

candidates and from some Members of the House and Senate. In an election year this is, of course, understandable, but we should be on our guard lest misinterpretation of the Secretary's intent do harm to our international position.

The criticisms are mainly on two counts: First, the proposal for assurance of continuity in economic assistance for development projects in underdeveloped countries. This has been exaggerated into an alleged 10-year commitment. Second, the brink of war statement in the article in the most recent issue of Life magazine.

Let me outline briefly my understanding of both these matters. In doing so, I must emphasize that I am not speaking by authority of Mr. Dulles, or endeavoring to interpret his thinking, or the thinking of the President in his state of the Union message. I am taking these statements at their face value and what they mean to me as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

I. THE ASSURANCE OF CONTINUITY IN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

The criticism on this count is undoubtedly based on the statement in the President's state of the Union message where he says:

We must sustain and fortify our mutual security program. Because the conditions of poverty and unrest in less developed areas make their people a special target of international communism, there is a need to help them achieve the economic growth and stability necessary to preserve their independence against Communist threats and enticements.

I continue to quote from the President's state of the Union message. This is the important part of the quotation:

In order that our friends may better achieve the greater strength that is our common goal, they need assurance of continuity in economic assistance for development projects and programs which we approve and which require a period of years for planning and completion. Accordingly, I ask Congress to grant limited authority to make longer term commitments for assistance to such projects to be fulfilled from appropriations to be made in future fiscal years.

As one who has traveled extensively in the Middle East and Far East and who has studied the immediate pressing problems of the underdeveloped countries I can say without hesitation that I am entirely in accord with this statement of policy by the President and the Secretary of State. In the great upheavals of today these overpopulated countries are seeking freedom, independence, and self-determination, and are opposing the imperialism and colonialism of the past. They have felt the breath of free fresh air. They have hoped and prayed that our America, built on the foundation of the sacredness of the individual human being and his freedom under God, might lend the helping hand to assist them in attaining that freedom. This does not mean handouts by us to buy friendships. It means a sympathetic partnership understanding of their eagerness for our know-how and our willingness to share that know-how with them. In order to make this philosophy work in our assist-

ance programs it may be necessary to obtain greater assurance of continuity in some economic aid programs, especially in the underdeveloped countries. It may be that this kind of longer term commitment will be necessary to assist in village development programs in the overpopulated areas, in the important construction projects, such as the big Egypt dam, or the proposals for refugee resettlement in the Middle East, where the problem is so difficult because of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The interests of the United States under this proposal would continue to be protected. Congress must act year by year. No Congress can irrevocably commit any succeeding Congress. Appropriations can only be made year by year. This constitutes an important check on the limited authority the President asks for.

I turn now to the second part upon which Mr. Dulles is being criticized.

II. THE BRINK OF WAR ARTICLE IN LIFE

My distinguished colleague and fellow member of the Foreign Relations Committee the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has developed an astonishing fear complex and has practically demanded the repudiation by President Eisenhower of his Secretary of State.

But, of course, as I said before, this is an election year, and, as the late Senator Vandenberg used to say to me, "We who are in public life, sometimes do and say things in an election year which we hardly even recall in normal times." I believe that is the best explanation of the hysteria on this point.

What is the mortal sin with which Secretary Dulles is charged? He simply relied on historical facts. If the Kaiser of Germany in World War I had known that the United States was able and willing to help save the world, that war would never have been started. Had Hitler known of our ability and willingness to join the Allies in World War II, that war might well have been averted; had Russia and Red China not been misled into thinking that Korea was outside the defense perimeter of the United States, the Korean war probably never would have broken upon us.

Mr. Dulles, as I understand him, believes that our military preparedness and our solemn determination to face up to the threat of war, if it should come to that, has saved and will save us from world war III. Any other attitude would mean a craven retreat even from moral principles and an inexcusable betrayal of our friends and allies abroad.

If we review Yalta and Potsdam—and we do not need to place blame at this point to do so—we will see clearly that retreat, compromise, appeasement, and fear can lead to dangers as great as war itself.

Mr. President, for myself, I thank God today and every day for the vision and courageous leadership of our great President Eisenhower and his distinguished Secretary of State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for one question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that in the three instances which were mentioned in the Life magazine article, the steps which were taken had satisfactory results? In other words, the Korean war was stopped, and it has not started again; Formosa is still in friendly hands; at least half of Indochina is still in friendly hands. The results speak for themselves. Is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. His statement is absolutely correct, and in line with the statement I have just made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1166. An act to amend section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended, and section 2 of the act of February 2, 1903, as amended; and

S. 2170. An act to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of basic and storable nonbasic agricultural commodities without restriction where similar commodities are exported in raw or processed form.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. CHATHAM, Mr. SELDEN, Mr. VORYS, and Mr. BENTLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5614) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ARTICLE BY GEN. MATTHEW B. RIDGWAY PUBLISHED IN THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 5 minutes with respect to a magazine article.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in tomorrow's Saturday Evening Post there will appear an article, now being circulated among various people, by a great soldier, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

There have been those among the money-firsters, including prominent civilians who picked up the military art after a few weeks' effort, who criticized

the military opinions of General Ridgway; and, as the article shows only too well, put incredible pressure on him. But there has never been anyone, anywhere, who ever criticized the integrity of this great officer.

Many times we have presented to the Senate the fact that the military security of the United States was now being sacrificed by those who believe figures come before forces; in other words, money before adequate national defense.

Many times, also I have said that undue persuasion was being used, yes, what might justly be called threats were being made, against our military leaders, to line them up prior to their testimony before Congress, behind a program with which they did not agree.

Many times some have cautioned that the American people would never argue against any program which had the approval of another former Army Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower.

Mr. President, I did not come to the Senate to present only those matters which might be considered popular.

If people agree with those of us who are against the sacrifice of security and principle—principle in the American tradition—they would be agreeing with men who had as much to do with winning the past war as anyone else—such great soldiers as General Bradley, General Spaatz, General Ridgway, and a great many others.

Now the whole factual story is out.

In effect, this article says that the security of the Nation is being thrown into the market place, to be traded for political advantage.

It will be interesting to see what the answer will be to this latest authoritative statement about the current policy of "figures before forces."

After reading General Ridgway's article, I do not see how anyone can honestly doubt his narration of facts as to how these military budgets are being made; and how the Members of this Congress are being deluded by misrepresentations now being employed to justify reductions in defense expenditures.

If there is a policy of putting a price tag on survival, let it be brought out into the open. The people have the right to know.

In an address delivered in Chicago last September 30, I asked:

How many people realize that all the vaunted talk about reducing the cost of Government during this administration has been entirely at the expense of our national defense? Whereas during the fiscal years of 1954, 1955, and 1956 there have been cuts totaling almost \$3 billion in defense expenditures, the record shows that the cost of conducting the other branches of the Federal Government has increased almost \$4 billion.

I ask, further, How many people realize that, in the face of the unquestioned facts of the Soviet military buildup, for 3 years the people have been asked to spend a smaller percentage of their gross national product, each year, for national security?

Whatever the cost for defense against the Communist threat, the American people will gladly pay it. But they will not even get that chance, any more than the British people did before 1938, unless

their Government gives them the truth.

I suggest that everyone read this article by General Ridgway—and then decide whether or not the people are being given the truth at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have on my desk the article to which the Senator from Missouri has referred. I do not mean to discuss the article with my colleague from Missouri. I heard him use the word "principle." I am not quite sure how he used it, but I am confident that he will agree with me that our present President will do what he believes to be right. My colleague may not agree that the security which is worked out is the best security. There can be a difference of opinion, but I hope there is no difference of opinion as to the fact that the present President of the United States is going to do what he believes to be right and that he is in that way living up to the principles to which he has always adhered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know who in this administration is responsible for urging various people in the Defense Establishment to testify before congressional committees to what they did not believe was in the interest of the security of the United States. But whoever is responsible for that incredible action should take the responsibility and accept the blame for it. I believe it to be against the principles for which our country stands. It is a fact, as a reading of the article will disclose, that General Ridgway states he was pressured "crudely" at times—because it was suggested to him that he not say what he believed. Mr. President, when a military man is placed in that position just prior to his appearance before a congressional committee, where in effect, he is under oath, it is against the American principle. Now this is not the first time such reprehensible action has occurred. It is not the first time people have said pressure was being brought in this fashion by members of this administration.

The late great General Vandenberg would confirm completely the position taken in this article by a former member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We can discuss the details of this matter later, but, knowing General Ridgway, I am confident that no man would try to pressure him into saying something he did not believe.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the article he states that is exactly what was done. He said he had had many shocks in his life, including moments in battle, but none to exceed his shock and surprise when he read the President's annual message for 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Defense Department, and I can assure the Senator from Missouri that what he has stated about General Ridgway is correct. He was the only official from the Pentagon who stood fast in the effort to get appropriations to carry out the ideas which the Senator from Missouri has in mind.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think my distinguished colleague as he defends the good name of a great soldier.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I asked the General, point blank, "Do you mean this?"

He said, "I certainly do."

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the Senator from Missouri has seen fit to make the speech he has just made on the floor of the Senate. I think it is a good antidote for some of the matters set forth in the state-of-the-Union message. I believe it is time the American people knew that the situation in which we find ourselves is perhaps the most gloomy since the end of the Second World War.

I am also delighted to know that the Defense Department is taking a new look at the New Look they gave the American people when this administration came into power in 1953, at which time they reduced the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, none of which branches has been restored to the optimum position held at the time when the new administration came into power.

I hope all Senators will see to it that the American people are told the truth about the situation which exists in the world today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana. What he says is true. These reductions in the face of growing Communist strength are bad enough. But what is worse is the accusation, now being made by a man who resigned under the fire created by his criticism, namely, that crude, unfair pressure was brought to bear on him; and that prior to his testifying before the committees of Congress, that body which under the Constitution appropriates the money to keep this country secure; pressure was exerted on him to make him state as fact something he did not believe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more comment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I point out that no one can ever question the courage of General Ridgway. He is one soldier who would never bow to pressure.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator; and would, among others, add the names of Billy Mitchell and Hoyt Vandenberg.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.