heroic oppressed, a sympathy that surmounts all barriers of geography and race.

Let us resolve to give generously of our substance that the hardships and suffering of the Hungarian people may be relieved and let us pray that this season of tragedy for them may end in the return of rights and freedom and self-government.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this 7th day of December in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred [seal] and fifty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-first.

By the President:
JOHN FOSTER DULLES
Secretary of State.

U.S. Delegates Leave for NATO Council Meeting

Departure Statement by Secretary Dulles
Press release 616 dated December 8

I am leaving for Paris to attend, with Secretary Humphrey and Secretary Wilson, the semiannual meeting of the North Atlantic Council.

This will be an important meeting, perhaps the most important such meeting that has ever been held. The NATO members will review the current international situation. This bears the indelible imprint of Soviet ruthlessness exhibited in Hungary. It also shows the need for rebuilding the processes of interdependence between Western Europe and the Middle East. The Ministers will also have the task of drawing up a new directive to their military representatives which will take into account both the present international situation and military developments in terms of the role of new weapons.

The Foreign Ministers of Canada, Italy, and Norway, appointed last May to study ways and means of strengthening NATO, will make their report, and the coming meeting will be acting on that report.
I am confident that the forthcoming meeting, in the discharge of its responsibilities, will strengthen the bonds that unite the treaty members to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, which is the express purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty.

**U.S. Delegation**

The Department of State announced on December 7 (press release 613) that the U.S. Government will be represented by the following delegation at the 18th Ministerial Meeting of the Nato Council to be held at Paris, France, December 11-14.

**U.S. Representatives**

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State  
*Special Assistant*  
William B. Macomb

Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense  
George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury  
George W. Perkins, U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations

**Senior Advisers**

Robert R. Bowie, Assistant Secretary of State for Policy Planning  
C. Douglas Dillon, American Ambassador to France  
C. Burke Elbrick, *Coordinator*, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs  
Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs  
Julius C. Holmes, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State  
Douglas MacArthur II, Counselor of the Department of State  
Edwin M. Martin, U.S. Alternate Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council  
Carl W. McCordle, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs  
Andrew N. Overby, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury  
Adm. Arthur W. Radford, USN, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

**Withdrawing of British and French Forces From Egypt**

**DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

Press release 606 dated December 3

The British and French Governments have now declared their purpose to comply with the U.N. resolution regarding withdrawal of their forces from Egypt. They have stated that they will work out with General Burns, Commander of the United Nations forces, a definite and early schedule for complete withdrawal.

The United States welcomes this decision. Its implementation will strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to deal with the other aspects of the Middle Eastern problems which are still unfinished business.

It will now, more than ever, become incumbent upon all members of the United Nations to ensure that the remaining issues are dealt with justly and promptly. The United States has repeatedly said during this crisis in the Middle East that the United Nations cannot rightfully or prudently stop merely with maintaining peace. Under its charter it is obligated to deal with the basic sources of international friction and conflicts of interest. Only in this way can it attain the charter goal of peace with justice.

In keeping with this obligation the United States will continue fully to support the measures required to make the United Nations force adequate and effective for its mission. In carrying out his plans for this purpose the Secretary-General can count on the unstinting cooperation of the United States.

As the United Nations force replaces those of the United Kingdom and France, the clearance of the canal becomes imperative. Every day of delay in restoring the canal to normal use is a breach of the 1888 treaty and a wrong to the large number of nations throughout the world whose economies depend so heavily on its reliable operation.

The United Nations and the interested states should, we believe, promptly direct their attention to the underlying Middle East problems. The United States Government considers it essential that arrangements be worked out without delay to insure the operation of the canal in conformity with the six principles

---

The United States is equally determined, through the United Nations and in other useful ways, to assist in bringing about a permanent settlement of the other persistent conflicts which have plagued the Middle East over recent years. Repeatedly we have made clear our willingness to contribute for the purpose of bringing stability and just peace to this area. The present crisis is a challenge to all nations to work to this end.

REPORT BY U.N. SECRETARY-GENERAL

U.N. doc. A/3415 dated December 3

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the Members of the General Assembly the text of two communications which he has received from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of France (see A and B below), and to call the attention of Members to an instruction issued by him to the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force (see C below).

A. Note verbale dated 3 December 1956 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations, addressed to the Secretary-General

NEW YORK, 3 December 1956

The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General and has the honour to make the following communication on behalf of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.

Her Majesty's Government and the French Government note that:

(a) An effective United Nations force is now arriving in Egypt charged with the tasks assigned to it in the Assembly resolutions of 2, 5 and 7 November.

(b) The Secretary-General accepts the responsibility for organizing the task of clearing the Canal as expeditiously as possible.

(c) In accordance with the General Assembly resolution of 2 November free and secure transit will be re-established through the Canal when it is clear.

(d) The Secretary-General will promote as quickly as possible negotiations with regard to the future regime of the Canal on the basis of the six principles set out in the Security Council resolution of 13 October.

Her Majesty's Government and the French Government confirm their decision to continue the withdrawal of their forces now in the Port Said area without delay.

They have accordingly instructed the Allied Commander, General Keightley, to seek agreement with the United Nations Commander, General Burns, on a timetable for the complete withdrawal, taking account of the military and practical questions involved. This timetable should be reported as quickly as possible to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In preparing these arrangements the Allied Commander will ensure:

(a) That the embarkations of personnel or material shall be carried out in an efficient and orderly manner;

(b) That proper regard will be had to the maintenance of public security in the area now under Allied control;

(c) That the United Nations Commander should make himself responsible for the safety of any French and British salvage resources left at the disposition of the United Nations salvage organization.

In communicating these conclusions Her Majesty's Government and the French Government recall the strong representations they have made regarding the treatment of their nationals in Egypt. They draw attention to the humane treatment accorded to Egyptian nationals in the United Kingdom and France. They feel entitled to demand that the position of British and French nationals in Egypt should be fully guaranteed.

B. Note verbale dated 3 December 1956 from the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations, addressed to the Secretary-General

The Permanent Representative of France has the honour to make the following communication to the Secretary-General on behalf of his Government:

1. The Governments of France and the United Kingdom note that:

(a) An effective International Force is now arriving in Egypt charged with the tasks assigned to it in the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly of 2, 5 and 7 November.

(b) The Secretary-General accepts the responsibility for organizing the task of clearing the Suez Canal as expeditiously as possible.

(c) In accordance with the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly of 2 November, free and secure transit will be re-established through the Canal when it is clear.

(d) The Secretary-General will promote as quickly as possible negotiations with regard to the future regime of the Canal on the basis of the six principles set out in the Security Council resolution of 13 October.

2. The Governments of France and the United Kingdom confirm their decision to continue the withdrawal of their forces in the Port Said area without delay.

3. They have accordingly instructed the Allied Commander, General Keightley, to seek agreement with the United Nations Commander, General Burns, on a timetable for the complete withdrawal of their forces, taking account of the military and practical questions involved. This timetable should be reported as quickly as possible to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

4. In preparing this timetable, the Allied Commander will have regard to the following requirements:

(a) That the embarkations of personnel and material shall be carried out in an efficient and orderly manner.

(b) That steps will be taken to ensure the maintenance of public security in the area now under Allied control.

(c) That the Commander of the International Force should make himself responsible for the safety of any
French and British salvage resources left at the disposition of the competent organization of the United Nations.

5. In communicating these conclusions, the two Governments nevertheless recall the strong representations they have made regarding the treatment of their nationals in Egypt. They draw attention to the humane and liberal treatment accorded to Egyptian nationals in their territory. They feel entitled to demand that the position of British and French nationals in Egypt should be fully guaranteed.

C. Instruction issued by the Secretary-General to the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force

The Secretary-General has instructed the Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force, Major-General Burns, to get into immediate touch with the Anglo-French Commander with a view to working out with him arrangements for the complete withdrawal of Anglo-French forces without delay. General Burns has been further instructed to arrange for the earliest possible date for the completion of this programme, taking into account the military and practical questions involved and the need to maintain public security in the area. In view of the Secretary-General’s understanding of the policy of the United Kingdom and French Governments regarding withdrawal, the attention of General Burns has been drawn to the need to ensure that the United Nations Force should be in a position to assume its responsibilities in the Port Said area by the middle of December.

Coordinating Efforts To Handle Oil Supply Problem

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated November 30

The President on November 30, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Acting Secretary of State, authorized the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to request the Secretary of the Interior to permit the U.S. petroleum industry to coordinate the efforts they have been making individually to assist in handling the oil supply problem resulting from the closing of the Suez Canal and some pipelines in the Middle East.

The United States desires to cooperate as fully as possible in lessening the effects of the present situation in both producing and consuming countries. The contemplated coordination of industry efforts will insure the most efficient use of tankers and the maximum availability of petroleum products.¹

¹ The Office of Defense Mobilization on the same day, Nov. 30, released an announcement to the effect that the Director of ODM had that day requested the Secretary of the Interior to authorize 15 U.S. oil companies to coordinate their efforts on the oil supply problem.

Question of Exchange of Flights Over Arctic With U.S.S.R.

Press release 614 dated December 7

A United States note dated September 19, 1956, to the Soviet Embassy proposed that the two countries exchange Arctic overflights in order to further polar ice studies for the International Geophysical Year.²

The proposal originated from conversations between United States and Soviet scientific delegations at the Stockholm Arctic Conference last May. At that time the U.S. scientists reported that the Soviet delegation informed them that their Government would be interested in exchanging such overflights as a means of gathering more complete data on the dynamics of the behavior of the Arctic icepack. The conference participants were in general agreement that an exchange of information on Arctic basin conditions would be beneficial.

The reply from the Soviet Embassy, dated November 21, follows:

The Soviet Government has studied the proposal of the United States Government on the organization, in connection with the arrangements for the International Geophysical Year, of mutual flights by Soviet and American aircraft between Murmansk and Nome to make observations of the ice situation in the area off the Siberian coast.

Soviet organizations engaged in the preparations for the International Geophysical Year have informed the Soviet Government that the participants of the Stockholm Arctic Conference of last May were of the general opinion that it would be desirable to have an exchange of information on the condition of the ice in the Arctic Ocean for areas off the coasts of Siberia, Alaska, Canada, and Greenland. These organizations have also reported that, on their part, they will provide during the International Geophysical Year information on the condition of the ice in the area from Murmansk to Uelen and north from the coast of Siberia to the North Pole, and that they see no need for any additional measures with respect to this area. At the same time it remains necessary to secure information on the ice situation in other areas of the Arctic Ocean, in particular in the area off Alaska, as was pointed out by the Soviet participants at the above-mentioned Arctic Conference. If the question of the desirability of the participation of Soviet polar aviation in operations for securing such information arises, the Soviet Government will be prepared to study proposals which the Government of the United States of America may have in this respect.

December 28, 1956, marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, 28th President of the United States, who became also a world statesman. An idealist, a scholar, and a writer—a man of courage and vision—Wilson possessed an intense interest in government, in public affairs, and in political reform. His earlier career included service as professor of jurisprudence and politics at Princeton University, as president of the university, and as Governor of New Jersey. Elected to the Presidency in 1912, Wilson entered the White House highly trained and with some experience in the field of government, although without experience in diplomacy.

Prior to taking office Wilson had given more study to domestic policy than to foreign policy. Once in office he pressed on Congress a domestic program which touched the national economy and welfare on a wide front, and Congress cooperated by passing such notable legislation as the Underwood Tariff Act, the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, the Federal Farm Loan Act, the LaFollette Seamen’s Act, the Child Labor Act, and the Eight-Hour Act for railway labor. But during Wilson’s administration as a whole, problems of foreign relations overshadowed all others.

Faced at once with problems in Latin America, Wilson adopted a foreign policy which embodied idealistic concepts of morality, right, and national honor. In the course of an address on October 27, 1913, he said:

We dare not turn from the principle that morality and not expediency is the thing that must guide us and that we will never condone iniquity because it is most convenient to do so. ... It is a very perilous thing to determine the foreign policy of a nation in terms of material interest.

But like an earlier idealist President, Thomas Jefferson, Wilson found it difficult to square his theories with harsh realities. After exercising extraordinary patience and restraint in circumstances of great provocation, Wilson finally resorted to armed intervention in Haiti and the Dominican Republic and sent troops into Mexico. He desired, however, an overall pan-American policy of understanding and peace, and in the autumn of 1914 he sketched a plan for mutual guaranties of political independence under a republican form of government and mutual guaranties of territorial integrity. Wilson gradually won the confidence of most of the Latin American nations and their sympathy with the United States in World War I.

When war broke out in Europe in 1914, Wilson, with his passion for peace, sought to end hostilities by means of mediation, and he strove to keep the United States out of the conflict. His attempts at mediation failed. His policy of neutrality succeeded for more than two and a half years in keeping the United States at peace. But it finally broke down in the face of Germany’s resort...
to unrestricted submarine warfare and the resultant sinking of American ships and loss of American lives.

On April 2, 1917, Wilson asked Congress to declare war on Germany. In his address to Congress on this occasion he said:

... the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

Congress voted the declaration of war on April 6.

Wilson threw tremendous energy into the task of leading the Nation at war. At the same time he gave thought to the peace settlement that would follow military victory. He envisaged a settlement based on broad principles of justice which would reduce international tensions and the causes of war, and one that would establish a permanent organization of the nations of the world equipped to find peaceful solutions to future international difficulties and disputes.

To the search for such a peace Wilson dedicated his energies and his life. In an address to Congress on January 8, 1918, he announced his historic Fourteen Points, which were designed as both a statement of war aims and an instrument of propaganda. On the basis of the Fourteen Points the German Government in October 1918 appealed directly to Wilson to arrange a peace conference. In his interchanges with the German officials at this time Wilson demonstrated diplomatic skill of a high order. These interchanges led to the armistice of November 11 and to agreement by the Allies that peace negotiations would be based largely on the Fourteen Points.

Wilson himself headed the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference. The conference opened on January 18, 1919, and continued until the German representatives signed the Versailles Treaty on June 28, 1919. During the conference Wilson encountered strong national interests of various kinds and was forced to compromise on some of his peace principles. But one point he refused to yield. He insisted that the conference draw up the Covenant of the League of Nations and include it as an integral part of the peace treaty. Wilson won this point, and the League Covenant, drafted by a conference commission headed by Wilson himself, became part I of the peace treaties with the former enemy nations.

On July 10, 1919, Wilson submitted the Versailles Treaty for the advice and consent of the Senate. A partisan struggle over the treaty, and over the covenant in particular, ensued. Wilson undertook to meet the opposition to the treaty by taking the League issue directly to the people in a series of addresses throughout the country. Although exhausted and in ill health, he made a tour from Ohio to the West Coast, delivering 26 addresses in 3 weeks. Then, on September 26, he suffered a stroke and was rushed back to Washington. A week later a second stroke left him gravely ill. While Wilson was thus incapacitated, the Senate rejected the treaty and the covenant.

Without the participation of the United States, however, the League of Nations came into existence. In 1920 Wilson issued the calls for the first meetings of the Council and the Assembly; and, also in that year, he received a Nobel Peace Prize for his vision and labor in creating the League. Nearly a generation later Wilson's vision became a further reality when, after involvement in another world war, the United States sponsored and joined a successor world organization, the United Nations.
The Colombo Plan and the Asian Regional Nuclear Center

Statement by Walter S. Robertson
Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs

It is both an honor and a pleasure to be here. It is an honor because my Government takes pride in the fact that it has been associated with the Colombo Plan since its early stages. The pleasure is in seeing again the friends this association has brought to me and to my colleagues of this delegation over a period of time.

The Colombo Plan is a remarkable institution. Its vitality and strength stem, I believe, from its singleness of purpose. We meet each year to consult, to exchange experience, to review our progress in the months that have intervened. Our agenda is simple and uncluttered. We are not charged with political or military tasks in these anxious times. What links us in close partnership is the fact that the challenge of our common goal is to advance economic and social progress and to provide a higher standard of living for the countries concerned.

You are all aware of the problems which confront us. I shall not attempt to define them here. Rather, I should like to explore with you the thinking and philosophy which my country brings to this meeting and this partnership.

Last March President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on the American foreign-aid program expressed his deep commitment to the program in this way:

To help a less developed nation in its initial steps toward an economy that can sustain freedom and independence and provide opportunity for higher living standards may mean postponement of desirable projects here in this country. We must continue willing to make these sacrifices, for the benefits we gain in the interests of peace are well worth the price.

The American aid program for the current fiscal year amounts to approximately one and three-quarter billion dollars. Of this one and three-quarter billion, approximately two-thirds goes to Asia. This fact—as well as the annual reports of the Colombo Plan from its start to the present—testifies that the strengthening of economic conditions in Asia has become a major aspect of United States policy. Secretary of State Dulles has truly voiced the awareness of all of that:

The day is past when the peoples of Asia will tolerate leadership which keeps them on a dead center economically and socially, and when each generation merely ekes out a bare subsistence, with a brief life expectancy, and passes on to the next generation only the same bleak prospect.

Our own desire to help in making these prospects brighter has its origin in some of the deepest roots of the American heritage. We see mirrored in the aspirations of many Asian peoples our own hopes and our own history. We see in their problems many of the same problems we ourselves faced and overcame in the days of our Founding Fathers and of a struggling new Republic.

There is also an economic bond that goes back into our past. Over the greater course of our own history we, like most of the countries of Asia, had an economy which was largely devoted to the production of foodstuffs for our own consumption and to the export of raw materials for the industrialized countries of the world. This period of our history is well within the memory of many Amer-
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1 Made at the Ministerial Meeting of the Consultative Committee for Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (Colombo Plan) at Wellington, New Zealand, on Dec. 5 (press release 608). Mr. Robertson was U.S. representative to the Ministerial Meeting.


3 Ibid., p. 539.
icans alive today. So it is understandable why Americans are stirred by the prospect of the peoples of Asia now seeking to bring about for themselves a better and more productive life, as we have striven and continue to strive to do. The peoples of Asia are dedicated to the same principles—though the terms may vary as they are translated into the different tongues—of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” which are the bedrock of our independence.

We mutually recognize the supreme dignity and worth of the individual, and we seek to aid him in the acquisition and the preservation of his God-given rights.

We see, too, in the efforts of the Asian people to improve their economic lot the dawn of a new day for all peoples; for we know well that a continuously growing economy in one part of the world requires corresponding growth in the rest of the world.

Purpose of U.S. Aid to Asia

The question is often asked: What is the compelling purpose of the U.S. Government in offering economic aid to the countries of Asia? The answer in basic terms is this:

We give aid to further the economic aspirations of the Asian people because their objectives of peace, freedom, and human dignity are our objectives.

We give aid because these peoples who aspire to sustain their freedom confront economic obstacles beyond their capabilities of surmounting alone.

We give aid because there are strong forces hostile to freedom in Asia eager to exploit economic weaknesses and so to subvert Asian independence.

We give aid since the cause of freedom, independence, and human dignity anywhere in the world is our cause as well.

In the implementation of our programs we sometimes incur misunderstandings. Specifically, we are sometimes criticized for what are regarded as unnecessarily complex and cumbersome procedures. It is alleged that these procedures not only result in delays in implementation, but in some instances it has even been charged that they may impinge upon the internal affairs of the country.

These procedures are sometimes termed “strings.” It would be much simpler for the governments concerned to dispense with all forms and reports. But accountability for government spending is one of the requirements of representative government.

The American people have a very great interest in the results of these programs. A million dollars, comparatively speaking, may seem to be a small sum in a period when billions are being spent. But a million dollars will provide several hundred Americans with a college education or buy tractors for 500 American farmers. American citizens who put up this million dollars in the form of taxes insist upon assurance that the million dollars serves the purpose for which it was intended. It is this consideration that makes necessary the procedures which sometimes seem complicated. They are necessary in order that our Congress may be completely informed as to the expenditure of the funds it has appropriated.

Totalitarian governments are not concerned with this problem. They do not have to answer to their people for any of their acts for the simple reason that their people have no say in anything that they do.

We are endeavoring to simplify our procedures and still meet the requirements of Congress for the basic information it will have in connection with these programs. We are well aware that a foreign-aid program which incurs resentment is a mistake, whatever else it may accomplish.

Need for Mutual Understanding

Let me put this in a slightly different way. The kind of understanding between Asia and the West which I am talking about embraces most particularly the realization on our part that we can do nothing in, for, or about any country unless what we are trying to do is what the people of that country wish to be done. Only the Asians themselves can determine what kind of help they want from us and the other nations represented at this table. Only the Asians can enable us more fully to understand their needs.

From the Asians, on the other hand, we hope to receive an understanding of our intentions and our motives. We do not expect all of our friends to agree with us, but Americans fervently hope that they will be understood.

This is as true collectively as individually. If a basic craving of man is to be understood by his fellows, this also is surely true of nations, which
are but the sum of the individuals of which they are composed.

In this we differ not.

Now, there is another area in which the bonds which link the nations here present are very firm and strong. That is in our mutual love of freedom, for both man and for nations. And, as the counterpart to this love, a deep and unyielding hatred of tyranny in any form.

Certainly so long as tyranny and its blood brother, war—or the threat of war—are abroad in the world, there can be no real stability, no lasting prosperity. The most carefully laid collective plans for a new world of peaceful and prosperous nations, exchanging their goods and services for the common benefit of all, must come to nothing unless the integrity and independence of all nations, large and small, can be assured.

Certainly we are all agreed that the high purposes and peaceful aims of such collective efforts as the Colombo Plan are doomed unless the world can be spared the horrors of a new world war. The presence here of every one of us is evidence of our faith that war can and must be prevented. Even though we may not always agree on the most effective means, we are united on that objective and that faith.

And so we come, almost inevitably, to a subject in which man's deepest fears are joined to his noblest dreams. That subject is atomic energy.

**Asian Regional Nuclear Center**

A year ago at the Colombo Plan meeting in Singapore the United States delegation proposed that a cooperative Asian effort be made to develop the trained personnel essential to the full exploitation by Asia of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. My Government pointed out that a logical beginning would be to establish, under the auspices of the Colombo Plan, a center for nuclear research and training. The United States indicated that it was prepared to contribute substantially toward the establishment of such a center.

I wish at this time to make a brief progress report on steps taken this year to forward this project. At the same time, I wish to indicate further steps which might be taken to make it a reality as soon as possible.

You will remember the hospitable reception this proposal received last year. The first decision which was required following the meeting concerned the location of the center. After the announcement of United States interest in such a center was made, many urgent invitations were received for the location of the center. You will all understand the difficulty of a final choice. After consideration of all relevant factors Manila in the Republic of the Philippines was selected as the site.

There were still many questions which needed to be answered. These included the fundamental concept of such an institution, its purposes and requirements, if it were to be successfully adapted to the needs of the region. The method of its financing and the nature of the problems to be encountered in its creation and development also required urgent exploration. It was recognized at the start that the center must blaze a trail in the application of atomic energy to the regional problems of agriculture, medicine, and industry.

"If such an institution is to come into vigorous life and to serve well the needs of the Asian world in this new field, " Mr. John Hollister, the Director of the United States International Cooperation Administration, pointed out last year, "it must rest firmly on Asia's interest and support. The center as we see it would be established for students of the region, staffed largely by scientists from the region, supervised by administrators from the region, and supported by governments of the region. The burden of setting up the center and carrying it forward, and the obligation of staffing it, would rest with the Asian members of the Colombo Plan. The fruits of the effort would also belong to Asia." 4

**Brookhaven Report**

The best way to determine the initial Asian response to this program and to measure the extent of the problems confronting us seemed to be a field study. The United States Government therefore arranged for the Brookhaven National Laboratory, a nongovernmental organization operated by nine of our leading universities, to send out a team composed of top nuclear scientists to visit the Asian countries here represented. Their task was to confer with their scientists and government officials and submit this study for the establishment of a center.

A report by the Brookhaven team has been sub-

---

mitted to our Government. Copies are now available and have been distributed to each delegation.5

It is the hope of my Government that we can now move ahead rapidly in the practical phase of the plan. We shall be prepared to make more detailed suggestions in consultation with each of you as to the establishment of a working group which can discuss the problems raised by the Brookhaven report and make specific recommendations to our respective governments for their solution.

That there are a number of major problems on which group recommendations are needed is made quite clear in the report.

The report states in part that,

In order to achieve its objectives, the Center must be staffed by men of high competence and diverse specializations. The recruitment of well qualified scientists will be a major problem. The staff, including students, is expected to increase, in phase with the ultimate, long-range growth of the program. . . . While eventual staffing by scientists of the region is imperative, much of the early key staff will have to be drawn from western countries.

A well balanced Center must contain laboratories and equipment for research in the basic sciences; general nuclear facilities such as a research reactor, a hot laboratory, radiation sources, and isotope laboratories; and extensive special facilities for application studies in medicine, agriculture, and industry . . . .

Because of the critical shortage of technically trained people . . . an education and training program must be undertaken. During the early years, emphasis would be on this training, and on immediate applications of atomic techniques to regional problems. A student training program, to begin immediately upon authorization of the Center, is proposed. Special training of prospective scientific staff members should also be initiated as soon as possible. . . .

On this basis, [the report concludes] the establishment of an Asian Regional Nuclear Center is considered to be entirely feasible, and capable of contributing significantly to the scientific and technological development of the region.

The United States Government, having considered carefully the financial implications of the Brookhaven report, is now prepared to contribute approximately $20 million to the establishment of the center. This sum is for capital expenditures and a contribution to initial operating costs. The contribution is made with the provision that mutually satisfactory arrangements can be worked out with the other participating countries.

The report also indicated that the Colombo Plan nations may not have available the required number of experienced scientific and administrative personnel at the center for several years and concluded that the United States must be prepared to insure that top-level staff requirements may be met from outside the area. During the initial period, it will be especially important to insure the effective and efficient operation of this center. My Government, which expects to make a very substantial contribution of men, money, materials, and techniques during this phase, is particularly concerned that these be well employed in the common interest. We shall have suggestions to make to this end which we believe will be satisfactory to all participants, and we shall advance these to your Governments in due course. There are other matters having to do with personnel, finance, and organization which will be of common interest on which our views have not been fully formulated. Furthermore, the complexity of these matters makes them more suited to detailed discussion than to a meeting such as this.

A study of the Brookhaven report will make it self-evident that only through a fully cooperative approach can this project become the success its importance warrants. My Government feels that this cooperative plan for developing in Asia the peaceful use of atomic energy holds limitless potential. We envision this first nuclear training center in Asia as a pioneer among educational institutions in the most far-reaching, frontier-opening technical science so far known to man.

If it can accomplish its high purpose, the center will be a crowning achievement of the Colombo Plan. It will demonstrate to the world in bold and positive terms the spirit in which the plan was born and through which it has increasingly flourished: the spirit of mutual effort for the common good.

5 For excerpts from the report, see International Co-operation Administration press release 240 dated Dec. 5.
General Assembly Calls Again for Compliance With Resolutions on Hungary

Following are texts of statements made by U.S. Representative Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., before the U.N. General Assembly on December 3 and 4 and a statement which he circulated among Assembly members on December 6, together with a resolution adopted on December 4.

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 3
U.S. delegation press release 2538

It is now 1 month since the General Assembly adopted its first resolution on Hungary (A/Res/1956). That resolution took note of communications from the then Government of Hungary concerning its request for the withdrawal of Soviet troops. It also noted a final, desperate radio appeal from Prime Minister Imre Nagy.

The resolution called upon the Soviet Union to desist forthwith from all armed attack on the people of Hungary and from any form of intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary. It also called upon the Soviet Union to cease the introduction of armed forces into Hungary and to withdraw its forces without delay from Hungarian territory.

The Soviet Union’s response to these requests of the General Assembly demonstrates its utter contempt for the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Instead of withdrawing its forces, it poured more troops into Hungary. Instead of ceasing its interference in Hungarian affairs, it forced out the Nagy government and took over direct and complete control of the administration of Hungary. Instead of ceasing its armed attack, the Soviet army devastated Budapest and ruthlessly set about exterminating all resistance.

But the Hungarian people continued to resist, armed with little more than the courage that springs from a love of freedom. When tanks, artillery, and rockets proved incapable of breaking their will, the rulers of the Soviet Union resorted to one of their favorite devices. They began the mass deportation of Hungarian men, women, and children. The Soviet response to the appeal of the Assembly to cease these deportations was in the form of another favorite Soviet device. It labeled the incontrovertible evidence presented here as a “slander.”

But obviously it is much easier to try to deny deportations in New York than it is in Hungary, where the horrible fact is known throughout the country. Far from denying that deportations have occurred, the press in Hungary—the Communist press—has admitted it.

Here is some new evidence, not from New York, but from the Communist newspaper of Debrecen, Hungary, the Hajdu-Bihari Naplo. On November 16, it carried the following news item:

In the past two days public opinion has been disturbed by reports that people are being transported in train coaches through Debrecen in the direction of Zahony. It has been announced from an authoritative place that such occurrences cannot take place in the future and that measures have been taken for the immediate return of the above-mentioned coaches.

The resolution of November 4 also requested the Secretary-General “to investigate the situation caused by foreign intervention in Hungary, to observe the situation directly through representatives named by him, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at the earliest moment. . . .” It called upon the then Government of Hungary
and the Government of the Soviet Union to permit observers designated by the Secretary-General "to enter the territory of Hungary, to travel freely therein, and to report their findings to the Secretary-General."

Mr. President, we have now received the report of the Secretary-General dated November 30 in which he informs us officially that "no information is available to the Secretary-General concerning steps taken in order to establish compliance with the decisions of the General Assembly which refer to a withdrawal of troops or related political matters."  

The Secretary-General also reports his effort to obtain permission from Hungarian authorities for observers to enter Hungary. So far no such permission has been given. With regard to the Secretary-General's offer to go personally to Budapest, we now learn that the Hungarian authorities are ready to welcome him—and I quote from the telegram which is on our desks this morning—"at a later date appropriate to both parties."

Mr. President, in all frankness let me say this sounds most unsatisfactory. Clearly the Secretary-General must be able to go there soon enough and with enough freedom for himself and his staff to do some good. Otherwise, his visit could not achieve a good result.

I am sure that the members of the General Assembly will agree that an invitation from the authorities of Hungary for the Secretary-General to visit that country at some remote distant date would not constitute compliance with the recommendations of the General Assembly.

It is incredible to us that a member of the United Nations would fail to respond promptly and affirmatively to an offer of a visit by the Secretary-General. Just think of what an implied self-accusation such a refusal is.

In his report the Secretary-General also informs us of the steps he has taken pursuant to paragraph 4 of the resolution of November 4, regarding an investigation of the situation caused by foreign intervention in Hungary. We welcome the announcement of the designation of Judge Gundersen, Mr. Lall, and Mr. Lleras 2 to assist the Secretary-General in carrying out these provisions.

The Secretary-General points out that this group has examined the material presently available to the Secretariat and concluded that it does not provide "a sufficient basis for a report to him at the present stage and that the group, moreover, deems it essential that its work should be supplemented and coordinated with such findings as might result from the process of direct observation in Hungary." We are also informed that the investigating group is continuing to examine the available material and that the cooperation of member governments will be required in order to furnish the group with information necessary for its report.

The United States will gladly furnish the official reports and information in its possession. We assume that other governments will cooperate in a similar way.

But it is clear that nothing can take the place of direct observation at the scene of these tragic events. That is why the United States has joined with 13 other sponsors in submitting the resolution that is now before the Assembly. 4

This resolution recalls the previous resolutions on Hungary and takes note of the failure of the Soviet Union and the Hungarian authorities to comply with the provisions of these resolutions.

The resolution then reiterates the Assembly's call upon the Soviet Union and the Hungarian authorities to permit United Nations observers to enter Hungary, to travel freely therein, and to report their findings to the Secretary-General.

It requests the Soviet Union and the Hungarian authorities to communicate to the Secretary-General not later than December 7 their consent to receive United Nations observers. The resolution also recommends that in the meantime the Secretary-General arrange for the immediate dispatch to Hungary and other countries as appropriate of observers named by him pursuant to paragraph 4 of the resolution of November 4.

Finally, the resolution requests all member governments to cooperate with the representatives named by the Secretary-General.

Mr. President, it is vital that we receive the information which impartial observers on the scene could obtain. There are many questions relative to our further consideration of this matter which such observation might help to answer.

---


3 Judge Oscar Gundersen of Norway, Arthur S. Lall of India, and Alberto Lleras of Colombia.

We need to know to what extent the Soviet Army has taken over the administration of the Hungarian government. We need to know if any of the persons who were deported have been returned to their homes. We should receive an authoritative account of the whereabouts of Imre Nagy and other members of his government and the circumstances of their detention in Rumania.

The observers should also seek to ascertain whether Soviet forces in Hungary are still being reinforced as is reported or whether at long last they are being withdrawn. They should be able to report to us on the reasons for the continuing flow of refugees out of Hungary, on the distribution of relief supplies, and the continuing needs of the Hungarian people.

These, Mr. President, are but a few of the many questions which observers on the spot can answer. The answers are to be found primarily in Hungary, and the observers must therefore gain access to that country. Some of the answers might be sought outside of Hungary from the thousands of refugees who are now located in many European and other countries. That is why our resolution provides for the observers going to Hungary and other countries as appropriate. It will certainly be necessary for them to visit countries bordering on Hungary, such as Rumania, to check on the movement of trains carrying deportees out of Hungary.

We very much hope that all governments concerned will cooperate with the Secretary-General’s representatives by extending such assistance and providing such facilities as may be necessary for the effective discharge of their responsibilities.

Mr. President, we are confronted by a demonstration of complete contempt—complete contempt—for the provisions of the charter and a callous disregard for human decency. It certainly cannot be said that we have proceeded too hastily or that we have not given the Soviet Union and the Hungarian authorities every opportunity to abide by their obligations as members of the United Nations.

The time has come for one final appeal, but we must set a deadline—a terminal date—for their response. We cannot permit ourselves to be fobbed off, to be stalled. We cannot permit the urgent recommendations of the General Assembly to be utterly disregarded.

If we here feel sometimes that our patience is

---

Text of Resolution

U.N. doc. A/Res/413

The General Assembly,


Having received and noted the report of the Secretary-General that United Nations observers have not been permitted to enter Hungary,

Noting with deep concern that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has failed to comply with the provisions of the United Nations resolutions calling upon it to desist from its intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary, to cease its deportations of Hungarian citizens and to return promptly to their homes those it has already deported, to withdraw its armed forces from Hungary and to cease its repression of the Hungarian people,

1. Reiterates its call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Hungarian authorities to comply with the above resolutions and to permit United Nations observers to enter the territory of Hungary, to travel freely therein and to report their findings to the Secretary-General;

2. Requests the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Hungarian authorities to communicate to the Secretary-General, not later than 7 December 1956, their consent to receive United Nations observers;

3. Recommends that in the meantime the Secretary-General arrange for the immediate dispatch to Hungary, and other countries as appropriate, of observers named by him pursuant to paragraph 4 of resolution 1004 (ES–II);

4. Requests the Governments of all Member States to co-operate with the representatives named by the Secretary-General by extending such assistance and providing such facilities as may be necessary for the effective discharge of their responsibilities.

---
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exhausted, just think of the ordeal of the workers and the peasants of Hungary whose courage alone sustained them. They have not submitted. And it is one of the proudest chapters in the history of the human race that they have not. On the contrary, they continue to employ the unbeatable
weapon of passive resistance, a weapon which the representative of India reminded us the other day is mightier than guns.

To use Lincoln's words, we here in this room cannot escape history. Let it never be said of us that we faltered, that we became discouraged, that we submitted quietly to the Soviet Union's contemptuous disregard for its obligations under the charter. Truth is mighty and will prevail. Let us energetically and effectively advance the United Nations' search for the truth about this inexpressible tragedy in Hungary.

FIRST STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 4

U.S. delegation press release 2543

The statement just made by the Hungarian spokesman [Imre Horvath] is very carefully worded, and the meaning is not completely clear in two different places.

He says he has "communicated his readiness at any time convenient to the Secretary-General to meet him to discuss settlement of the date and arrangements." It is not clear whether the words "any time convenient" apply to the meeting with the Secretary-General or whether it applies to the time of the visit.

Then he says "to meet him to discuss settlement of the date." He does not say to meet him to set a date, which would be a very different thing.

Mr. President, I intend to move that we recess this meeting for 1 hour, during which time the Secretary-General and the Hungarian spokesman can fix a definite date for the Secretary-General's visit. This I think is ample time.

I propose that, if the Secretary-General does not announce a definite date at the end of an hour, we should go ahead with our debate and pass the pending resolution.

Mr. President, I now move that we recess this meeting for 1 hour, during which time the Secretary-General and the Hungarian spokesman can fix a definite date for the Secretary-General's visit.

6 Following Ambassador Lodge's statement, President Wan Waithayakon proposed that the meeting be adjourned until 9:30 p.m. and Mr. Lodge agreed. The afternoon meeting ended at 4:45 p.m.

STATEMENT AT NIGHT MEETING OF DECEMBER 4

U.S. delegation press release 2546

We welcome the announcement of the Secretary-General, and we trust that his voyage and that of Mr. de Seynes 6 to Budapest will take place exactly as the Secretary-General desires. 7 We cannot be satisfied until these plans have become facts.

The pending resolution, to be sure, does not conflict with the Secretary-General's visit. It is a distinct proposition which stands on its own feet and is, among other things and as a new matter, directed to the immediate sending of observers to Hungary and to adjacent territories. The Secretary-General's visit not only does not conflict with the provisions of the pending resolution—they both complement each other and can go ahead concurrently.

The hour is late and I will close simply by saying this: that the first resolution on this diabolical situation in Hungary passed the General Assembly on November 4. Today is December 4. One month has gone by—one month in which nothing that is good has been accomplished, nothing but dark and bloody violence in the worst traditions of the Czars, of Lenin, of Stalin, and of Khrushchev.

There really is no time to lose, Mr. President. I hope our resolution can be voted promptly.

STATEMENT CIRCULATED ON DECEMBER 6

U.S. delegation press release 2546

I bring to the attention of the Assembly the seriousness of the report emanating from Hungary that the Hungarian regime has declined to receive the Secretary-General. It is vital to speak here and now to focus the attention of the Assembly on the consequences of this decision if it is true.

The General Assembly will remember that, on the afternoon of the 4th of December, the Hun-

6 Philippe de Seynes, U.N. Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs.
7 Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold had informed the Assembly that Mr. Horvath had agreed to suggest to his government that he (the Secretary-General) arrive in Budapest on Dec. 16 and that Mr. de Seynes arrive a week in advance.
The report of the Hungarian regime's decision not to receive the Secretary-General on that date—if it is true—raises the question in everyone's mind as to the good faith of the statement of the Hungarian spokesman here. It clearly suggests that either the Hungarian spokesman, who is designated as the Foreign Minister of that country, does not speak for the Hungarian Government or that—if he does—he does so to deceive and delude the Secretary-General and the General Assembly. In either case, he puts himself outside the pale of accepted international behavior and common decency.

The Assembly must consider what action it should take in these circumstances.

The United States intends to enter into immediate discussions with a view to determining what action would be most effective in the circumstances.

Meeting the Needs of the World's Refugees

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

Before commenting on the report which is now before the Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to express the profound regret of my Government at the untimely death of the High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. G. J. van Heuven Goedhart, and to pay tribute to his memory as a truly great humanitarian.

As High Commissioner he was a worthy successor to the great Fridtjof Nansen, High Commissioner for Refugees under the League of Nations, in whose memory the award of the Nansen Medal is made each year. It is particularly fitting that this year this medal should have been awarded posthumously to Dr. Goedhart.

In these dark days of renewed brutal oppression on the part of certain governments which is swelling the ranks of refugees by the thousands every day, we draw inspiration from the vision, fighting determination, and courage of the late High Commissioner.

Turning to the report of the High Commissioner which is now before the Committee, it is encouraging to note that, in spite of a chronic shortage of funds, substantial progress is being made in assisting the old-line refugees left behind in the wake of the Second World War and its aftermath. At the beginning of 1955 it was estimated that some 300,000 refugees coming within the High Commissioner's mandate were unsettled and needed assistance. Of these, more than 84,000 were in refugee camps. The High Commissioner's report indicates that the number of unsettled refugees has now been reduced to some 250,000 and the number in camps to about 70,000.

Progress has also been made in obtaining for refugees in many countries the right to work, the benefits of education, and public assistance. Concessions in these areas not only are of great importance to the status of unsettled refugees but also redound to the benefit of the hundreds of thousands of other refugees who have managed to establish themselves in new homes throughout the free world.

For the unsettled refugees, and more particularly for those in camps and for the so-called "difficult cases," the High Commissioner's office has

December 17, 1956
been especially active in administering the program of the United Nations Refugee Fund which the General Assembly authorized at its ninth session. This UNREF program, in addition to having a direct effect on the refugee problem, has within the space of a year stimulated a general awareness of and concern for the problems of the refugees whom it is seeking to assist. For example, in addition to the contributions to the fund by governments and private sources, including especially that of the Netherlands National Campaign, governments of the countries of residence have taken increasingly active measures on behalf of refugees. These measures have included the commitment of nearly $4 million in local contributions to the 1955 program from governments and other sources within the countries of asylum.

The importance of these efforts to integrate refugees in countries of residence has been repeatedly stressed by the High Commissioner. The establishment of such a program in which the countries of residence actively participate is indeed one of the major accomplishments of the High Commissioner. A great tribute is due to those countries which have made special efforts to take over difficult cases for permanent settlement, which include refugees who are tubercular, aged, or otherwise disabled.

Special tribute is due also to the outstanding work, noted in the report, of other agencies on behalf of refugees. Foremost among these are the great voluntary agencies which have for many years played and continue to play an indispensable role.

For all of these efforts we can be duly grateful, and I would like to express to the staff of the High Commissioner the great appreciation of my delegation.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, it is evident that the problem of settlement of the old-line refugees is far from solved. If there are still some 250,000 who require our aid, it is largely due to the chronic lack of funds. Only about half of the amount due under the 4-year program of $16 million in governmental contributions for permanent solutions has been received. This means that only about half of the program of permanent solutions scheduled for 1956 can be implemented this year. Many projects already approved have been held up because of lack of funds. This situation is such as to bring into question the seriousness with which member governments regard a special program which the General Assembly has decided to support. Indeed, the majority of governments which supported the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 832 (IX)\(^a\) are not among those who have contributed to UNREF. In this connection, I want to point out that my Government believes that special voluntary programs under the auspices of the United Nations should have general international support and that, when such support is not forthcoming, it is faced with considerable difficulties in justifying its own participation.

I am pleased to report that the Congress has appropriated $1,300,000 for the 1956 program and, in order to enable the United States contribution to be made early in the year, $600,000 for the first half of 1957. The payment of these contributions, $500,000 of which has already been made, will be related to the contributions from other governments. The total amount needed to complete the program of permanent solutions is $11,500,000 during the next 2½ years. Surely this comparatively small amount for such a great need can and should be raised without further delay.

If I have omitted reference to an important group of new refugees, Mr. Chairman, this is not because the plight of the Hungarian refugees is not one of deep concern to my Government. However, since the plenary session of the General Assembly has been seized with this problem, I shall not dwell on it at length nor suggest any action by this committee concerning the Hungarian refugees. But I should like to express my appreciation for the action taken by the Secretary-General and the Deputy High Commissioner [James M. Read] to determine and help meet the needs of the rising tide of Hungarian refugees, now estimated at over 50,000, and to bring about coordinated action on their behalf through governments, intergovernmental agencies, and nongovernmental organizations.

Offers of aid for the Hungarian refugees have been prompt and generous, but, in view of the magnitude of the problem, much more will be required. There is therefore a compelling need for all governments of good will to answer the appeals of the Secretary-General and the Deputy High Commissioner for aid to this new wave of refugees.

\(^a\) Bulletin of Nov. 8, 1954, p. 705.
Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, just one more word. New and heavy responsibilities are being placed upon the High Commissioner. We trust we shall all support him and all the other agencies giving assistance to the Hungarian refugees. We must not, however, permit the new problems arising from the Hungarian situation to diminish in any way support for the earlier refugees. As a matter of fact, this new crisis should lead us to increase our support for the regular work of the High Commissioner on behalf of these earlier refugees. They too are victims of oppression and international cataclysms. Many of them have suffered for years in camps. We cannot, we must not, neglect them, or the work we are now doing on behalf of refugees from Hungary will lose much of its meaning. By helping the earlier refugees we shall demonstrate to the new victims of terror that we are determined to see through the job of assuring all refugees from oppression a chance for a new life and that we shall not be content with half measures. Not only the lives and happiness of hundreds of thousands of people but the cause of freedom itself are at stake.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE III ON NOVEMBER 29

The General Assembly,


Taking note in particular of the addendum to his Report dealing with the effect of the short-fall in Governmental contributions to the United Nations Refugee Fund (A/3123/Add. 1),

Bearing in mind that under the Statute of his Office the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is charged with the duty of seeking solutions for the problems of refugees through voluntary repatriation, resettlement and integration,

Bearing in mind the provisions of part II of General Assembly resolution 308 of 9 November 1956 and General Assembly resolution 400 of 21 November 1956 on the problem of Hungarian refugees, the appeals of the Aus-

1 Introducted on Nov. 29 (U.N. doc. A/C.3/L.510/Rev. 1) ; sponsored by Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Turkey, U.K., and U.S.; adopted by a vote of 49 to 0, with 19 abstentions.
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Trian Government for assistance in dealing with this problem, and the response of Governments to these appeals,

Taking note of the statements of the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees on the steps so far taken by his Office to deal with the problem of Hungarian refugees and on the impact of this problem on the UNREF programme,

1. Expresses its appreciation of the efforts of the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees to implement the programme for permanent solutions of the existing refugee problem and to deal with the emergency situation created by the problem of Hungarian refugees,

2. Expresses its appreciation to the Austrian Government for the part it has played in receiving and assisting the refugees who have entered its territory,

3. Requests the High Commissioner to continue his efforts to effect solutions in accordance with the Statute of his Office and the UNREF programme, under due safeguards in accordance with his responsibility under the said Statute to provide international protection to refugees within his mandate,

4. Requests the High Commissioner in consultation with the Secretary-General and with the Governments concerned to develop a comprehensive assessment of the needs, both material and financial, of the Hungarian refugees to be submitted to the UNREF Executive Committee for its approval at the earliest possible date,

5. Expresses grave concern at the short-fall in the Governmental contributions to the United Nations Refugee Fund established at $16 million,

6. Urges all States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies to give early and serious consideration to making contributions to the United Nations Refugee Fund in order that the target for 1956 and 1957 may be reached and the High Commissioner enabled fully to implement the programme planned under that Fund,

7. Requests the United Nations High Commissioner to study with the UNREF Executive Committee the appropriate means to ensure the full implementation of the UNREF programme.

Progress in Reconstruction of Republic of Korea

STATEMENT BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

This item of our agenda affords the General Assembly an annual opportunity to review the work of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, and I want to thank the Agent

It is also a reminder of the encouraging and courageous manner in which the United Nations responded when the young organization first faced the challenge of armed aggression. It was a challenge to the very foundations of the United Nations—a test of the defense of peace and freedom through cooperative action.

The United Nations met that challenge on the battlefield. But from the very beginning of hostilities in Korea, its members recognized that the task extended beyond the battlefield—for the collective action of the United Nations and the Republic of Korea in defense of that country involved great and terrible loss of life, vast destruction of property, and almost complete disruption of the Korean economy.

The reconstruction of Korea and the rehabilitation of its people was an urgent call upon the collective conscience of the international community. The Korean Reconstruction Agency was the response of the United Nations to this call.

The subsequent work of the Agency and its accomplishments under the direction of its able chief, General Coulter, are well known to all of us. The scope of its contribution to Korea’s reconstruction is indicated in the report before us by the fact that projects of every description have been launched in every province of Korea at 4,235 places—projects for which materials or technical assistance have been provided by UNKRA. As the Agent General told us this morning, over 1,100 of these projects were completed during the year under review. A look at the table of contents of the Agent General’s report reminds us of the many facets of UNKRA’s work—in industry, in mining, in power, transport and communications, in housing and education, in health and sanitation.

Thus UNKRA’s activities have permeated the Korean economy. As the report of the Agent General tells us, “This has meant more classrooms and homes; more food and more consumer goods; more power and light; more financial aid for the small businessman; and new equipment for industrial establishments and mines.” In short, the Agency’s program is bringing lasting benefits to the Korean people.

The Korean people, of course, continue to face difficult economic problems. But we do have the satisfaction of witnessing noticeable improvements in Korea’s economic situation. While these improvements have resulted in large part from the determined efforts of the Korean people themselves, it is clear, as the Agent General points out, that they could not have been achieved without the substantial aid made available to Korea from abroad. As General Coulter has pointed out, the United Nations can be justly proud of the part played by UNKRA in these developments.

In recognition of UNKRA’s work, my delegation has the honor to cosponsor with the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Canada, and the United Kingdom a draft resolution which is designed to express sentiments which, I am sure, are shared by most of us.

I do not believe that the resolution requires any detailed explanation on my part. It would record the Assembly’s recognition and appreciation of a task well done by the Agent General and his associates. It would commend the Agent General for his response to the wish expressed in last year’s resolution that appropriate programs be expeditiously implemented to the maximum extent possible within available funds. It would recognize the valuable assistance given to UNKRA by the specialized agencies and the many voluntary non-governmental organizations. Their cooperation has made the UNKRA program a more effective one than it otherwise could have been. Finally, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution is designed to give effect to the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council that the Council be relieved of the burden of reviewing the Agent General’s report subsequent to the review of the report by the General Assembly itself, as has been the practice in previous years.

Mr. Chairman, last year the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds informed the Secretary-General that financial contributions to UNKRA had just about reached their limit. We regret that it has not been possible to do more in this direction. I feel, nevertheless, that we can be genuinely gratified that UNKRA has been able to accomplish so much on the basis of the contributions actually received. It stands as an unprecedented example of genuine collective cooperation.

\[^{2}\text{U.N. doc. A/3195.}\]

\[^{3}\text{Bulletin of Oct. 24, 1955, p. 672.}\]
with the people and the government of a stricken land.

Because there has been an Unkra, the sufferings of the Korean people have been at least partly alleviated and the ravages of war in Korea at least partly erased. In years to come, the Agency will continue to stand as a symbol not only in Korea but throughout the world of what cooperative action among nations has done to make life a little better, a little less burdensome for men, women, and children who were called upon to endure far more than human beings should.

RESOLUTION ON UNKRA

U.N. doc. A/Res/415

The General Assembly,
Recalling General Assembly resolutions 410 (V) of 1 December 1950, 701 (VII) of 11 March 1953, 725 (VIII) of 7 December 1953, 828 (IX) of 14 December 1954 and 920 (X) of 25 October 1955,
Taking note of the report of the Agent General on the work of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for the period 1 July 1953 to 30 June 1956, and of the comments thereon by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/3322],
Recognizing the particular importance of the Agency's programme for the relief and rehabilitation of the Republic of Korea,
Considering the recommendation contained in Economic and Social Council resolution 611 (XXI) of 24 April 1956, relating to submission to the Council of the reports of the Agent General,
1. Commands the Agent General of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for the excellent progress made by the Agency in pursuing its mission of assisting the Korean people to relieve the sufferings and to repair the devastation caused by aggression;
2. Commands the Agent General for the progress he has made in carrying out the desire expressed by the General Assembly that the approved programmes of the Agency be expeditiously implemented to the maximum extent possible within available funds;
3. Expresses appreciation for the valuable and continuing assistance given to the Agency by United Nations specialized agencies and by voluntary non-governmental organizations;
4. Decides to amend resolution 410 A (V), as follows:
   (a) From paragraph 5 (d), delete the words "and to the Economic and Social Council";
   (b) Delete paragraph 13 and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

Adopted by Committee II on Nov. 21 by a vote of 49 to 0, with 16 abstentions and by the plenary on Dec. 7, by a vote of 54 to 0, with 13 abstentions.
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TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Aviation

Agreement on joint financing of certain air navigation services in Greenland and the Faroe Islands. Done at Geneva September 25, 1956. Enters into force not earlier than January 1, 1957, when instruments of acceptance or accession have been deposited by Governments responsible for not less than 90 percent of the operating costs of the services.
Signatures: Denmark, France, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and United States.

Agreement on joint financing of certain air navigation services in Iceland. Done at Geneva September 25, 1956. Enters into force not earlier than January 1, 1957, when instruments of acceptance or accession have been deposited by Governments responsible for not less than 90 percent of the operating costs of the services.
Signatures: Denmark, France, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States.

Cultural Property

Ratification deposited: Ecuador, October 2, 1956.

Labor

Acceptance deposited: Spain, May 28, 1956.


Narcotic Drugs

Protocol for limiting and regulating cultivation of the poppy plant, production of, international and wholesale trade in, and use of opium. Done at New York June 23, 1953.
Ratification deposited: New Zealand (applicable also to the Cook Islands (including Niu), Tokelau Island, and the Trust Territory of Western Samoa), November 2, 1956.

Trade and Commerce

Signatures: Austria, October 24, 1956; Nicaragua, October 26, 1956; Burma, November 13, 1955.

1 "Subject to the availability of funds."
2 Not in force for the United States.
3 Not in force.
4 Subject to ratification.
Protocol of organizational amendments to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.¹

Signature: Nicaragua, October 26, 1956; Burma, November 13, 1956.


Signature: Nicaragua, October 26, 1956.

Protocol amending part I and articles XXIX and XXX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.²

Signatures: Nicaragua, October 26, 1956; Burma, November 13, 1956.

Protocol amending preamble and parts II and III of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.³

Signatures: Nicaragua, October 26, 1956; Burma, November 13, 1956.


Signatures: Nicaragua, October 26, 1956; Ceylon, November 13, 1956.

Protocol of rectification concerning the protocol amending part I and articles XXIX and XXX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the protocol amending the preamble and parts II and III of the general agreement, and the protocol of organizational amendments to the general agreement. Done at Geneva December 3, 1955.

Signatures: Czechoslovakia, October 23, 1956; Nicaragua, October 26, 1956; Burma, November 13, 1956.

Fifth protocol of rectifications and modifications to texts of schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva December 3, 1955.⁴

Signatures: India, October 22, 1956; Czechoslovakia, October 23, 1956; Japan, October 24, 1956; Nicaragua, October 26, 1956; Burma and Ceylon, November 13, 1956.

Weather


Accession deposited: Sudan, December 3, 1956.

Whaling

Protocol amending the international whaling convention of 1946 (TIAS 1849). Open for signature at Washington through December 3, 1956.⁵

Signatures: United States, November 29, 1956; Canada and Netherlands, November 30, 1956; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, December 1, 1956; Brazil, France, New Zealand, Norway, and Union of South Africa, December 3, 1956.

Wheat


Accessions deposited: Belgium, Costa Rica, Federal Republic of Germany, France, and Mexico, November 30, 1956; Egypt and Liberia, December 1, 1956.

Accessions deposited: Honduras, November 30, 1956; Indonesia and Venezuela, December 1, 1956.

Date of entry into force: July 16, 1956, for parts 1, 3, 4, and 5; August 1, 1956, for part 2.

BILATERAL

Dominican Republic


France


Japan

Agreement supplementing the understandings to the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of February 10, 1956 (TIAS 3580), by providing for the partial use of loan funds for a factory site. Effective by exchange of notes at Tokyo November 13, 1956. Entered into force November 13, 1956.

Vatican

Agreement for the exchange of international money orders. Signed at Vatican City November 24, 1955, and at Washington December 22, 1955. Entered into force November 1, 1956 (date mutually agreed upon by the two parties).

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Resignations

Herbert Hoover, Jr., as Under Secretary of State, effective about February 1. (For an exchange of correspondence between President Eisenhower and Mr. Hoover, see White House press release dated December 8.)

Recess Appointments

The President on December 4 appointed Douglas MacArthur II to be Ambassador to Japan. (For biographic details, see press release 607 dated December 4.)
Foreign Relations of the United States . . .

The basic source of information on
U.S. diplomatic history

1942, China

This volume is the first of a series which will cover the relations of the United States and China for the years 1942-49. It deals with the first year in which the United States was at war in the Far East, and the subjects treated are for the most part directly related to the war effort. The documents tell of conditions in China, which was isolated from the other Allies by Japan's operations in the South Pacific. They tell also of the problems caused by that isolation and by the early concentration of Allied war effort against Germany.

The present volume tells the story of relations with China chiefly as viewed by the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Treatment of military matters is given as a necessary part of the diplomatic picture. For further study on military affairs citation is given in the preface to narrative histories published by the Departments of the Army and Air Force. Likewise matters of primary concern to the Treasury Department and to special wartime agencies are covered only so far as they were of diplomatic importance.

The major emphasis in this volume is on the following subjects: general wartime relations between the United States and China; political conditions in China including Sino-Soviet relations and threatened Kuomintang-Communist conflict; negotiations for relinquishing by the United States of extraterritorial rights in China; financial relations between the United States and China.

Copies of Foreign Relations of the United States, 1942, China may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for $3.75 each.
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General Assembly Condemns Soviet Violation of U. N. Charter, Calls Again for Withdrawal of Troops From Hungary

Following are texts of statements made in the General Assembly by U.S. Representative Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., on the situation in Hungary, together with a resolution adopted by the Assembly on December 12.

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 10

U.S. delegation press release 2550

All else having failed, the General Assembly now comes to a solemn climax and must face the issue of voting a condemnation of the Soviet Union for its brutality against the tragic and valorous Hungarian people.

There can be no doubt about the two sets of facts: what has happened in Hungary and what has happened in the United Nations.

In Hungary we have seen a sequence of events which is indistinguishable in essence from the kind of thing which was done by Adolf Hitler in World War II. We have seen the suppression of a small country by a large, powerful dictatorship; we have seen the large and powerful dictatorship put its agents in control of that small country; we have seen the local puppet government make a treaty with the large external dictatorship authorizing it to tamper in every respect with the internal affairs of the small country; and, finally, we have seen the people of that country left with only their own personal valor to stand between them and the large external dictatorship. This is the kind of thing that happened under Adolf Hitler to small countries, it is what happened under Josef Stalin, and it is what is happening in Hungary now under Khrushchev. There is no essential difference between what is being done by the Soviet Union today and what was done by Nazi Germany in its day.

There is equally no doubt as to what has happened here in the United Nations. We have been extraordinarily patient and persistent in exhausting every single remedy which the charter authorizes us to use.

The record of General Assembly action on the situation in Hungary begins with the resolution adopted on November 4, the very day Russian troops began to take over the country. Since then eight more resolutions have been adopted.

And in order that we may have perspective, I would like to summarize our actions here.

On November 4, in A/Res/393, this Assembly called upon the Government of the Soviet Union to stop its armed attack on the people of Hungary. It called upon the Soviet Union to withdraw all of its forces without delay from Hungarian territory. It called upon the Government of the Soviet Union and Hungary to permit observers designated by the Secretary-General to enter into Hungary, to travel freely therein, and to report their findings. It called upon all members to cooperate in making available to the Hungarian people food, medicine, and other supplies. The response of the Assembly to the tragic situation in Hungary was immediate.

On November 9, in A/Res/397, this call was repeated, and on that same day, in A/Res/398, we asked for emergency assistance to the growing number of refugees from Hungary. On November 9 also, in response to the extreme suffering to which the Hungarian people were being subjected, all members of the United Nations were asked, in A/Res/399, to participate in giving immediate aid by furnishing medical supplies, foodstuffs, and clothing.

On November 10, the item concerning the situa-

\[1\] *Bulletin* of Nov. 19, 1956, p. 803.
\[2\] Ibid., p. 806.
\[3\] Ibid., p. 807.
tion in Hungary was transferred to the agenda of the 11th regular session (A/Res/401), and on November 16 the Secretary-General appointed a committee of three to investigate the information available regarding the situation in Hungary (A/3339).

On November 21 we again asked for the admission of observers and demanded that the Soviet Union stop its brutal program of deportations. We demanded that those who had been deported be returned promptly to their homes. Two resolutions (A/Res/407 and 408) were passed with overwhelming support in one day.

On that same day—November 21—we urged, in A/Res/409, that governments and nongovernmental organizations make contributions for the care and resettlement of Hungarian refugees. Efforts made to meet the problem of Hungarian refugees were described in a report by the Secretary-General on November 30 in document A/3405.

After receiving the report of the Secretary-General of November 30 (A/3403) noting that no information was available to him concerning steps taken in order to establish compliance with decisions of the Assembly which refer to withdrawal of troops or related political matters, the Assembly met again on December 4 to consider the situation in Hungary.

On that day, in A/Res/413, the Assembly called once more for compliance with its previous resolution. The Assembly recommended that the Secretary-General arrange for immediate dispatch to Hungary and other countries as appropriate of observers named by him pursuant to the Assembly’s first resolution on Hungary. A deadline of December 7 was set for a reply from the Soviet Union and Hungary to the request for admission of observers.

Since then, Mr. President, we have been met with continuing and complete obstruction by the Soviet Union. At 1 minute past midnight on last Saturday morning, the deadline of December 7 set by the Assembly for a response to the request for admission of observers passed. Although the Government of Austria has communicated its willingness to receive observers, observers have not been permitted to enter Hungary. Soviet troops have not been withdrawn. The proposed date for the Secretary-General’s visit to Budapest has not been granted and has been met with a wall of silence. We have no reports of any return of deportees to Hungary.

These actions show that there has been a magnificent response by the people the world over to the plight of the Hungarian people. But all of the resolutions calling for action by the Soviet Union have been ignored by them and by their Hungarian agents. We have seen an unparalleled demonstration of the flouting by a single state of the repeatedly recorded wishes of an overwhelming majority of the nations of the world.

In the words of President Eisenhower’s Human Rights Day statement, which was published in the newspapers this morning, we have seen the Soviet Union impose a terror upon Hungary—a terror, Mr. President, upon Hungary—which “repudiates and negates almost every article in the Declaration of Human Rights.”

As the President said of the terror imposed by the Soviet Union on Hungary:

It denies that men are born free and equal in dignity and rights and that all should act in the spirit of brotherhood.

It denies the right to life, liberty, and security of person.

It denies the principle that no one shall be subjected to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.

It denies that no person shall be arbitrarily arrested, detained, or exiled.

It denies that all are equal before the law and entitled to its equal protection.

It denies the right to fair and public hearings by an independent and impartial tribunal.

It denies the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

It denies the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

It denies the right to freedom of peaceful assembly.

It denies that the individual may not be held in slavery or servitude.

It denies that the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government.

That these human rights have been so flagrantly repudiated is cause for worldwide mourning.

Yes, Mr. President, at 1 minute after midnight last Saturday morning the deadline passed for a reply authorizing the entrance of observers into Hungary—and yet the tragedy goes on.

Thomas Jefferson said, and the President quoted him, too, the human spirit knows that “the God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time.”

The President added, "The courage and sacrifices of the brave Hungarian people have consecrated that spirit anew."

The truth is that this uprising in Hungary is an uprising of youth. This makes it the deadliest of condemnations, the most abject of failures, of the whole Soviet system; of its middle-aged inability to sense the modern mood; of its ritualism; of its monstrosity; and of how completely it carries within itself the seeds of its own dissolution. That system based itself on the idea that, if what they call "the dictatorship of the proletariat" would only stay in power long enough, the new generation would grow up without ever having known anything else and would therefore be solidly, dependably Communist.

Now, we have seen the failure of that whole idea. The trouble with this idea—and with the whole Marxist idea, for that matter—is that it ignores that which is noble and spiritual in human nature and sees the world through the prism of Karl Marx's bitter and self-pitying frustration. It totally ignores what Abraham Lincoln called "the better angels of our nature."

Mr. President, the repudiation of the Soviet system by the youth of Hungary is a deadly blow to Soviet prestige which will continue to shrink in world standing and influence as snow melts in the summer sun.

Let us vote this resolution, Mr. President, so that the world may know of our condemnation.

**STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 12**

U.S. delegation press release 2553

We thought it might be useful to make a detailed statement of our opinion on the amendments to the 20-power draft resolution submitted by Ceylon, India, and Indonesia in document A/L.216. We note that these amendments are drawn largely from the language of the draft resolution submitted by these delegations and Burma which is contained in document A/3437.

Let me say first that there is much in these amendments of which we approve. They contain, in fact, a resounding condemnation of the action of the Soviet Union in Hungary. This is further proof that the oppression of the Hungarian people by the armed forces of the Soviet Union has evoked a feeling of revulsion not alone in Europe, not alone in the Americas, but throughout the whole world.

We welcome this expression of agreement, but we must also consider the fact that most of the ideas contained both in the resolution and in these amendments have already been expressed in past resolutions on this question. There is, obviously, no point in a mere reiteration of past views at this stage. The time has come for a careful and sober appraisal of the situation and for a deliberate and solemn expression of our convictions about it.

In doing this we think it is important that we should not give the appearance of retreating from principles on which we have agreed by such overwhelming majorities.

The first proposed amendment would delete the second and third preambular paragraphs of our resolution. We cannot accept this amendment because we are convinced that there is not one sentiment in these two paragraphs with which the overwhelming majority of this Assembly is not in complete agreement.

The second proposed amendment is advanced as a substitution for the sixth paragraph in the preamble of our resolution. This paragraph in our resolution reads as follows:

**Considering** that recent events have clearly demonstrated the will of the Hungarian people to recover their liberty and independence.

We see no reason to delete this paragraph. Surely this is a statement on which every member of this Assembly can agree. But we believe that the language proposed in the second amendment offered by Ceylon, India, and Indonesia is a useful addition to our resolution and we have therefore incorporated it as the final paragraph in our preamble. I would like to read the language:

**Noting** the overwhelming demand of the Hungarian people for the cessation of intervention of foreign armed forces and the withdrawal of foreign troops.

The third proposed amendment expresses ideas which are largely covered in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of our resolution, and we therefore do not believe that it would be useful to add them. Certainly we could not agree to substitute it for our first operative paragraph, which declares that the Government of the Soviet Union is violating the political independence of Hungary. Here again we do not see how any member of this Assembly can disagree with this finding. Moreover, we do
not think it is accurate to speak of the reaction of the Hungarian people to the oppression which they have suffered as "non-cooperation," which is the expression used in this amendment. Surely no one would properly expect any people to cooperate with oppression.

The fourth proposed amendment would appear to have as one of its objectives the deletion of our second operative paragraph, and that is the paragraph that condemns the violation of the charter by the Soviet Union. Frankly, as many speakers have said in the past few days, we believe that the time has come for this Assembly to express its condemnation of the Soviet action in depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental rights.

The fifth and final proposed amendment would substitute three paragraphs for operative paragraph 4 of our resolution. Here again we can see no reason to delete paragraph 4 from our text, which merely calls upon the Soviet Union to withdraw and which we are convinced reiterates the views of the overwhelming majority of this Assembly.

We fully share the view that the use of force and the use of violence in Hungary has aggravated the plight of the Hungarian people and has denied them their freedom. But this paragraph of the proposed amendment is ambiguous. As presently drafted, it could be construed as a reflection on the Hungarian people for having resisted their oppressors. And, of course, we cannot accept that.

The same fault is present in the proposed paragraph which appears at the top of page 2 of document A/L.216. It speaks of foreign intervention and external pressure in the abstract. The facts as known to all of us are that the intervention and pressure has come from the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union has refused to allow any investigators to go in to see whether there has been any pressure from anywhere else.

The final paragraph of the proposed amendments—the one which refers to the Secretary-General—is not acceptable to us for several reasons. We believe that the Secretary-General has sufficient authority under the charter to do whatever he thinks would be helpful in the Hungarian situation. If he decides that it would be helpful to go to Moscow, he would undoubtedly do so, just as he decided, very properly but on his own responsibility, to go to Peking in behalf of the American flyers members of the United Nations force who were held in Communist China. Moreover, we have already in our resolution of November 4 asked him "as soon as possible [to] suggest methods to bring an end to the foreign intervention in Hungary in accordance with the principles of the Charter." It seems to us that this constitutes an adequate and a more proper mandate for the exercise of his good offices or any other appropriate initiative he may consider helpful in the situation.

But, Mr. President, because we have noted a widespread desire to call attention once more to the possibility of a constructive use of the Secretary-General’s good offices, as for example in the Austrian resolution, we have added a new and final paragraph to our resolution:

5. Requests the Secretary-General to take any initiative that he deems helpful in relation to the Hungarian problem in conformity with the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly.

These are the reasons, Mr. President, why the United States must oppose these proposed amendments. But in doing so let me draw the Assembly’s attention to the great effort made by the group of sponsors of the resolution contained in document A/3436 to give expression to the widest possible consensus of views, including the views expressed in these amendments. We, the sponsors, have exercised great care in our choice of language to avoid certain things which have created difficulties for some delegations on past resolutions. We have chosen to stress those aspects of this matter on which we believe the overwhelming majority of this Assembly is in full agreement.

We have made a good-faith effort to ascertain the views of the members of the Assembly. Our resolution is in essence a summation up of the consensus of the General Assembly as nearly as we, the 20 sponsors, have been able to get it. For that reason we believe it deserves the support of every delegation which has declared its sympathy for the valiant struggle of the Hungarian people.\[a\]

---


[a] Before voting on the 20-power draft, the Assembly rejected the first, third, fourth, and fifth amendments contained in A/L 216; the second amendment did not come to a vote. After adoption of the 20-power proposal, the draft submitted by Burma, Ceylon, India, and Indonesia (A/3437) was withdrawn; the Austrian delegation also withdrew its draft resolution (A/3441).
TEXT OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED DECEMBER 12


The General Assembly,
Deeply concerned over the tragic events in Hungary,
Recalling those provisions of its resolutions 1004 (ES-II) of 4 November 1956, 1005 (ES-II) of 9 November 1956, A/Res/407 of 21 November 1956 and A/Res/413 of 4 December 1956, calling upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to desist from its intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary, to withdraw its forces from Hungary and to cease its repression of the Hungarian people,
Recalling also those provisions of its resolutions 1004 (ES-II) and A/Res/407, calling for permission for United Nations observers to enter the territory of Hungary, to travel freely therein and to report their findings to the Secretary-General,
Having received the report of the Secretary-General (A/3403) of 30 November 1956 stating that no information is available to the Secretary-General concerning steps taken in order to establish compliance with the decisions of the General Assembly which refer to a withdrawal of troops or related political matters, and the note of the Secretary-General (A/3455) of 7 December 1956,
Noting with grave concern that there has not been a reply to the latest appeal of the General Assembly for the admission of United Nations observers to Hungary, as contained in its resolution A/Res/413,
Considering that recent events have clearly demonstrated the will of the Hungarian people to recover their liberty and independence,
Noting the overwhelming demand of the Hungarian people for the cessation of intervention of foreign armed forces and the withdrawal of foreign troops,
1. Declares that, by using its armed force against the Hungarian people, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is violating the political independence of Hungary;
2. Condemns the violation of the Charter by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental rights;
3. Recommends its call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to desist forthwith from any form of intervention in the internal affairs of Hungary;
4. Calls upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to make immediate arrangements for the withdrawal, under United Nations observation, of its armed forces from Hungary and to permit the re-establishment of the political independence of Hungary;
5. Requests the Secretary-General to take any initiative that he deems helpful in relation to the Hungarian problem, in conformity with the principles of the Charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly.

Developments Relating to Hungarian Relief Activities

Following are two statements which were released to the press by the White House (Augusta, Ga.) on December 12.

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON'S TRIP TO AUSTRIA

The President has requested the Vice President to make a brief trip to Austria as his personal representative. The Vice President will depart on December 18 and return December 23.

The purpose of the Vice President’s trip, concurred in by the Secretary of State, is to consult with American, Austrian, and international officials as to problems relating to relief and resettlement of Hungarian refugees and to visit while there as many as possible of those who have recently escaped from oppression. The announcement of the trip is being made with the approval of the Austrian Government.

Although the United States and other free-world countries have already taken steps to admit and move to their countries many thousands of refugees and have made substantial public and private relief contributions, much remains to be done.

A disproportionate burden has been placed on the courageous and humanitarian Republic of Austria. In spite of the many thousands of Hungarian refugees who have been able to move further to the west, there still remain within the small territory of Austria as of today nearly 80,000 recently arrived refugees. In spite of financial aid, foodstuffs, and other emergency supplies which have been contributed by other nations, the drain on Austria’s resources has been great.

As a result of this trip, the Vice President plans to report to the President and to the Congress on the full scope of what is necessary and practicable and to recommend what further steps should be taken by the United States for the relief of this suffering. He will also carry to the Hungarian refugees and to the Austrian people the sympathetic good wishes of the President and of the American people.

The Vice President will depart by air following a luncheon he is giving for the Prime Minister of India on December 18. Because of the limited time available, the Vice President will not stop in any other countries except Austria.
CREATION OF REFUGEE RELIEF COMMITTEE

The President today announced creation of the President’s Committee for Hungarian Refugee Relief.

In recently appointing Tracy S. Voorhees as his representative in connection with Hungarian refugee relief and resettlement activities, the President directed him, among other duties, to assure full coordination of the work of the voluntary agencies with each other and with the Government agencies involved and to see that effective machinery is promptly set up for this purpose. Acting upon Mr. Voorhees’ recommendation that the best organization to accomplish this is a small group of persons actively interested in this field of endeavor, including representatives of the principal religious faiths currently concerned with this problem, the President today appointed the committee with the following initial membership:

Lewis W. Douglas, honorary chairman
Tracy S. Voorhees, chairman
J. Lawton Collins, vice chairman and director
William Hallam Tuck, vice chairman
Leo C. Beebe
Alfred M. Gruenther
Lewis Hoskins
Mrs. John C. Hughes
John A. Krout
Moses Leavitt
George Meany
Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom
Charles P. Taft
R. Norris Wilson
William J. Donovan, counsel

In addition to its coordinating functions, the committee will be a focal point to which offers of assistance to refugees, such as jobs, homes, and educational opportunities, can be directed and referred to the appropriate agencies.

The functions of the committee, the President said, will not include fund-raising. The committee will support in every way possible the various religious and other voluntary groups which are already so devotedly engaged in work for these refugees. It will assist in coordinating their efforts, particularly those related to the work of the responsible Government agencies concerned with this program.

The committee will have a head office in Washington and an office at Camp Kilmer, where much of the work will be done in close contact with the voluntary agencies. Mr. Tuck will be the committee’s representative in Austria, acting in a liaison capacity with the American Ambassador, Llewellyn E. Thompson.

The members of the committee will serve without compensation. No expenses of the committee will be paid from any funds raised for Hungarian refugee relief.

Protest to Hungary Concerning Communications With Budapest

Following is the text of a U.S. note concerning interruption of communications with the American Legation at Budapest which was handed to Tibor Zador, the Hungarian Chargé d’Affaires at Washington, on December 10.¹

Press release 618 dated December 10

The Acting Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Chargé d’Affaires ad interim of the Hungarian People’s Republic and brings the following to his urgent attention:

For a period of more than 24 hours beginning on December 9 the American Legation in Budapest was again deprived of normal telegraphic communications facilities. While the Hungarian Foreign Office transmitted one message on behalf of the Legation during this period, it refused to accept enciphered material.

It is an accepted principle of international law, as the United States Government has recently pointed out to Hungarian authorities, that diplomatic missions have the right at all times and under all circumstances to communicate freely and privately with their governments. Hungarian authorities have now within a brief period disregarded this principle for the second time. While the Department of State is again receiving some telegrams from the Legation in Budapest, it has no assurance that normal communications facilities have been restored.

The United States Government strongly protests this interruption of telegraphic facilities and expects that the Hungarian authorities will prevent such an interruption in the future.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

¹ For an account of a conversation between Deputy Under Secretary Murphy and Mr. Zador on the cutting off of communications, see Bulletin of Nov. 5, 1956, p. 701.
Results of Ministerial Meeting of North Atlantic Council

Following is the text of a statement issued by Secretary Dulles on December 15 after reporting to President Eisenhower on the North Atlantic Council meeting at Paris December 11-14, together with a statement which the Secretary made on his arrival at Paris and the communiqué issued at the close of the Council meeting.

SECRETARY DULLES' STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 15

White House press release

We went to the North Atlantic Council meeting knowing that it would be an important meeting. It turned out to be both important and productive.

There was a realistic facing up to difficulties and dangers, and an evident purpose to overcome them. We return with renewed hope that this purpose will be realized.

Our meetings, both formal and informal, helped to restore a sense of fellowship which will enable NATO to become an even more solid structure for the defense of the treaty area.

In order better to assure the defense of the Atlantic Community, the Council directed a fresh military study, which would take account of modern weapons, available resources, and the cooperative sharing of burdens and responsibilities.

We also agreed on measures to strengthen the nonmilitary aspects of NATO. This action involved acceptance of the recommendations of the three Ministers who had been studying this matter since last May. These recommendations call for a more thoroughgoing system of consultation and also for further measures designed to assure the peaceful settlement of any future disputes between member countries.

The United States of course did not enter into any commitments which affected other friendly nations which were not in Paris to be consulted.

I have reported fully to President Eisenhower, and he shares my own sense of satisfaction that the Atlantic Community is showing renewed evidence of vigor and unity for its security and well-being.

SECRETARY'S STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 9

I am glad to be again in France, which I have visited so often and respect and admire so much.

This time I come to attend the NATO Ministerial Meeting and to have talks with French and other leaders who will be here. We shall have to prove that, although we may differ in some matters, nevertheless we remain united in vital matters. The task, illustrated by recent events, is to assure unity and strength as against the threat of aggression, a threat which became a brutal reality in Hungary. Also, the Western European nations must find a way to maintain their economies despite the present interruption in the normal flow of oil from the Mideast.

The United States stands ready to help in both respects. It is our firm purpose to find the way to bury past discords in a future of peaceful and fruitful cooperation.

TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE, DECEMBER 14

The North Atlantic Council met in Ministerial Session from 11th to 14th December, under the Chairmanship of Professor Gaetano Martino, Foreign Minister of Italy, and took decisions that will strengthen the military and non-military cooperation of the Alliance.

1. In the meeting just ended, the Ministers drew from the experience of past divergences in the policies of NATO members the confirmation of the necessity for all members to develop effective political consultation and cooperation. They reaffirmed their determination to work together in unity and friendship to achieve the aims of the Alliance and to strengthen the Alliance in all its

1 Made to correspondents at Orly Airfield, Paris.
3. As a major forward step in the development of NATO in the non-military field, the Council approved the recommendations of the Committee of Three in their report to the Council. In doing so, the Council approved wider and more intimate consultation among the member states on political matters. The Council also approved arrangements to aid in the settlement of disputes among members and adopted measures for strengthening the organization of NATO internally and for further cooperation between members in certain economic and cultural fields. The report has been released by the Committee of Three.

4. The Council reviewed the international situation, discussing frankly the problems which confront the Atlantic Alliance. In the course of this discussion Ministers, realizing that their views were in general agreement, decided that the detail should be worked out by continuous consultation in the Council in the months ahead.

5. The Atlantic Alliance is primarily concerned with the threat to the security of the NATO area. The Council discussed the threat which Soviet penetration into the Middle East would present for NATO. In view of the fact that the security, stability and well-being of this area are essential for the maintenance of world peace, the Council agreed to keep developments in this area under close and continuing observation.

6. Council members emphasised in particular the need for rapid progress in clearing the Suez Canal in conformity with the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly of 2nd November last. The Ministers further stressed the urgent need for initiating and pressing to a conclusion negotiations through the good offices of the United Nations with a view to restoring the Canal to full and free operation. They endorsed, as the basis on which a lasting settlement should be worked out, the six principles agreed upon by the United Nations Security Council on 13th October. They also agreed on the urgent need to bring about, through the United Nations, a permanent political settlement between Israel and the Arab States, including an equitable solution of the Arab refugee problem. The need for adequate support for economic development of the area was recognised.

7. The Council members have followed the course of events in Hungary with shock and revulsion. The brutal suppression of the heroic Hungarian people stands in stark contrast with Soviet public professions. The Council reaffirmed the conviction of its Member Governments that the United Nations should continue its efforts, through the pressure of world public opinion, to induce the Soviets to withdraw their forces from Hungary and to right the wrongs done to the Hungarian people. The peoples of Eastern Europe should have the right to choose their own governments freely, unaffected by external pressure and the use or threat of force, and to decide for themselves the political and social order they prefer.

8. The Ministers examined the implications for NATO of Soviet policy and actions in Europe and elsewhere. In the light of their assessment of Soviet policy they were in full agreement on the need to face up to any threat which would endanger the security and freedom of the Atlantic Community. In this connection, the Council approved a directive for future military plans, taking into account the continued rise in Soviet capabilities and the various types of new weapons available for NATO defence. The concept of forward defence in NATO strategy will be maintained. The Council considered the Report on the 1956 Annual Review and approved force goals for 1957, 1958 and 1959.

9. The Council expressed their deep regret at the decision of Lord Ismay to retire this spring as Secretary General of the Organisation and paid tribute to his distinguished services to the Alliance. Mr. Paul-Henri Spaak, the Foreign Minister of Belgium, was appointed as Lord Ismay's successor.

10. The Council adopted the two annexed resolutions.

---

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

84th Congress, 1st Session


84th Congress, 2d Session


---

1 Texts of these resolutions, together with the report of the Committee of Three, will appear in the Bulletin of Jan. 7, 1957.
The United States Balance of Payments With Latin America During the First Half of 1956

by Walther Lederer and Nancy F. Culbertson

Business between the Latin American Republics as a whole and the United States expanded rapidly during the first half of 1956. Total payments by the United States, mainly for imports of goods and services and in the form of net private and Government loans and investments, increased by $350 million, or nearly 15 percent, over total payments in the first half of last year. Receipts from Latin America, mainly from sales of goods and services and income on United States investments, advanced by about the same amount over the same period. The balance of the transactions between Latin America and the United States was, therefore, virtually the same as a year earlier, with United States payments exceeding receipts by about $60 million. However, Latin American gold and dollar assets increased during the first 6 months of 1956 by about $178 million, while the rise during the corresponding period last year had been only $62 million. The excess of the increase in Latin American gold and dollar assets over recorded net payments by the United States indicates either that the preliminary estimates used here did not include all payments by the United States or overvalued some United States receipts, or that Latin American countries had net receipts of gold and dollars from transactions with countries other than the United States.

Business Expansion Well Balanced

Total United States payments during the January–June 1956 period were higher than during any previous half-year period. The previous peak in payments was during the first half of 1951, when United States imports were at a temporary high as a result of the buying spurt and the high prices following the outbreak of the war in Korea. United States receipts during the first half of this year were about as high as in the second half of 1951, when many of the Latin American countries had expanded their purchases in the United States following their own high sales. At that time, in order to finance these high purchases, some Latin American countries had to draw heavily on their gold and dollar reserves or incur heavy debts, which ultimately led to the imposition of restrictions on imports.

In contrast, not only could the rising expenditures by these countries in the United States during the first half of this year be financed from current incomes, but the substantial additions to gold and dollar holdings indicate that the expansion in transactions during the first half of this year was on a comparatively firm basis. Although there are some weak points in the picture, they are more than compensated for by the favorable developments.

This article is the second of a series on the balance of payments between the United States and the Latin American Republics; the first, which summarized the period 1940-55, appeared in the Bulletin of March 26, 1956, p. 521.

Mr. Lederer and Mrs. Culbertson are members of the Balance of Payments Division, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce. The data on which this article is based were prepared by the Balance of Payments Division and published in the September 1956 issue of the Survey of Current Business, the monthly periodical of the Office of Business Economics.
United States Balance of Payments With the Latin American Republics
by Half Years
1953-First Half of 1956

[Millions of dollars]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services including investment income</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government grants and other transfers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct investments, net</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private United States capital, net</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>-157</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Government capital, net</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total payments</td>
<td>2,473</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>2,446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United States receipts

| Merchandise             | 1,491     | 1,567     | 1,609     | 1,729     | 1,588     | 1,708     | 1,861     |
| Income on investments   | 298       | 313       | 297       | 348       | 370       | 431       | 420       |
| Services               | 353       | 360       | 340       | 356       | 353       | 372       | 387       |
| Total receipts         | 2,142     | 2,240     | 2,246     | 2,433     | 2,311     | 2,511     | 2,668     |
| Balance of transactions with the United States [net United States payments (-)] | -331     | 92        | -200      | 56        | -61       | 59        | -57       |
| Increase in Latin American dollar assets | 181      | -57       | 245       | -9        | 62        | -105      | 178       |
| Increase in Latin American gold holdings 2 | 150      | -100      | 25        | -25       | -25       | -25       | -25       |
| Unrecorded transactions of the United States with Latin America and transactions of Latin America with other areas [net gold and dollar receipts by Latin America (-)] | -35      | 55        | -72       | -1        | 71        | -121      | -121      |

Source: Balance of Payments Division, Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce.
1 Excluding transfers of military supplies and services under grant-aid programs.
2 Estimated by the International Monetary Fund. Changes in gold holdings include gold transactions with other countries as well as the United States.

Payments to Latin America Reach New Peak

The $350 million increase in United States payments to Latin America over the first 6 months of last year consisted of a $250 million increase in merchandise imports, a $60 million rise in direct investments, and additional expenditures of $30 million for services.

Excluding petroleum, merchandise imports into the United States during the first 6 months of this year approached in value those of the first half of 1953; with petroleum included, they exceeded the 1953 figure slightly. Compared with last year, however, many commodities were in higher demand; petroleum accounted for only $47 million of the $250 million import rise.

The 15 percent increase in the value of imports reflected almost entirely a rise in volume; average prices were nearly the same as a year earlier. Nevertheless, there were substantial differences in the price movements for different commodities. Prices of foodstuffs, mainly coffee and cocoa, were lower than a year earlier, whereas the major non-ferrous metals advanced in price. The expansion in the value of imports was concentrated in foodstuffs, petroleum, unmanufactured wool, non-ferrous metals, and iron ore.

Coffee and sugar accounted for most of the rise in the value of imported foodstuffs; imports of cocoa were smaller. The rise in the value of coffee imports by $100 million over the first half of last year did not fully reflect the 28 percent increase in volume since prices were about 10 percent lower than last year. During the first half of last year, imports were low because United States stocks were drawn down in anticipation of further price declines. As price declines stopped around the middle of last year, imports increased again; toward the end of the year inventories were replenished. During the first 6 months of this year, imports may also have been somewhat accelerated to permit additions to stocks. However, price rises during the first half of this year were not yet fully reflected in import values. With these two compensating factors, it seems
Major United States Exports to Latin America by Half Years, 1953—First Half of 1956

[Millions of dollars]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks and buses</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron and steel mill products and metal manufactures</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger automobiles</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile manufactures</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuffs</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total exports</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau of the Census and Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce.

1 The total represents general exports adjusted for balance-of-payments purposes, and includes "special category" items which for security reasons are excluded from commodity data.

likely therefore that the increase in import values does not represent a temporary bulge but rather a return to a more "normal" level at present market conditions.

The $25 million rise in sugar imports over the first half of 1955 reflected primarily a return to the normal seasonal distribution. Last year a relatively smaller volume of sugar was imported in the first half of the year. An increase in domestic consumption of sugar was also a factor contributing to the rise.

The volume of cocoa imports in the first half of 1956 rose 6 percent over the corresponding period of last year. This increase followed the rapid drop in prices during 1955. Because of the lower prices, however, the import value was $14 million lower than a year earlier.

Imports of unmanufactured wool for consumption were 25 percent higher in value than in the first half of 1955 and exceeded the total of all previous half-year periods since January–June 1953. In addition, stocks in bonded warehouses increased. Total imports were therefore somewhat in excess of current consumption.

The developments for these major items indicate that in general the market situation for agricultural commodities imported by the United States from Latin America improved during the first half of the year and that adjustments necessitated by the major price declines during the previous years have been accomplished.

With the possible exception of copper, the market situation for metals also continued favorable during the first half of 1956. Imports either moved upward or remained near the high points reached during the second half of last year. With the exception of copper, inventories did not change significantly, so that it may be assumed that imports will continue to reflect the high level of business activity in the United States. Copper imports from Latin America increased in value during 1955 and continued the rise during the first half of this year. Compared with a year earlier, copper imports rose by about $30 million, or 30 percent. This increase in value resulted from rising prices; the volume of imports actually declined somewhat from last year. Nevertheless, copper imports during the first half of this year exceeded current consumption and inventories increased sharply. Price declines in the United States set in around the middle of the year. It is likely, therefore, that copper imports from Latin America during the first half of the year may have reached at least a temporary peak. However, the recent price adjustments can be expected to improve the competitive position of copper vis-à-vis other metals and materials and consequently may contribute to the stability in the industry. The confidence of the industry for the longer run is indicated by the large investments in Latin American mining and processing facilities currently undertaken or planned by major American enterprises.

Higher travel expenditures and payments to mi-
Major Commodities Imported From Latin America by Half Years, 1953-First Half of 1956

[Millions of dollars]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1953</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane sugar</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa and cacao beans</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other metals and manufactures</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum and products</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool, unmanufactured</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total imports</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,911</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,670</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,883</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,562</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau of the Census and Bureau of Foreign Commerce, Department of Commerce.

Total imports represent general imports adjusted to balance-of-payments concepts. Commodity data represent imports for consumption.

Gratatory workers were the principal factors in the rise of service transactions.

The travel expenditures rose mainly in the Caribbean area. In Mexico they remained at the high level reached in 1955 following the Mexican devaluation. Mexico continued to gain from increased payments to migratory workers employed in the United States.

Increased Flow of Private Capital From U.S.

United States private capital continued to flow into direct investments in Latin America at greatly increased amounts. The $60 million rise over the first half of 1955 resulted primarily from expansions in the mining industry, particularly in Peru, where new mining facilities are being developed. The net outflow of $129 million during January-June of this year represents the largest outflow for any half-year period since January-June 1952. The peak reached at that time was also the result of large investments in the mining industry.

A complete measure of capital outlays in Latin America by United States companies should include reinvested earnings of United States subsidiaries, exploration and development expenditures of the petroleum industry charged to earnings, and expenditures financed from current depreciation allowances or reserves as well as the net capital flow from the United States. The reinvested earnings of United States subsidiaries in Latin America alone amounted to $175 million in 1955, or 25 percent more than the net capital outflow. Data for the other sources of funds will be available with the completion early next year of a special study, now being conducted by the Office of Business Economics, of the operations of United States direct investment companies in Latin America.

A further expansion in direct investments in Latin America by United States companies is expected in the last half of this year. The petroleum industry, particularly in Venezuela, will account for a major portion of the growth. Investments in the mining and manufacturing industries are expected to continue at a high rate.

The relative strength of business between most of the Latin American countries and the United States is indicated also by the changes in short- and medium-term credits by the United States.

During the first half of 1956 such credits increased by $70 million, compared with $85 million a year earlier. The additional credits were given mainly to Mexico and Venezuela, two countries in relatively favorable balance-of-payments positions. Brazil had reduced its large short-term indebtedness through consolidations and repayments in 1955, and outstanding United States credits continued at the low point reached at the end of that year. The rise in credits to Colombia, however, reflected the continued payments difficulties of that country.

Return Flow of Money to U. S. Rises With Outflow

Of the total United States expenditures of over $2.7 billion in Latin America during the first half of this year, all but about $80 million returned to the United States in payment for goods and serv-
Merchandise exports increased to $1,861 million from $1,708 million during the second half of 1955 and $1,588 million during the first half.

Trucks and construction and mining machinery comprised about $70 million of the $270 million increase in exports over the first half of last year. Other machinery (principally electrical), industrial materials, and metal manufactures accounted for another $80 million. More than half of the remainder consisted of foodstuffs, particularly grains. Exports of manufactured consumer goods gained relatively little. Shipments of textiles remained unchanged, and those of automobiles were smaller than a year earlier. The large share of producer's goods in the export rise indicates the expansion of business in Latin America (including the investments of United States companies) and the relatively smaller needs for imported consumer goods.

United States income from investments in Latin America was about $50 million, or 13.5 percent, higher than in the first half of 1955. The amounts shown here do not include undistributed earnings of subsidiaries but do include all earnings of branches. Incomes rose approximately in the same proportion as total United States payments to Latin America, but in absolute terms the rise was substantially less. To a large extent, rises in incomes depend upon larger imports by the United States since about one-third of the imports consist of the products of the Latin American branches and subsidiaries of American enterprises. To some extent the higher incomes from United States enterprises operating in Latin America reflect also the favorable market conditions in Europe and Japan. Many enterprises, particularly in the manufacturing field, may attribute their incomes to the rising business activity and incomes within Latin America itself. The previously mentioned survey by the Office of Business Economics will also provide data showing the extent to which American enterprises operating in Latin America contribute to Latin American exports, meet local demands, and add to incomes and tax receipts of the countries in which they operate.

Reserve Positions More Favorable

As a result of Latin America's transactions during the first half of this year with the United States as well as the rest of the world, its gold and liquid dollar holdings, including official reserves and private assets, rose by nearly $180 million to about $4,150 million, two-thirds of a billion more than at the end of World War II. Most important among the changes during the first 6 months of 1956 was the rise in Brazilian holdings by $74 million. This rise, by far the largest for that country in any recent half-year period, reflects the improved market situation for coffee and the successful adjustments made by Brazil in its external transactions. Some of the smaller coffee-producing countries also had important gains in their reserves, but Colombian reserves did not improve during that period. The $66 million rise in Venezuelan gold and dollar balances is a continuation of the nearly uninterrupted trend since the end of 1951. The rise was due to large seasonal tax payments by oil companies during the second quarter and exceeded by about $40 million the increase in short-term debts to the United States. Of the losses in reserves, the largest were experienced by Argentina, whose reserves dropped by about $30 million, and Mexico, whose holdings declined by $34 million. The decline in Mexican reserves followed a very rapid increase during the second half of 1955; they are still substantially higher than in mid-1955.

The changes in reserves thus indicate that, on balance, the liquidity of most of the American Republics has improved and that the expansion of foreign purchases during the first half of this year, including purchases from the United States, was well balanced by higher incomes from abroad.

President To Renew Request for U.S. Membership in OTC

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated December 11

The White House on December 11 made public the following exchange of letters between the President and Thomas J. Watson, Jr., Chairman, United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

President's Letter

December 1, 1956

Dear Tom: I want to express my appreciation for your letter of November twentieth on behalf of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.
I am heartened to know that the Council continues its support of the Administration’s program for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. It is the intention of the Administration to renew its request to the incoming Congress for such membership and to seek earnestly for affirmative action.

I am especially interested in the last sentence of your letter which gives assurance that the United States Council will continue its efforts to explain to the public the compelling reasons for our membership in the organization. I encourage you most heartily in your efforts to spread knowledge about this important project throughout the business community and throughout the country generally.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

Mr. Watson’s Letter

November 20, 1956

Dear Mr. President: The United States Council has consistently and vigorously supported the many wise proposals you have made to expand international trade and strengthen economic cooperation among friendly nations. Foremost among these is your recommendation that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade be strengthened by establishing an Organization for Trade Cooperation to administer the Agreement. The events of the past few months have increased the urgency of re-enforcing the General Agreement as one of the major means of economic cooperation among the free nations.

By strengthening the General Agreement in this manner we will improve the outlook for our own economic growth, encourage our friends abroad, and enhance our national security. The General Agreement is one of our main bulwarks against Communist economic penetration of the free world. It is likewise our best means of insuring that the present plans to create new trade arrangements among other friendly nations will not become discriminatory against the products of this country. It is also, of course, an outstanding example of United States leadership toward reducing governmental interference with normal and healthy business relations.

For these reasons we sincerely hope that the legislation to authorize membership in the O.T.C. will continue to be part of your program. Further, let me assure you that the United States Council will maintain its efforts to make known to the business community and the public generally the compelling reasons for United States membership in the Organization.

Sincerely,

T. J. Watson, Jr.

President’s Determination on Aid to Italy, France, and U.K.

The International Cooperation Administration announced on December 13 that ICA Director John B. Hollister had that day notified Congress of a Presidential determination to continue aid under the mutual security program to Italy, France, and the United Kingdom. The Presidential determination is required by the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act) because those countries shipped $1,601,752 worth of industrial commodities to European Soviet-bloc countries. The shipments by France and the United Kingdom were contracted before the commodities were placed under embargo. The Italian shipments were the outgrowth of trade agreements concluded before the items were subject to Battle Act restrictions. None of the shipments by Italy, France, and the United Kingdom included arms, ammunition, implements of war, or atomic energy materials.

Presidential determinations are made periodically as required by section 103 (b) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act. This section provides that the President “may direct the continuance of assistance to a country which permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials when . . . cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States.”

Advisers on Mutual Security
To Visit 18 Countries

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated December 8

The President’s Citizen Advisers on the Mutual Security Program plan visits to 18 foreign countries as further preparation for their report to the President due March 1.
They will leave Washington December 27 and return February 17 on a trip through Europe and the Middle and Far East. The trip follows some weeks of intensive discussions with officials and studies carried on at Washington since the advisers were appointed September 27.1

The group will consist of:
Benjamin F. Fairless, coordinator
Colgate W. Darden, Jr., President, University of Virginia
John L. Lewis, President, United Mine Workers of America
Whitelaw Reid, Chairman of the Board, New York Herald Tribune

Jesse W. Tapp, Chairman of the Board, The Bank of America

The advisers will be accompanied by staff members Howard J. Mullin, Donald B. Woodward, Comdr. Means Johnston, Jr., and Jack F. Bennett.

The places to be visited are as follows: Madrid, Paris, Bonn, Vienna, Belgrade, Athens, Istanbul, Ankara, Tehran, Karachi, New Delhi, Rangoon, Bangkok, Saigon, Manila, Hong Kong, Taipei, Seoul, and Tokyo.

American Studies in British Schools and Universities

by Robert L. Sutherland

High schools and colleges in the United States have always given much attention to the British background of their government, history, and literature. Are British professors, dons, and school teachers equally willing to include in their courses on modern literature, history, and government factual materials about developments in this country?

C. S. Roberts referred to the idea as "the 'wishful hope of a few' at the end of the war for the establishment of a forum where teachers of American subjects in English universities and schools could meet under expert guidance with a view to broadening the horizons of their knowledge."2

As a member of the United States Educational Commission in the United Kingdom and of the faculty of Cambridge University, he was in a position to do something about it. With the new exchange opportunities available under the Fulbright Act, the Commission, which helps to administer this program in the United Kingdom, proposed that distinguished Americans be awarded grants to participate in special American

Studies seminars during the summer months.

The "wishful hope" became a reality four times over. The first American Studies Conference with its theme "The United States in the Atlantic Community" was held at Cambridge University in 1952. The next summer the conference moved to Oxford, the following year returned to Cambridge, and, in the concluding year, was held at Oxford. During this time, 43 American scholars and specialists held discussions about various aspects of American life with British scholars and teachers representing over 160 educational institutions.

What was the conference and what has come of it? The "come of it" has been the formation of the British Association for American Studies. This took place at University College, Oxford, July 28, 1955. The Association held its first professional meeting in the spring of 1956 and plans

---

1 For an announcement of the appointment of the committee, see Bulletin of Oct. 8, 1956, p. 551.
2 Fifth annual report of the United States Educational Commission in the United Kingdom, p. 31.

Robert L. Sutherland, author of the above article, is professor of sociology and director of the Hogg Foundation for Mental Hygiene at the University of Texas. He was one of the U.S. scholars who participated in the American Studies Conference at Cambridge University in 1954.
to conduct an American Studies Conference on its own in the summer of 1957. In the meantime, it is investigating the status of American studies in all aspects among the universities and university colleges of the United Kingdom. It is aided in this work by a statistical inquiry into the teaching of American history in British universities and public and secondary schools made by Prof. H. C. Allen, formerly of Lincoln College and now professor of American history at the University of London. The chairman of the Association’s committee is Frank Thistlethwaite of St. John’s College, Cambridge, and the secretary is Marcus Cunliffe, head of the Department of American Studies at Manchester University.\(^2\)

**The Four Summer Conferences**

The four summer conferences which led to this recent development were accomplishments in themselves.

Each summer an American foundation assisted in meeting the travel and living expenses of dons from universities and university colleges throughout Great Britain so that they could attend the 3-week conference held either at Cambridge or Oxford. The Dons Conference was followed each summer by a 2-week conference for public and secondary school teachers who likewise came from all parts of the United Kingdom.

Scholars from the United States who were recipients of U. S. Government grants under the Fulbright Act were the conference leaders. The first summer they all came from American university faculties. By the third summer an innovation was tried; not all of the visiting scholars were professors. Virginius Dabney, editor of the Richmond, Va., *Times Dispatch*, and Clarence Elliott, city manager of Kalamazoo, Mich., took their places along with John Hope Franklin, historian from Howard University, Arthur Mizener, professor of literature from Cornell University, and Denna Fleming, professor of foreign affairs from Vanderbilt.

Similarly the novelist Eudora Welty, who lectured on creative writing in contemporary America, joined in the panel of lecturers along with C. Easton Rothwell, director of the Hoover Library, Stanford University; Dr. George Stoddard, dean of education, New York University; Robert L. Sutherland, professor of sociology at the University of Texas; C. Lowell Harriss, professor of economics at Columbia University; and David B. Truman, professor of government, also of Columbia. Special lectures were given by two other Americans, Dr. Andrew Clark of Wisconsin and John Fischer, editor of *Harper’s Magazine*.

Arguments among the American team members pleased the British and also convinced them that this was not a propaganda mission. When one American lectured, the others came to listen and to disagree, or at least to discuss. There were many similarities in points of view among those who came from different parts of the United States, but the British were more surprised and pleased by the many differences.

**Emphasis on Informality**

The course had a few of the characteristics of an American “workshop” or “seminar,” but throughout the entire summer these terms were never mentioned. There were lectures of the formal type—in fact, two each morning. In addition, each lecture was followed by a question and discussion period, following not a tea but a “coffee break.” The informality and personal acquaintance typical of an American workshop were achieved through the small group seminars—called “classes”—through the spontaneously arranged discussions, and through the discussions which were not arranged at all.

The housing plan helped in achieving this. Participants in the first conference had been housed at five different colleges in Cambridge. When the conference returned to Cambridge 2 years later, all of the American scholars and the British dons lived in one college—the smallest in Cambridge, Peterhouse. They came together each day at breakfast after the special undergraduate group had finished—at the respectable hour of 9:20 a.m. From then on until bedtime the two groups mingled at meals, lectures, classes, and teas. This arrangement made it easier for the British participants to buttonhole the lecturers. The lecturers’ lives tended to become almost nonstop seminars. A plan similar to the one just described followed at the last conference held at Oxford.

Each summer, as the American scholars boarded ship or plane, they were not too certain what to expect nor what would be expected of them in the give-and-take atmosphere of these conferences. Each knew he had been selected by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, a board appointed by the President to supervise the exchange program.

under the Fulbright Act. Each knew he was to report for his first check at the office near Grosvenor Square of the United States Educational Commission in the United Kingdom, and, in the case of the second Cambridge conference as an example, each received a longhand or self-typed letter from Dr. William R. Brock, fellow of Selwyn College, who had been designated as the resident secretary of the conference. Dr. Brock was never given the name “coordinator,” but that word suggests his function. He and his Cambridge undergraduate assistant, Michael Newton, helped the families of the American scholars find housing in town, took care of the living arrangements for the dons and the American lecturers at Peterhouse, helped them locate the libraries, and tactfully let them know what type of presentations would be of greatest interest to the British members.

Even so, the course was not “structured.” Each visiting lecturer had to sense what was wanted and how best to present it. The many opportunities for discussion and for informal conference helped him adjust to the interest of the group.

All types of fields were represented by the British participants in the first conference. Restrictions were placed on membership in the subsequent conferences in order to include only those persons who had an active interest in some branch of American studies and were themselves working in fields which included or might include material based on American studies. In this way the lecturers were free to work at a higher level in their own fields of specialization.

A number of the Americans thought that the schoolteachers’ conference was equally if not more rewarding than the dons’. The teachers seemed especially eager to ask questions and to learn how they could incorporate material from American studies in their own courses.

Importance of Good Fellowship

Good humor, fellowship, and social affairs were as important as the learned presentations. Each conference session was opened and closed with a special event. During the opening banquet arranged by the United States Educational Commission, toasts were given to Her Majesty, the Queen, Her Excellency, the President of the United States, and to members of the Commission. Distinguished guest speakers like Dr. Herbert Agar were presented. The master of a college at Cambridge or Oxford usually presided.

On such occasions the masculine tradition of the college was violated. Wives and the older children of the American scholars were included as guests at the banquets. They were also included at the garden parties given by the Vice Chancellor of the University. Also contrary to the custom during the winter term, wives were welcome to join the conference group at meals in the dining halls of the college and to remain for after-dinner coffee with the Fellows who were in residence.

The British members helped the Americans in their weekend sightseeing plans, marking on maps the points of special interest. The Americans, especially those who had “hired” cars, were grateful for the several long weekends. One Morris Minor car driven by an American was dutifully trying to remain on its left side of the road as it headed for the Lake Country only to be crowded almost to the ditch by a faster-moving motorist in a larger Austin. The driver of the latter turned out to be another American scholar, who had transposed his American speed habits to the narrow, winding roads of Britain! While in Cambridge or Oxford some of the Americans took to bicycles as a more economical and highly respectable form of transportation. Mrs. Rothwell, dressed in her party best, including high heels and white gloves, rode her bike to tea parties given for the ladies.

The event which closed each session was strictly informal. It included refreshments, friendly lampooning skits (the word “socio-drama” was never used!), and spontaneous vaudeville performances by sedate members whose entertaining talent had been hidden previously.

A Look at the Results

It is easy, in reflecting on these conferences, to remember the anecdote and the incident. However, one remembers also the very real accomplishments.

Some of these are necessarily intangible, but others are quite apparent. For example, since the conferences began, the first lecturer in American history has been appointed at Cambridge University (1933) and in American literature at the University of Manchester (1955). The first formal work in American literature was undertaken at the University of Nottingham in 1933, and the number of scholars working in the field of American studies at many of the universities has steadily increased. Greater acquaintance with American
studies has also been noted among those entering university departments from the secondary schools.

An equally significant but less tangible result of the conferences lies in the correspondence, the mutual writing and research, the sharing of periodical subscriptions, the exchange of professional journals, and the books with the compliments of the author which go back and forth across the water and keep strong the ties developed through personal acquaintance.

Thus "the wishful hope of a few," thanks largely to the educational exchange resources opened up by the Fulbright Act, are being realized in no small measure. Today, British scholars are carrying on in their own way as a voluntary association. Such an outcome was hoped for and is now a reality.

Arrangements With Canada for Seaway Dredging

Press release 612 dated December 7

In connection with the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the U.S. Government has been informed by the Canadian Government that it plans to dredge a Canadian channel north of Cornwall Island to a depth suitable for deepwater navigation at the same time that the main seaway channel is dredged south of Cornwall Island.

This dredging will give the town of Cornwall, Ontario, access to the joint seaway which is now under construction. It would be useful as a part of a seaway which could be constructed on the Canadian side of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, after consultation between the two governments, if and when such parallel facilities were required.

The U.S. Government, in order not to delay the construction of the joint seaway project, has taken cognizance of the de facto situation which has resulted from the Canadian decision. At the same time it has advised the Canadian Government that it does not believe the Canadian action is in accord with existing agreements and that it reserves all its rights to protect its interests as they may be affected by the Canadian action.

Following is the text of a note from the U.S. Ambassador at Ottawa addressed to the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, together with the latter's reply.

United States Note
No. 126

November 7, 1956.

Sir: I have the honor to refer to the Department of State's aide memoire of April 21, 1956, concerning the excavations in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway in the Cornwall Island channels, and also to discussions which have recently taken place between representatives of our two Governments in which it was stated that your Government had decided to dredge the channel north of Cornwall Island to a depth suitable for deep-water navigation at the same time that the Seaway is dredged in the south channel.

The Government of the United States has given careful consideration to the situation which will exist if the Government of Canada proceeds to carry out its announced plan. While it believes that the proposed Canadian action is not in accord with the agreement which this Government entered into as a result of the enactment of PL-358, 83rd Congress (2nd Session) and with the other arrangements which have been made between our two Governments with respect to the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Government of the United States does not wish to delay the construction of the joint Seaway project, in which both Governments are mutually interested, and consequently it is bound by events to take cognizance of the de facto situation which is created by the decision of Canada to proceed with deep-water dredging in the channel north of Cornwall Island.

In the circumstances, the Government of the United States deems it important to record that the United States reserves all its rights to protect its interests in this matter.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

Livingston T. Merchant

The Honorable
Lester B. Pearson,
Secretary of State for External Affairs,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Canadian Reply
No. 294

December 4, 1956.

Excellency: I have the honour to refer to your note No. 126 of November 7, 1956 and to recent consultations between representatives of our two Governments regarding excavations in the St. Lawrence River north and south of Cornwall Island.

1 Not printed.
The Canadian Government cannot accept the opinion of the United States Government that the Canadian decision to undertake 27-foot excavations in the Cornwall north channel is not in accord with the exchange of notes of August 17, 1954\(^2\) or other arrangements between the two countries. In its note of August 17, 1954 the Canadian Government declared its intention to complete 27-foot navigation works on the Canadian side of the International Rapids section, if and when it considered, after consulting your Government, that parallel facilities were required. The Canadian Government does not propose to complete parallel navigation facilities at Cornwall at any early date. However, it considers that the Canadian right to build such facilities, including 27-foot excavations north of Cornwall Island, was reserved in the 1954 exchange of notes and in the other exchanges of notes and letters on the St. Lawrence projects, whereas these exchanges of notes and letters cover only by implication the navigation excavations in the south channel. Moreover, the north channel excavations will compensate for the south channel excavations and thus serve the purposes of the Boundary Waters Treaty.

Engineers of the two Seaway entities met on July 18, 1956 and evolved plans for the excavations in both channels and for the apportionment between the two Seaway entities of responsibility for the different parts of the work. The Canadian Government finds that these plans meet the requirements of the Boundary Waters Treaty, and accepts responsibility for the excavations in the north channel and a part of those in the south. The Government has accordingly directed that, as the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation proceeds with its excavations in the south channel, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority should concurrently undertake the excavations assigned to it in the July 18 arrangements. It is understood that the two power entities will make a contribution to the costs of these excavations. As the plans envisage that each entity will undertake excavations in the territory of both countries, the Canadian Government is prepared to grant customs and immigration waivers on a reciprocal basis.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

L. B. Pearson
Secretary of State for External Affairs

His Excellency
Livingston T. Merchant,
Ambassador of the United States of America,
Ottawa.

**U.S. Sending 9,100 Tons of Rice to Typhoon-Hit Ryukyus**

The International Cooperation Administration announced on December 2 that the United States, Nationalist China, and Japan are sending emergency relief and reconstruction supplies to help the people of the typhoon-ravaged Ryukyu Is-


lands (Okinawa) recover from the destruction and destitution caused by a series of late summer and fall typhoons.

The ICA is preparing to send over 200,000 bags (9,100 tons) of U.S. rice to Okinawa as part of the U.S. assistance to the islands. The initial shipment of 4,000 tons was to be loaded on a Military Sea Transportation Service vessel on December 3 at San Francisco.

Nationalist China, together with American voluntary agencies on Taiwan (Formosa), moved quickly to assist Okinawa and on October 11 sent over 500 tons of rice, flour, cornmeal, and beans which was available on Taiwan. The National Catholic Welfare Conference in New York paid the ocean freight charges.

From Japan is to be sent, by the end of the year, 3,343 bags of rice and 55,000 cubic feet of lumber.

The U.S. rice, valued at $210,000, on the basis of the Commodity Credit Corporation’s acquisition and handling costs, is being provided by ICA under terms of title II of Public Law 480 (Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act). Title II, for which ICA is primarily responsible, authorizes this agency to grant U.S. surplus agricultural commodities to friendly peoples for emergency or relief purposes.

ICA also has authorized the use of up to $395,000 from title II funds to pay ocean freight charges for transporting the rice to Okinawa.

The rice is to be sold in the Ryukyus under direction of the U.S. Civil Administration, Department of the Army, which is responsible for the islands’ administration, and the proceeds used for construction, under U.S.-approved work relief programs, of homes, utilities, and port facilities to replace those destroyed or damaged by the typhoons.

Besides the rice, the United States has authorized the contribution of $2 million worth of Japanese yen from proceeds of sales to Japan of U.S. surplus agricultural products under title I of Public Law 480 and is considering making additional amounts of yen funds available.

Typhoon Emma struck the Ryukyus with full force on September 9, on the heels of several smaller storms. Described as the most serious in the area in 20 years, it did tremendous damage. Typhoon Emma was followed by Typhoons Freda and Gilda, which further raked the islands and added greatly to the destruction of homes, public utilities, and port facilities.
U.N. Expanded Program of Technical Assistance

Statement by Paul G. Hoffman
U.S. Representative to the General Assembly

I am especially pleased that I was chosen to represent my country in this Committee on this particular subject—technical assistance. I first became interested in technical assistance, as one of the best ways of accomplishing constructive things in the world, when I was serving as Administrator of ECA [Economic Cooperation Administration]. I think it is now generally agreed that some of the most lasting results of the Marshall plan came about through the sharing of experience and knowledge between the countries participating in that great effort—the European countries and the United States.

One fact which becomes immediately apparent to any thoughtful person who comes in contact with technical-assistance operations, and which we learned as a result of our early experience, is that the benefits of technical-assistance programs are not confined to the person or organization or nation which receives technical assistance. Quite the contrary. The benefits of technical assistance flow in all directions—to all who take part in any way in the process. It is not a case of advanced countries giving and less advanced countries getting. Both benefit. I can recall a number of instances where dynamic ideas for increasing industrial and agricultural production came from men of countries where technological knowledge was least advanced. No single country has a monopoly on ingenuity. Each participant in the technical-assistance effort has a contribution to make.

Under the Marshall plan, a collateral benefit of very great importance came from our partnership with others in technical assistance. This was the benefit on the human side, the better understanding—yes, the real camaraderie—that developed between people of different nations as they worked together to find better ways of doing things.

In the Marshall plan days we were, of course, working largely in one area of the world. The contacts made were mainly between technicians from the United States and the European countries. Big as that field was, what a tremendous extension of the area and scope of technical-assistance programs the United Nations effort represents. This fact was dramatically brought home to me when I learned from Mr. David Owen [Executive Chairman, Technical Assistance Board] that, during this year, United Nations experts drawn from 70 countries have been working in 111 states and territories of the world. Truly our effort in the United Nations is worldwide, and, in consequence, so is our opportunity, an opportunity to build steadily an increasing degree of skill, knowledge, understanding, and good will among people everywhere. The vision of these United Nations technicians all over the world, engaged in constructive work, is an inspiring and hope-producing picture.

For millions of people throughout the world, the United Nations is represented, not by its inspiring headquarters, not by the impressive meetings of the General Assembly, not even by the charter with its important statement of principles. It is represented by the United Nations team of experts working in the village or the rural

1 Mad in Committee II (Economic and Financial) on Dec. 4 (U.S. delegation press release 2541).
community. The United Nations is the public-health doctor showing how the dreaded malaria mosquito can be eradicated; the nurse teaching how to purify infected water; the agricultural specialist demonstrating the higher yield of hybrid corn.

American Support of U.N. Programs

Support of technical-assistance programs is deeply rooted in American foreign policy. For a good many years, we have carried on various bilateral technical-assistance programs in areas where such programs were needed and wanted. The technical-assistance programs of the United Nations have also had vigorous American support. This support was once again demonstrated most recently at the Technical Assistance Pledging Conference in October of this year. On that occasion, the United States representative announced a contribution for 1957 of $15.5 million, subject only to appropriate amounts being made available by other contributing countries. The amount of such contributions thus far pledged by other countries indicates that practically the whole of the United States pledge will be available for the program.

As the chairman of the Technical Assistance Board stated in his opening report to this Committee,² and as speakers before me have emphasized, it is encouraging to note the steady growth of the program. With 23 countries increasing the amount of their pledges over 1956—some very substantially—the program will be operating at the highest level in its history. It is particularly gratifying to note that Morocco and the Sudan, which only recently attained their independence, were among the countries contributing to the program for the first time. I feel that there could be no more eloquent expression of the importance of this program to countries such as these, which are just taking their place as full-fledged members of the international community.

This further evidence of the intense interest of the newly independent countries in technical assistance is gratifying, because without such interest no program can produce enduring results. Economic development can take place only when the people concerned want it and will work for it themselves.

Furthermore, if technical-assistance programs are to produce maximum results, the individuals who are initially trained must themselves become trainers of their fellow countrymen. These trainees must themselves in turn be able to transmit their skills in an ever-expanding chain reaction. This point was cogently brought out by the distinguished representative of Mexico [Armando C. Amador] yesterday. In one project of which I have personal knowledge three experts were able to transmit by this process skills and knowledge to more than a thousand people in 3 years.

Evaluation of Program

There is another feature of the technical-assistance program which, as other delegations have also pointed out, requires special attention, that is, evaluation. The results of the first thoroughgoing attempt at evaluation of the Expanded Program, which began in 1954 and was completed in April of this year, are greatly encouraging. Understandably, it was not possible for recipient countries to isolate the impact of technical-assistance activities on their economic development, or to measure it in precise statistical terms. Nevertheless, the analysis of the contribution of the United Nations Technical Assistance Program did lead to the conclusion that “significant results have been achieved in a large proportion of the technical-assistance activities undertaken in the past five years; and especially in terms of human welfare, the catalytic effects of introducing new ideas and stimulating new efforts were evident over a wide range of activities.”

I suggest that, despite this pleasing report, we have only made a start in this important matter of evaluation. I believe much more must be done; much more accurate and adequate methods of periodic testing of results and evaluation of methods must be developed. We are still too vague on the subject of what we are accomplishing, where we are succeeding, where we are failing and why.

It is gratifying to note that the Technical Assistance Committee has decided that an evaluation of the program shall now be part of the annual report of the Technical Assistance Board. We shall follow with close interest the results of this annual analysis, and we hope to see each year a major advance in the effectiveness of the evaluation process.

The unique appeal and underlying strength of
the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance derive from the fact it is designed to be a genuinely multilateral program, not the program of any one country or of any special group of countries but a United Nations program in the truest sense. Over the past 2 years, however, various practices developed with respect to the utilization of certain contributions that tended to emphasize bilateral or other special arrangements for carrying on projects, arrangements that were basically incompatible with this fundamental principle.

The United States attaches great importance to the maintenance of the multilateral character of the program. For this reason, we joined in and strongly supported the action of the Economic and Social Council embodied in the currency utilization resolution adopted at its last session. We feel that, with the adoption and implementation of this resolution, an important step has been taken to safeguard the essential foundations of the program.

Since the United States delegation closely followed the consideration of this matter in the ECOSOC, I can assure this Committee that the Council was keenly aware of the importance of avoiding requirements on contributing countries that would be so onerous as to discourage larger contributions to the program in the future. My delegation feels that this danger has been avoided and that no country desirous of contributing to a truly multilateral program will find any obstacle in the Council resolution to doing so. The resolution does not, in any way, require convertibility of contributions into hard currencies. It does not, in any way, as claimed by the representative of the Soviet Union [G. F. Saksin], tie the technical-assistance program to the American dollar.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation is convinced that, if the Expanded Program should ever substantially begin to lose its character as a genuinely international undertaking, one of the basic reasons for the maintenance of this program in the United Nations will also begin to disappear. It has been argued by some delegations that the action of ECOSOC was unnecessary, that no problem of currency utilization any longer exists. I do not intend to debate this point. The real point is that it should not develop again. The resolution of the Council provides important insurance against this contingency. For these reasons my delegation continues to support the action of ECOSOC and will vote against the proposal of Czechoslovakia and Rumania that the Council reconsider its recommendations.

Secretary-General's Request for Additional Funds

In his excellent statement to this Committee on November 23, Mr. [Hugh] Keenleyside [Director-General, Technical Assistance Administration] called our attention to the papers circulated by the Secretary-General in support of his request that additional funds be made available to expand the activities of the United Nations under its regular program of technical assistance in the field of public administration.

I do not think that anyone would quarrel with the proposition that effective administration in government and related public activities is essential to a country's economic and social progress. Without an adequately trained staff of public servants, no country can even hope to tackle the complex problems involved in building a modern society. In view of the importance of this aspect of United Nations technical-assistance activities, the United States, at the last session of ECOSOC, joined in sponsoring the resolution which recommends that the General Assembly give special attention to the need for sufficient funds for this program. The decision as to precisely what increase should be made in the funds available to the Secretary-General for this purpose is, as has been pointed out, a decision for the Fifth Committee. I should like to state, however, that because of the importance which my delegation attaches to the work of the United Nations in this field, we shall support, within the United Nations budget, an appropriation to the full amount requested by the Secretary-General for this purpose.

Expanding the Technical Assistance Committee

The United States has for some time been of the opinion that the Technical Assistance Committee should be expanded in order to bring additional

---

1 ECOSOC resolution 623 B III (XXII).

2 ECOSOC resolution 623 A II (XXII).
countries—including contributing countries not members of the United Nations—into closer association with the program. In fact, in 1954 the United States joined with other delegations in Ecosoc to sponsor a resolution to this effect. We feel that appropriate action should be taken on this matter at this session. We have, accordingly, joined in sponsoring the draft resolution which has been circulated in document L. 284. A moderate increase in the membership of the Tac, as provided by this draft resolution, will make the Committee a more representative group of contributing and recipient countries without making it so unwieldy as to prevent effective work.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to a matter raised by a number of other delegations. These delegations have objected to the rejection by the Secretary-General of an offer from Eastern Germany to participate in the Expanded Program with a contribution of 400,000 East German marks.

My delegation believes that the Secretary-General’s decision in this case was the only possible decision. It is clear from the General Assembly resolution establishing the program that only states which are members of the United Nations or of a specialized agency are entitled to contribute to and to participate in the Expanded Program. In addition, the following consideration must be kept in mind. No precedent exists for accepting a financial contribution for the Expanded Program under Financial Regulation 7.2 from a regime not generally accepted by the international community as a legitimate government. Since only states so recognized may participate in the program, acceptance of a contribution for this purpose, even under this regulation, would imply a recognition by the United Nations of the East German regime as a state.

Two important organs of the United Nations—the Economic and Social Council on December 8, 1955, and the Economic Commission for Europe on April 6, 1956—have considered the status of the East German regime and have rejected the view that it is a sovereign state. Clearly, no action should be taken in this matter by the administrators of the program which would imply otherwise.

For these reasons, my delegation fully supports the position of the Secretary-General.

In closing I should like to tell all of you once more how deeply I personally believe in the technical-assistance program of the United Nations and how staunchly the United States Government is prepared to support this effort. Great numbers of the citizens of my country—I know from personal experience and contact with them—feel that there is probably greater hope for the world—for economic advance and growing human understanding, for that tolerance and good will which our torn world needs so desperately in these days—in the kind of effort represented by the over 4,000 United Nations experts working in 111 states and territories than in almost anything else that has so far been devised by man.

Scale of Assessments for Apportioning U.N. Expenses

Following are texts of statements made by U.S. Representatives Richard Lee Jones and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., in Committee V (Administrative and Budgetary) of the U.N. General Assembly, together with a U.S. proposal on the scale of assessments for the apportionment of U.N. expenses.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JONES, NOVEMBER 29

U.S. delegation press release 2537

I have asked to speak again on this matter, not only to reply to a number of statements which have been made here with respect to the United States proposal but also to state our present position at this stage of the debate.

When I spoke to this Committee on Monday, I tried to make clear that we were approaching this problem in a spirit of moderation, despite the fact that we felt very strongly that the recommendation of the Contributions Committee was inequitable and violated a basic principle of this organization, namely, that we are all sovereign and equal states sharing in a common enterprise.

1 Mr. Jones is U.S. Ambassador to Liberia. For text of his statement in Committee V on Nov. 27, see U.S. delegation press release 2529 (not printed).
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I stated that we were prepared to put forward a compromise proposal to avoid unnecessary controversy in an organization now beset by so many grave problems.

Listening to many of the statements made during the past few days, it is my impression that the spirit in which we approached this problem has, in many cases, been misunderstood and, in others, completely rejected. I say that it has been misunderstood because some members of this Committee have indicated their belief that our tone of moderation implied that we were not really concerned about the principles involved in this situation. I say that it has been rejected in other cases since some speakers have indicated an unwillingness even to accept our proposal that the whole matter of the principles involved here be discussed at the next session of the Assembly. This latter reaction is something which we had never expected to see in this organization.

I hasten to say, Mr. Chairman, that my delegation appreciates the support which its proposal has received from some delegations, including Burma, Canada, and the United Kingdom, who have approached this problem in the same spirit of moderation and compromise which has motivated us. I wish particularly to thank the distinguished representative of Iraq [Kadhim Al-Khalaf] for the kind words which he said in respect of my country's actions in support of international cooperation in an attempt to place this problem in a proper perspective.

I would like to deal first of all, Mr. Chairman, with certain misunderstandings concerning the United States proposal which are abroad in this Committee. First of all, it is apparent that several delegations are under the impression that we wish this Committee to decide now that the United States contribution should be reduced to 30 percent. This is not the case. We are not seeking any decision concerning a new ceiling figure at this time. All we have requested with respect to the reduction of the United States contribution is that there be agreement that the matter be discussed, along with other related questions, at the next session of the Assembly and that the Contributions Committee be instructed to present this Committee at its next session with sufficient material to enable it to discuss the problem intelligently.

Accordingly I hope, Mr. Chairman, it is clear to all that we are not asking any delegation to com-

mit itself now in any way to a reduction of the United States contribution to a 30 percent level.

A second misunderstanding, Mr. Chairman, appears to exist with respect to the implications of the United States proposal that the contributions of the new members for 1956 be treated as miscellaneous income. It apparently has not been recognized by a great many that this proposal would benefit not only the United States but also all those countries which contribute at the percentage of .08 percent and less. It has been surprising to hear representatives of certain countries in this latter group opposing the United States proposal on the ground that it was not equitable to them. Such a proposal is considerably more equitable to them than that of the Contributions Committee since it would provide a benefit in the way of a reduction of the amount of their contribution which is not provided by the recommendation of the Contributions Committee. In this connection, I am also amazed that a number of other delegations have opposed this proposal—which is favorable to the countries having the lowest capacity to pay—while, at the same time, professing that their opposition is based upon their deep concern for the less wealthy countries.

There is another misunderstanding relating to the United States proposal for treating the 1956 contributions of new members as miscellaneous income. It is suggested that, when the United States, and 25 other countries who pay a percentage of .08 and less, participate in a distribution of the 1956 contributions, this is an attempt to shift the contribution burden to countries having a lesser capacity to pay. This is clearly not the effect of the proposal. Under the United States proposal all countries would pay less than they would under the scale fixed by the Assembly in 1955; none of the countries would pay more than their percentages fixed in 1955. All that the United States proposal attempts to do is to make a broader distribution of the benefits. It avoids the retroactive application of the new scale, which would result in only certain members of the organization receiving all the benefits at the expense of other members.

Let me also mention, Mr. Chairman, another proposition put forward here which I prefer to term a misunderstanding. This is the proposition that, because of the decision taken by the last session of the Assembly to fix a scale for 3 years, this
Committee is somehow bound to accept the new scale now proposed by the Contributions Committee for the same 3-year period, that is, through 1958. It is difficult for me to understand how this proposition can be put forward seriously. It is true that last year we voted to fix a scale for 3 years. However, the scale recommended by the Contributions Committee for our adoption this year is a completely new scale which includes 16 new members and which provides for changes in the percentage contributions for 40 of the old members. This is not the scale for which we voted last year. If we are to maintain our decision of last year, then we should retain through 1958 the scale we approved last year and should treat the contributions of new members during that period as miscellaneous income. If we decide to accept the scale as recommended by the Contributions Committee, then we are superseding our decision of last year. Consequently, we are obviously not bound by our decision of last year to maintain a completely new scale for any particular period.

Let us be realistic and drop any fiction of adopting a new 3-year scale. It is clear that no one here expects the scale recommended by the Contributions Committee to apply for 1958. We have recently admitted three additional members. Further members may yet be admitted. It is apparent that delegations want the contributions of new members to be considered when fixing the scale for 1958.

In view of these facts, Mr. Chairman, we simply cannot accept the statements of certain delegations, particularly the Soviet Union, concerning the supposed sanctity of the 3-year scale. It was especially astounding to hear the Soviet Union make such a statement when it, under the recommendation of the Contributions Committee that the new scale be accepted for 1956, 1957, and 1958, would receive in each year a reduction of approximately $750,000 below the contribution it would have paid on the basis of the scale which we did approve for 3 years at our last session.

Speaking of the proposed reduction in the contributions of the Soviet Union, Mr. Chairman, reminds me of the fact that it was argued here that the contributions of new members for 1956 could not be treated as miscellaneous income, thus reducing the overall budget, since this would mean that the greatest contribution reduction in terms of dollars would be received by the United States, which has the greatest capacity to pay. If this argument is valid—and I do not accept it as such—then it would also apply to the proposal of the Contributions Committee which, in reducing the percentage contributions of certain members of the organization, gave by far the greatest reduction to the Soviet Union, which has the greatest capacity to pay among those members for whom a reduction is recommended. I do not understand how a principle can be invoked against the United States and ignored in favor of the Soviet Union.

In addition to the various misunderstandings of the situation which I have mentioned, Mr. Chairman, I noted in the past 2 days a number of statements which had no valid relationship to the matter under discussion and some which indeed were, I consider, of questionable propriety.

I recall, for example, the statement by the representative of Hungary [Imre Hollai], who, after speaking of the devastation of a large part of his country—which he attributed to no one in particular—mentioned that Hungary was experiencing other difficulties because of trade policies of the Western governments. I need not elaborate to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, why I found this particular statement unacceptable.

There were also statements, particularly by the Soviet Union, which were intended to lead one to believe that the United States is somehow making a handsome profit out of its position as host to the United Nations. The United States is very proud of being the host country of this organization, but no one who knows anything about the factual situation could ever suppose that there is an element of monetary profit in acting as the host. I will not discuss the matter further, Mr. Chairman, for I think all will understand why I found this statement also to be completely unacceptable.

It is, however, with respect to the so-called concept of capacity to pay that I felt some of the discussion strayed to matters not before us for consideration. First of all, there has been no official report by the Contributions Committee on capacity to pay, and statements made in this Committee concerning the capacity to pay of the United States were made without any supporting evidence. But admitting the concept and some of the statistics for the moment, we may come to some interesting conclusions.

The representative of France [André Ganem] reminded us yesterday that in 1946 this Commit-
The fixed the percentage contribution of the United States at 39.89 percent at a time when its relative capacity to pay was said to be 60 percent. This means that the United States percentage contribution was fixed at less than two-thirds of its relative capacity to pay. Now, if the figure of 45 percent which was mentioned in this Committee as the present United States portion of aggregate national incomes of United Nations members is accurate, then on a similar basis the United States contribution should be fixed at two-thirds of that amount or less than 30 percent. At the 33.33 percent level the United States is obviously paying more with respect to its relative capacity to pay than it was in 1946. This, I think, should be of interest to certain delegations which have argued that the burden of the United States has steadily been decreased over the past years.

However, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, this matter of capacity to pay is not a decisive factor when we are considering what should be done with the contributions of new members for 1956 and when we are fixing a ceiling on the contribution of the highest contributor. The treatment of the 1956 contributions should be based upon what is equitable to all. The fixing of a ceiling is an arbitrary matter depending, as I have said on a number of occasions, on what is wise and fair and just as among equal partners in this enterprise. It is only after fixing of the arbitrary figures for the largest contributor and for the smallest so-called capacity-to-pay statistics enter the scene and then only as a convenient mechanical device to spread the remaining percentage among other members.

Here I am forced to observe that delegates persist in calling the figure of 33 percent a "principle." We should not abuse that term. The principle in this matter is that no one member should pay an inordinate or preponderant share of the expenses of an organization of sovereign nations. What constitutes an improper share is open to discussion at any time. What is more, the figure selected at any one time in application of the principle must not be treated as a floor. It is a variable and ad hoc ceiling or maximum.

Having said all this, the question still remains as to what position we should take in the present situation. I am convinced that we would be perfectly justified in insisting that our original proposal be put to the vote. All that I have said indicates why I believe this to be true.

However, as I said Monday, we still hope to avoid or at least limit as much as possible any controversy on this matter. Accordingly, in a further effort to reach general agreement, we have withdrawn our proposal that the new scale of assessments not be applied for 1956.

This means that we are prepared to accept the scale of contributions—again subject to congressional approval of the appropriations necessary for the United States contribution—for the years 1956 and 1957. This means that we will not receive for those 2 years the benefit, amounting to more than $2 million, which we believe should have accrued to the United States as a result of the contributions of the new members.

We are not prepared, however, Mr. Chairman, to accept the new scale of assessments for 1958. We object very strongly to the proposal that we should be foreclosed next year, by action taken now, from proposing a change in the scale for 1958. This is especially true because of the possibility that additional significant contributions might accrue to the organization before next year because of the admission of new states such as Japan. Further, we continue to propose that there be agreement that this entire matter be considered and reviewed at the next session of the Assembly. On this latter point, it should be recognized that, as a member state, the United States can, in any case, raise this question at the next Assembly. All that we are asking with respect to this is that there be understanding that this problem will be considered at the next session and that this Committee be supplied by the Contributions Committee with the materials necessary to permit an intelligent discussion of, and a decision on, the problem.

This is clearly, Mr. Chairman, a minimum position and one which I find it difficult to believe this Committee can reasonably reject. I wish to make it clear that the United States will vote against any resolution which attempts to fix the new scale for 1958 and which fails to provide for the kind of review and reconsideration which we have proposed in paragraphs 4 and 5 of our original draft resolution.4

Further, Mr. Chairman, should a resolution of the kind I have mentioned be approved by this Committee, we will seek to amend it along the lines of our proposal in the plenary.

4 Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the original U.S. draft (A/C.5/L.398) were incorporated in the revised U.S. proposal introduced on Nov. 29 (A/C.5/L.405) ; see below.
We are not wedded to the exact language of our original paragraphs 4 and 5 and will accept any reasonable modification which retains the substance embodied in them.

In order to make the United States position completely clear, we are circulating a revised draft resolution [U.N. doc. A/C. 5/14. 405] embodying the amendments which we believe must be made in the resolution proposed by the Secretariat [A/C. 5/L. 399] on the basis of the report of the Contributions Committee.

Because the revised proposal which we are circulating represents a major modification in the proposal which we put before this Committee last Monday, we request, Mr. Chairman, that it not be voted on at today's meeting.

**STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, DECEMBER 4**

U.S. delegation press release 2542

Ambassador Jones has yielded to me so that I may say just a few words in opposition to the concept expressed in the report of the Contributions Committee in accordance with which the extra amount coming to the United Nations because of the admission of the new members would be apportioned in such a way that the Soviet Union and other nations would receive a reduction in their assessment, whereas the United States and other nations would receive no reduction at all.

I do not oppose this report because of the amount of money involved. The United States is able to pay this—and larger—sums of money. The United States is willing to pay very large sums of money indeed to prevent world war III. Looked at from the financial viewpoint alone, to pay a million dollars more per year is nothing when compared with a billion dollars a day—a billion dollars a day—which is what it is estimated a future war would cost. That is in dollars; I don't even mention the far greater cost in human life.

We do not object to this report because of the amount of money. We object to this report because we think it is unjust and discriminatory. The feeling for justice and the feeling for fair play exists in all countries, large and small, and the United States is no exception. For most of our history, the United States has been a small country; it is now a large country. But at all times it has been animated by a sense of justice—and that involves objection to the feeling of injustice.

Now, I do not say that we will not go on paying our dues and remaining a member in good standing, because, of course, we will. What I do say is that being treated in what we think is a discriminatory and unjust fashion will mean that Congress will look at other United Nations expenditures with a very disillusioned eye—and I am making that as a prediction. That can have a very serious effect on these programs, and there are many programs that are being mentioned for the future. That is something for which all those who would impose this discriminatory system of payment on us must bear the responsibility.

In saying what I have just said, I speak as a friend of the United Nations. I think service for more than 4 years here qualifies me to apply that term to myself. I also speak as one who served in the United States Congress for 13 years, which is specifically why Ambassador Jones yielded to me today for this brief statement. Because in my capacity as a former Senator I know the utter impossibility of ever persuading one single member of Congress that this concept embodied in the report of the Contributions Committee is just. And it certainly is a discrimination which I cannot accept. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that surely we need not be limited to a concept which is based so narrowly on purely arithmetical, statistical considerations and which so completely fails to take into account that which is human, that which is fundamental, and that which is just.

Now, that concludes the brief statement that I wish to make giving my judgment of the effect of this on the Congress in Washington, and which I thought this Committee, of which, incidentally, I was a member in 1950, should have.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I request that further consideration of this matter be adjourned at this time. I make this request for two reasons. First, several new proposals have been submitted to us privately by other delegations in an effort to make it possible to reach general agreement. One of these, for example, is to the effect that the United States accept the new scale of assessments for 1958—thus assuring other members that their assessments remain fixed for that year—on condition that the contributions for 1958 of new members admitted at this session be applied first to a reduction of the United States percentage toward 30 percent. There may be a basis for agreement in such a pro-
proposal, and we wish to give it the most careful con-
consideration. We hope that other delegations hav-
ing proposals will submit them formally and as early as possible to the Committee for study and debate.
Secondly, we all know of the likelihood that in the near future this Assembly will consider the admission of another new member. We believe that final action on these scale-of-assessments questions should be postponed until we learn the outcome of the action on membership. This Committee, we think, should not repeat the error of last year, that is, to fix the scale of assessments in advance of the admission of new members.
Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I propose the adjournment of discussion on this item for at least 10 days.⁵

TEXT OF U.S. PROPOSAL OF NOVEMBER 29
Amendment to the draft form of resolution contained in the Note by the Secretariat (A/C.5/L.399)
1. Replace the words “1956, 1957 and 1958” included in paragraphs 1, 2 and 5 of A/C.5/L.399 by the words “1956 and 1957”.
2. (a) Omit paragraph 6 of A/C.5/L.399.⁶
(b) Include as new paragraphs 6 and 7, two new para-
graphs following the text of paragraphs 4 and 5 in-
cluded in the original proposal of the United States of America (A/C.5/L.398), reading as follows:
“6. That the principles relating to the scale of as-
sessments, including the assessment of the highest con-
tributors, shall be considered at the twelfth session of the General Assembly;
“7. That the Committee on Contributions shall:
(a) Recommend percentage contributions for 1956
and 1957 of Sudan, Tunisia, and Morocco and any other Members admitted at the eleventh session, out-
side the scale of assessment in paragraph 1 above.
(b) Include in its report for consideration at the twelfth session (1) a scale of assessments for the financial year 1958, including Members admitted at the eleventh session, and based upon the same principles which were applied in preparing the scale in paragraph 1 above; (2) an alternative scale of assessments for the financial year 1958, including Members admitted at the eleventh session and based upon the

⁵The Soviet representative, G. N. Zaroubin, opposed the U.S. move to postpone discussion and requested that it be put to a vote; the Committee approved Mr. Lodge’s proposal by a vote of 47 to 9, with 6 abstentions.
⁶Paragraph 6 of the draft resolution based on the Contribution Committee’s recommendation reads:
“That the Committee on Contributions shall consider in 1957 the assessment of those States admitted to mem-
bership in the United Nations at the eleventh session of the General Assembly and report thereon to the twelfth session of the General Assembly.”

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences
Coal Committee, Economic Commission for Europe
The Department of State announced on December 6 (press release 609) that Charles R. Nailer, president of the Christopher Coal Company, Morgantown, W. Va., has been designated the U.S. delegate to the series of meetings to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, under the auspices of the Coal Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe, during the week of December 10, 1956.
This Committee, one of the principal subsidiary organs established by the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe, is concerned with the demand, the supply, and the consumption of coal in the European market. The Coal Trade Subcommittee meeting, which convenes on December 10, will be followed by meetings of the Coal Committee, December 11, and the Utilization Working Party, December 12-13.

Caribbean Commission
The Department of State announced on December 10 (press release 617) the U.S. delegation to the 23rd meeting of the Caribbean Commission at Barbados, British West Indies, December 10-15, 1956. This meeting will mark the 10th anniver-
sary of the establishment of the Caribbean Com-
mission. Commemorative ceremonies were held on December 8 at Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, head-
quarters of the Commission.
The United States will be represented at the Commission meeting by the following delegation:
United States Commissioners
Roderic L. O’Connor, chairman, Deputy Assistant Secre-
tary of State for Congressional Relations and Cochair-
man of the Caribbean Commission
Arturo Morales Carrion, Under Secretary of State, Com-
monwealth of Puerto Rico
José Trias Monge, Secretary of Justice, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
Leonard Brewer, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands

1002 Department of State Bulletin
Mr. O'Connor was appointed by the President on August 2, 1956, a U.S. Commissioner and Chairman of the U.S. Section of the Caribbean Commission. Mr. Brewer was appointed a Commissioner on December 3 of this year. Dr. Morales Carrion and Dr. Trias Monge have been Commissioners since 1954.

The Caribbean Commission is an international advisory body resulting from expansion of the original Anglo-American Caribbean Commission. It serves to coordinate activities of the four member governments, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States, in their efforts to improve the economic and social well-being of the inhabitants of the Caribbean area.

Items to be discussed at the meeting include the proposed work program and budget for 1957; reports of meetings and conferences held since the last meeting of the Commission; and progress reports on the Commission's technical-assistance projects.
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World Bank Makes $50 Million Loan to Australia

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development announced on December 4 a loan of $50 million to the Commonwealth of Australia to finance imports of equipment for the development of agriculture and forestry, road and rail transport, industry and mining. The loan will be used to pay for equipment needed from the dollar area by farmers, private businesses, and Commonwealth and State government agencies.

Australia has a continuing need to import capital to carry out development throughout all sectors of the economy. In line with its policy of increasing its population and at the same time improving the standard of living, Australia, since World War II, has undertaken an immigration program and has increased its efforts to accelerate the growth of production.

Between the world wars, Australians had developed manufacturing to a point where they were able to supply the bulk of their own consumer goods; since World War II, they have been developing the manufacture of capital goods. Although this industrial growth has made Australia more self-sufficient, agricultural production, particularly of wool, has continued to expand, and agricultural commodities remain Australia’s chief exports.

The 1.1 million immigrants who have come to Australia in the past 10 years nearly equal the number who immigrated in the whole 166 years since the continent began to be settled. While the recent influx has required more housing, transportation, public utilities, and the like, the new immigrants are contributing importantly to the growth of the gross national product, which has increased at the rate of 5 percent annually since the war. For example, steel production has doubled since the war, with output rising from 1.2 million to 2.4 million tons annually, and three-quarters of the additional workers required to make this possible have been immigrants. Similarly, 40 percent of the total workers employed in the motor-vehicles industry are immigrants.

Australia has financed much of its development from its own savings, but it must continue to import capital if the pace of development is not to be slowed. The World Bank has now lent a total of $317.73 million to help finance equipment from the dollar area for the expansion of the economy. A $9.23 million loan of November 15 was part of a transaction carried out in participation with institutional investors to finance equipment for Qantas Empire Airways, Ltd. Each of the other loans has been to assist in programs for developing, expanding, and improving productive facilities in major sectors of the economy. The programs to be assisted with the proceeds of the present loan are as follows:

Agriculture and Forestry—$17.2 Million

Agricultural products, including wool, wheat, meat, dairy products, fruit and sugar, earn more than three-fourths of Australia’s export income and, for the foreseeable future, will remain the major source of the Commonwealth’s foreign-exchange earnings.

In the last 5 years the Commonwealth Government has consistently given a high priority to agriculture and adopted policies to increase the output and export of rural products. The output is now 32 percent more than it was before the war, and exports have increased by 31 percent despite a 35 percent increase in population over the same period. As long as the world demand for Australia’s major agricultural exports remains fairly strong, possibilities for further growth in rural output are still large.

The continuing research on farm problems has had some remarkable results in finding new methods of land clearance, conserving water and fodder, and improving soil fertility. One particularly rewarding measure has been to control the rabbit population by infecting it with myxomatosis. Prior to the adoption of this method of extermination, it was estimated that about 600 million rabbits were eating grass sufficient to feed 75 million sheep. Because of the degree of control achieved through myxomatosis, it is estimated that in 1955 A£50 million ($110 million) was added to the year’s export income from wool.

Equipment financed by earlier bank loans has helped to increase farm efficiency, to improve pastures, and to expand land settlement. The bank’s continued assistance in this program will enable Australians to continue development along these lines. The equipment to be imported under the loan will consist largely of heavy tractors, agricultural machinery and implements, and compo-
Road Transport—$12.8 Million

Because of the large distances between centers of population and production, adequate and improved road transport facilities are of great importance to the Australian economy. Since 1939 freight carried by road has grown rapidly and the number of commercial vehicles operating in the country has more than doubled. Heavy trucks are now carrying an increasing volume of interstate traffic. With the increased traffic density the need for construction and proper maintenance of highways has become more pressing. The funds allocated from the loan will assist in financing the import of trucks, tractors, components for truck manufacture in Australia, and equipment for building and maintaining roads.

Railways—$4 Million

The Australian railways systems have been turning more and more since the war to Diesel electric traction and other modernization measures to reduce operating costs and improve efficiency. Most of the bank funds allocated to the railways will be used for the import of components for the manufacture in Australia of Diesel electric locomotives and other rolling stock, control equipment, and equipment for track maintenance.

Industry and Mining—$16 Million

Manufacturing industries now employ about 30 percent of Australia's labor force and produce approximately one-third of the national product. Between 1939 and 1956 the volume of manufacturing output has more than doubled; the manufacture of machinery and transport equipment has developed most rapidly. The outlook for sustained industrial expansion appears to be good. Mining, which makes a significant contribution to Australia's foreign-exchange earnings, is expanding moderately. The present loan will provide the foreign exchange needed to import specialized equipment necessary for expanding output and increasing efficiency in the iron and steel, engineering, and food-processing industries and in the mining of lead, zinc, copper, and coal.

Terms and Signing

The $50-million loan is for a term of 15 years and bears interest of 4 3/4 percent including the 1 percent commission charged by the bank. Amortization will begin July 15, 1959.

After having been approved by the bank's executive directors, the loan documents were signed on December 3, 1956, by Sir Percy Spender, Australian Ambassador at Washington, on behalf of the Commonwealth of Australia, and by Eugene R. Black, President, on behalf of the World Bank.

---

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Atomic Energy

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Open for signature at United Nations Headquarters, New York, through January 24, 1957.\(^1\)

Signature: Mexico, December 7, 1956.

Automotive Traffic


Declaration deposited: Morocco, November 7, 1956 (that if assumes obligations arising out of ratification by France).

Finance


Narcotic Drugs


Declaration deposited: Morocco, November 7, 1956 (that if assumes obligations arising out of ratification by France).


\(^1\) Not in force.
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Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3656. 4 pp. 5¢.

The Arbitration Tribunal and the Arbitral Commission on Property, Rights and Interests in Germany—Waiver of Immunity From Suit and Legal Process. TIAS 3657. 3 pp. 5¢.

Mutual Defense Assistance—Extension of Facilities Assistance Program. TIAS 3658. 7 pp. 10¢.

Military Advisory Mission to Brazil. TIAS 3659. 2 pp. 5¢.


Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3661. 16 pp. 10¢.
Agreement, with annex, between the United States of America and India—Signed at New Delhi August 29, 1956, with related letters. Entered into force August 29, 1956, with related letters.

Disposition of Lend-Lease Supplies in Inventory or Procurement in the United States. TIAS 3662. 9 pp. 10¢.

Guaranty of Private Investments. TIAS 3663. 4 pp. 5¢.

Economic Cooperation. TIAS 3664. 6 pp. 5¢.

Radio Communications Between Amateur Stations on Behalf of Third Parties. TIAS 3665. 3 pp. 5¢.

BILATERAL

Dominican Republic

Japan
Agreement supplementing the understandings to the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of February 10, 1956 (TIAS 3590), to provide for the use of loan funds for improvement of wholesale food marketing facilities. Effected by exchange of notes at Tokyo November 30, 1956. Entered into force November 30, 1956.

Pakistan

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases
For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

A pamphlet based on an address by Assistant Secretary Francis O. Wilcox made before the Norman Wait Harris Foundation Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., on June 26, 1956.

A complete list of numbered publications of the Department of State—January 1, 1953–December 31, 1955.

1 Not in force.
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Check List of Department of State Press Releases: December 10–16

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.
Press releases issued prior to December 10 which appear in this issue of the Bulletin are Nos. 609 of December 6 and 612 of December 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>Delegation to Caribbean Commission (rewrite).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>Note concerning communications with Budapest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>12/11</td>
<td>Death of Miss Emma Lansing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>Program for Nehru visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>12/14</td>
<td>FSO graduation ceremonies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not printed.
† Held for a later issue of the Bulletin.
Foreign Relations of the United States . . .

The basic source of information on U.S. diplomatic history

1942, China

This volume is the first of a series which will cover the relations of the United States and China for the years 1942-49. It deals with the first year in which the United States was at war in the Far East, and the subjects treated are for the most part directly related to the war effort. The documents tell of conditions in China, which was isolated from the other Allies by Japan's operations in the South Pacific. They tell also of the problems caused by that isolation and by the early concentration of Allied war effort against Germany.

The present volume tells the story of relations with China chiefly as viewed by the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Treatment of military matters is given as a necessary part of the diplomatic picture. For further study on military affairs citation is given in the preface to narrative histories published by the Departments of the Army and Air Force. Likewise matters of primary concern to the Treasury Department and to special wartime agencies are covered only insofar as they were of diplomatic importance.

The major emphasis in this volume is on the following subjects: general wartime relations between the United States and China; political conditions in China including Sino-Soviet relations and threatened Kuomintang-Communist conflict; negotiations for relinquishing by the United States of extraterritorial rights in China; financial relations between the United States and China.

Copies of Foreign Relations of the United States, 1942, China may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25 D.C., for $3.75 each.

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

$(cash, check, or money order).

Please send me __________ copies of Foreign Relations of the United States, 1942, China.

Name:  ____________________________________________________________

Street Address:  __________________________________________________

City, Zone, and State: ____________________________________________