

STAT

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/01/15 :
CIA-RDP60-00321R000300300011-4

Page Denied

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/01/15 :
CIA-RDP60-00321R000300300011-4

by Mr. MURKIN (for himself and Mr. Cass of South Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROSSER:
Article entitled "Senate Will Regulate Export Regulators," published in the *Washington (Wia.) Freeman* of February 20.
Article on the subject of fair trade laws, published in the *New York Times*.

ANSWERS TO THE LETTER OF A VIETNAMESE GIRL

Miss Miss Le-My: Yours is a charming letter; your questions are good ones, set down clearly and frankly. I'm happy to try to answer them, as frankly and clearly as I know how.

In doing so, I can speak only for myself, as one American, for there is no official doctrine that Americans subscribe to; everyone has his own ideas and delights in stating them. But I earnestly think that my views would not be very different from those of the great majority of Americans; that in broad terms they fairly represent the philosophy of our Government and—in this area—of both our political parties, despite those parties' differences on other matters.

1. All governments try to act—and should act, I think—in their own interest. If the acts in their own interest are also friendly and kindly and generous ones, so much the better. And the best of all is when the acts in our own interest are equally in the interest of other nations affected. I believe the American-aid program to Vietnam and to all the other lands where it operated, was that happy kind of an act. The real question is what do we mean by America's "own interest"?

It is to live in a world of other free, democratic, and prosperous nations. Such nations, governed by their people, do not want or plot war, for all ordinary people hate war and would never choose it if they could avoid it. With other free, prosperous, democratic nations as neighbors, no country need fear that it will be attacked, or undermined, or subverted. If it is prosperous, it can produce and trade for what it needs, without wanting to grab or dominate the property and people of other countries. In short, an independent country, governed by its own citizens, seeking progress toward a bright horizon of good living, is no threat or menace to anyone, or to the peace. It will resist the attempt by anyone, from within or outside, to overthrow it and replace its democracy with a tyranny.

So the United States sees its best chance for peace and for a happy future in living in a world where other nations are governed by the majority will of their people, are steadily independent, and can both flourish to growing prosperity and improvement in the conditions of life. It has no wish to make those countries similar to the United States in other matters, and does not seek to change their national—and natural—customs, philosophies, values, culture, or civilization.

America's aid program is intended, therefore, to help other countries, particularly the new ones which have gained independence since World War II, establish themselves as strong, secure, and self-governing. This is America's own interest, and the interest for which it acts. Is it not also, fortunately, in the interest of every other democratic nation to be helped in staying free and to be aided toward prosperity, and to find other nations around it similarly helped?

You suggested that the United States helps other lands for its own strategic and commercial reasons. To the extent that a country so helped is better able to resist Communist attempts to poison and destroy its democracy, and to the extent that, with increasing prosperity, it will want and be able to buy and sell more goods from all countries around the world, to that extent I agree with you.

2. Surely America has not cannibalized any of the countries it has aided. It spent billions of dollars through the Marshall plan and other programs to help European countries, and I think they would agree they were helped enormously. Yet none of them feel, I believe, that their freedom of action has

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Address delivered by Senator McCLELLAN at the annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New York City on February 28, 1958.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by Senator Gans of New Jersey at luncheon session of Fifth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, Washington, D. C., February 28, 1958.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Address delivered by Senator Gans at Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, St. Louis, Mo., March 1, 1958.

Article entitled, "Proposals To Push Power Authority for Northwest," written by Malcolm Bauer, and published in the *Christian Science Monitor* of January 13, 1958.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by Mr. Randolph A. Hines at the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, in San Francisco, on February 11, 1958.

Address entitled "Utah and Trails Safety—A Blueprint for Achievement," delivered by T. S. Peterson, president, Standard Oil Company of California, at annual meeting, Utah Safety Council, Salt Lake City, Utah.

By Mr. BYRD:

Address delivered by Mr. Hugh Gordon Miller in presenting to Dr. Francis Pottenger Gains the sixth gold medal award of Honor of the New York Southern Society, New York, N. Y., January 17, 1958.

Address delivered by Mr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics on subject Space Technology and the NACA, New York, N. Y., January 27, 1958.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Editorial entitled "Wired Electrification," published in the *Oklahoma (Tul.) News* of February 18, 1958.

By Mr. COTTON:

Article concerning highway advertising on Federal interstate highways, written by Gladstone Williams, and published in the *Sacramento (Calif.) Bee* of February 12, 1958.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Article entitled "Oregon Lays Groundwork for Its Centennial," written by Senator Armstrong, and published in the *New York Times* of March 2, 1958.

By Mr. MORTON:

Letter addressed to him by Robert S. Martin, superintendent of public instruction, Commonwealth of Kentucky, February 28, 1958, regarding library service.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Letter dated February 19, 1958, addressed to the editor of the *Portland (Maine) Press Herald* by Hon. Roscoe C. Ingersoll, of Newport, Maine, in regard to economic conditions in Washington County, Maine.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Industrial Development Parley Called by C. & N. W.," published in the *Janesville (Wia.) Daily Gazette* of February 28, 1958; and excerpts from statement by Roy J. Colbert entitled "United States for Industrial Development."

Article entitled "18,000 To Take Tests Seeking Gifted Pupils," written by Robert L. Bishop, and published in the *Milwaukee Journal* of February 16, 1958.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON BILL TO EXTEND THE AUTHORITY TO REGULATE EXPORTS FOR 2 YEARS

Mr. PULSIFORT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on March 13, 1958, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, on S. 3092, a bill to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3321, extension 3321, as soon as possible.

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ASKED BY A VIETNAMESE GIRL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the letter to the little Vietnamese girl which appeared in the *Washington Post*, yesterday, March 2. The letter is Editor Alfred Friendly's reply to Miss Le-My, of Saigon. Miss Le-My's letter was published in the *Post* last Tuesday, and contained 18 questions concerning America and its relationship with Vietnam.

I believe it is vitally important that these questions and the answers by Mr. Friendly be published in the Record, because we must realize that Miss Le-My's questions are becoming the questions—whether they are Communist inspired or not—of thousands of southeast Asians.

Too many Americans did not seem to realize that they were in Vietnam to serve, not to be served. The Americans did not trouble themselves to learn the language or understand the customs. The apparent secret of Communist success in Asia and throughout the world lies in the willingness of the Communists to take the time and trouble to really understand the Asians.

We are, and always will be, guests in the house of the Asians. The questions asked by Miss Le-My are important. Mr. Friendly's answers to them are good.

But we must go beyond the answers. We must change the ways of our own hearts, so that all the Miss Le-My's of Asia will know we serve their interests—and not our own, alone.

If we show that our interests and theirs are really the same—namely, the arrest of communistic enslavement—we shall be able to work together everywhere, for everyone.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

been isolated, much less that they have been assimilated by the American aid. Indeed, instead of that they have been helped to become stronger, more aware, more purposeful and—and this is the most important—better able to stay free and independent—dependent of the United States and of anyone else. The mass, I think, is true with the new Asian nations. Ceylon, India and Ceylon, for example, have been helped in their new independence by American aid, and are receiving American aid to forward them on the path of stability and prosperity.

Think of the course of development of some of the countries which had been helped by large amounts of American aid. America and India, for example, became neutral in the cold war; Greece and Pakistan are allied in the United States by various treaties; Yugoslavia is a Communist country but strictly independent of Moscow's control; Egypt is currently unfriendly to us. They diverge they all are, one from another. But they have one thing in common: both is dominated by America or confined to American policy; none is in any way dominated.

We might ask ourselves who is the real colonial power these days. Are not Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, enslaved to Moscow in their actions and policies and directions? Did not a brutal military force from Russia smash an attempt by the Hungarians to choose their own government? And as for assimilation, was there ever a greater extermination of national identity and independence than that accomplished by Russia on Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and in its Asian territories?

Wouldn't you agree that America's record in colonial matters has been very good? The United States freed Cuba from Spain, but did not make it a colony. At the same time, it took the Philippine Islands, but granted them independence when they were able to govern themselves, and fulfilled that promise. It offered Puerto Rico a choice between independence or remaining as part of the United States, by the free choice of the Puerto Ricans, they decided to join this country as a self-governing commonwealth. America had many chances to win colonies, but it has no colonies.

HOW SOON?

2. You ask whether the Americans will go home or remain for years and years in your country. They want to go home, I wish to assure you, as soon as possible, because each person likes best to live at home, not in another's country. I cannot make you promises; I can only ask you to look at what has happened in other nations where the United States had aid missions and programs. As soon as the country was restored to a sturdy condition, the aid missions, both civil and military, left.

NO POWER

4. Americans do not consider Ngo Dinh-Diem as an American puppet, as you say many Vietnamese people do. I do not consider that he is and believe he is in a vastly different position from the puppet heads of countries which are Russian satellites. And I know, too, that as other democratic nations which America aided grew stronger, their government leaders guided them ever more independently along their own national ways and in their own national policies.

LEARN UP

5. I am sure most Americans do not know that, as you say, 95 percent of the Vietnamese do not like them. They will be unhappy in the thought that this is so. It is a failing of Americans, I am afraid, to want everyone to like them. Perhaps, if you will write me again, you will tell me what the characteristics of Americans are that your people dislike. It may be that some Americans are rough in their manners, or, not knowing the customs of others, may seem too rude. And

yet I hope that among our best babies you do not find the qualities of meanness, or cynicism, or deceit, or brutality. We are civilized to civilization, and I hope always to be sympathetic and generous towards them when we come to understand the conditions around us.

THE NEGRO

6. You ask whether the Americans consider the Vietnamese as they do Negroes in America. This implies, if I understand you, that we think ill of Negroes here. This is not so. To be sure, many of our people in the South particularly, but certainly not a majority of the Nation, see the Negro as less than the equal of the rest of the population. But most of us, I think, see the Negro as endowed with all the rights and dignity of all human beings.

As for the Vietnamese, we know only a relatively few of them in this country, but there is no hostility toward them. On the contrary, they are liked and welcomed wherever they are, principally in American schools where they have come to study.

In the past century there was, in certain parts of the country, some prejudice against Asians. It is rapidly disappearing. Some of our finest citizens, our most distinguished artists, teachers, scientists, businessmen, and workers are of Asian blood. In all but a few places, they are completely part of the community. Their neighbors give their ancestry scarcely a second thought, and their oriental descent is little more noted than the fact that other neighbors may be of German or Polish or Irish forebears.

CONTRACTS

7. What about the influence of big capitalists on President Eisenhower, you ask. Well, many of his friends and several of his principal Government advisers are men who were successful in large business. But he has great numbers of friends and advisers who have not come from the ranks of business, big or little. The only way one can judge their influence is to look to the policies that the President has adopted. Some Americans argue that some of Mr. Eisenhower's policies affecting the domestic economy favor big business, while others argue vehemently the contrary. But few would argue that the foreign policy of the United States and of President Eisenhower—things which most concern you and your country—is aimed at a goal of helping business, big or little, or is influenced by what could be called business considerations. It is not influenced, I feel, by any thought of favoring one or another individual group, such as business or labor, rich or poor, whites or Negroes, North or South, farm or city, but rather it is influenced by what must be seen as national considerations: that is, what is good for the country as a unit.

There has been much talk from those hostile to this country that our foreign policy is based on the desire of big capitalists for more profits through military protection and that they deliberately keep up a war scare, or stimulate world unrest and disturbances for this purpose. For almost 40 years, the Communists have been trying to peddle that absurdity. Nothing could be more ridiculous. In a peaceful, unthreatened world, our business and our labor, everyone in our country, would profit vastly more by producing the goods of peace; taxes, a heavy burden on business and individuals here, could be cut in half; all the good things people want—schools and scholarships, roads, household possessions, equipment for recreation and sports, for science and learning, libraries and museums—could be produced in larger measure at just as high wages for labor and just as good profits for business. Yet a war, in today's world, means devastation for the winner as well as the loser, destruction of life and of everyone's property. Big capitalists as well as other people know this. They know they have as

much to lose from war and from the words of their own leaders as anyone else—and maybe more.

EACH COUNTRY

8. You turn again to the race question in America. It is a difficult one and I would not want to pretend to you otherwise. It is not true that white Americans think of Negroes as slaves. But many as I said before, think Negroes inferior to them. In one sense many Negroes are, but only because they have been deprived, through no fault of their own, of opportunities for good schooling, and they have generally been among the least privileged in their economic opportunities, background, and way of living.

Why this was so is a long and complicated and sad story, and one that takes patience to explain and describe. But it is true, and it represents a blot on America's good name. The Nation has determined that this must be changed. What is now important is that our Federal Government has said that discrimination by reason of race can no longer be permitted in schools, in jobs, in politics, in any of the rights of a citizen. It has set its face firmly in this direction, and is acting on this principle with the support of the great majority of the people.

In law and its policies are being resisted in some areas and some of the States of the Union. It will be many years, I think, before prejudice is erased and full justice done. But the direction we are going, and the good speed at which we are moving in this goal, are encouraging.

America's problem here, and its proposed solution, may be much like India's. There, for centuries, there has been a caste system, with great discrimination against some classes. But by its laws and by its firm resolve, India has determined to end that unfairness. It will take time and courage to do it.

America, like other countries, has its problems; this is one of its most difficult ones. It is moving the right way to solve the problem and is moving successfully. It is important, don't you think, to observe not only what is bad, but to judge how determined and resolute and effective are the programs to correct what is bad?

Little Rock was indeed a shame that hangs over the United States. It was a shame that a group of people tried to stop Negroes from entering a public school. But it was right, and not a shame, that the Government indicated that there be obedience to its new rules that Negroes be allowed to enter the schools, and that it took action to obtain obedience.

RUSSIAN MOONS

9. Americans were tremendously impressed by the Russian man-made moon. They realized that these satellites demonstrated the Russian's scientific and technical skill. More than that, they realized that this represented a marvelous achievement of man, not of a Russian, or of an American, or of a Vietnamese, but of man.

Now the United States has successfully launched its first artificial moon. Both Russia and the United States will surely put up many more before the year is out. And their success did not, and will not depend upon spying upon each other, but rather on the fact they are studying and developing basic scientific knowledge which cannot and should not be kept secret, but which by its very nature is the property of all men of all lands and cannot be hidden from them.

SECOND PLACE

10. America was second, not first, in launching a satellite not because we were unable to find out, by spying, how the Russians did it. Rather, the Russians devoted earlier and perhaps worked harder on the project of launching the moon. There has been much talk, most of it foolish, in my opinion, that Russia was able to make an

atomic bomb only because it spied here and discovered how we did it. Perhaps the Russians were helped a bit by getting some American secrets. But I go back to what I said before: there are no secrets to be kept for long in science, and there is no national monopoly in scientific ability.

What there should be, of course, is world-wide cooperation in scientific and cultural work, so that everyone in every country can enjoy the fruits. In a world where no nation threatens another, this will come about. Meantime, because Russia and China declare continually and insistently that they mean to conquer free countries, overthrow their democratic governments, and replace them with a Communist government, which we see as tyranny and despotism, we and our allies turn science to military use, and build weapons, just as Russia is doing. Thus we have built some atomic submarines and doubtless will build some more. Russia will too, I am sure, although whether it will produce 150 or not, I do not know. It has not built one yet, as far as I know.

You and I can agree that making weapons is a wasteful thing to do, when there is so much else to be done that would be constructive. Yet we would also agree, I think, that we must make weapons now if we are to stay free and live by the governments we choose.

JAMES DEAN

11. If you tell me that James Dean is more popular in Vietnam than President Eisenhower, I must take your word for it, but I don't think you can exactly blame Hollywood for it. Hollywood movie companies, all privately owned and not controlled by Government, make films which they think people will enjoy. I suppose they conclude that when people go to the cinema they want entertainment rather than serious politics, and so they make films by entertainers, and often about them. We here would rather be entertained by movies than preached to, and that may also be the case in your country.

What I have written is, as I said at the beginning, just one American's answers. But your questions are so important—and I believe they reflect so well the concern that millions of people around the world, in Vietnam and in many other countries, have about my country—that I think they deserve reading and answering by many Americans.

So—and I hope you don't mind—I am going to print your letter in our newspaper with the request that others write you with their answers. I will not disclose your name or address but am using the pseudonym LÉ-MY; our paper will forward the letters to you.

You will, I suspect, get a lot of them. Some may be foolish, a few may even be unpleasant, for America has its share of foolish and unpleasant people—no more and no less, I guess, than other nations. But most letters, I think, will be earnest attempts to tell you about America and its attitudes and aims. Taken together, all the letters may give you the best and most accurate picture of what our country feels and works for and worries about * * * and dreams about. And most of the letters will be written as this one is, with the greatest good will to you and your countrymen.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED FRIENDLY,

P. S.—One question to you: Where did you learn such splendid English?

MISSOULA AND MONTANA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the March issue of Harper's magazine contains an article glorifying and describing Missoula, Mont., and the State of Montana as places of near perfection in

which to live. That is a position with which I heartily agree.

I was especially pleased that the author, Herbert Howarth, was so impressed during his stay in Missoula. It is an exceedingly wonderful community, located in the valley in the heart of the mountains of western Montana. Undoubtedly I am prejudiced, because I went to the university in Missoula, and for a time was a member of the faculty at Montana State University.

Herbert Howarth is an Englishman who recently completed a year as a visiting lecturer at the University of Montana. While most of Mr. Howarth's article, entitled "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway," is largely concerned with Missoula, I feel that what is "good, relaxed, unconsciously kindly" in Missoula can also be found in the entire State of Montana.

Mr. Howarth had an opportunity to become acquainted with one of Montana's greatest assets, its young people. He concurs in the excellence of Montana's State University system and its topnotch faculty, but he also points out that many of the Treasure State's talented young people and its brightest minds go to other parts of the Nation. Montana cannot afford to lose them.

This Harper's magazine article is very readable, and gives a tremendous insight into Montana. I urge all my colleagues in the Senate to read it. I know that each and every one would arrive at the same conclusion that Mr. Howarth does, if given an opportunity to live in Missoula, Mont.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway," and editorials published in the Lewis-town Daily News and the Ekalaka (Mont.) Eagle be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA: THE FRONTIER WENT THATAWAY

(By Herbert Howarth)

We stopped one evening to buy cream at a farm where Missoula edges the mountains, beyond which Montana becomes Idaho. It was a small farm, started a generation and a half ago by homesteaders from middle Europe. The strong-featured grandmother who poured cream for us in the kitchen still talked with a Hungarian chime in her voice. The family was just sitting down to supper—to cottage cheese and chives, a bowl of steaming buttered corn, another of giant potatoes, a baked meatloaf in 2 inches of tomato sauce, coffee. The cutlery was sterling, heavy, and good. Revere saucepans shone on the range. A small farm, but its prosperity made us, with European scenes still fairly fresh in our memory, reflect, "Who in Europe today has a farm like this?"

We were, as that comparative way of putting it shows, still fairly recent arrivals. My wife was born in Switzerland, I in Britain, and we were in Montana for the academic year—I was lecturing at Montana State University's Missoula campus. This was not our first sight of the United States; we had enjoyed previous stays at other American universities; but it was our first spell in the Rocky Mountains.

As we came out I looked across the plantation of raspberry canes. The hills were pleasant in the sunset. A vacant lot beyond the farm was marked "Five acres for sale."

"Why are we just visitors?" I asked my wife. At that moment it seemed near perfection to have the genial productive life of Missoula, to settle into the rhythm of its hard, clean winters and fruitful summers.

If we could have acted on that thought, would we really have liked it? Arrivals stream steadily into Missoula, but it doesn't keep a hold on all of them. It is growing, but it has a quick turnover of transients. Newcomers separate into two distinct groups—those who find the promise of a satisfying life in it, and will stay; those who come hopefully, but now are restless and will move on.

For Missoula confronts you with this test: can you be content with what is good, relaxed, unconsciously kindly, but short of the stimuli of larger cities? Or must you have, to buoy you, that typical modern urban life where a complex, saturated law, and culture flow above a lower level of complex, saturated anitlaw and vice? There are no double levels in Missoula. A minimum of urbanity, maybe, but with it a minimum of trouble. Missoula, like all Montana, has its contradictions, some of which I will try to pin down, but they are innocent, transparent.

MONEY AND PASSION

The first thing about Missoula is its affluence. It insists on the newest in living styles. It puts more up-to-date cars on the street, per capita, than I have seen in a prosperous Michigan town of the same size near the automobile plants. It is building impressive and expensive houses up all the creeks and canyons and equipping them lavishly. Even in the older houses the interiors have comfort and charm.

Beyond the perimeter and into the hills obvious up to datefulness diminishes, but spending power is abundant. The day before Christmas Missoula filled with families from outlying ranches. Leathery men, girls in rough corbody trousers with yellow hair trailing to the base of their spines, piled out of cars and practically stripped the stores. The packed toy basement of Montgomery Ward had, at dusk on Christmas Eve, been crowded of all but 3 or 4 bicycles.

What is extraordinary is that collecting this spending power does not produce tensions or pressure. No one in Montana is in a hurry. If there were barometers of public anxiety, installed like the temperature clocks over the city banks, they would register low all the way from Glacier Park to Glendive. Men take their jobs, including the heavy and dangerous jobs in forest or mine, at a leisurely pace. The natural resources teeming on the banks of the Divide seem to turn to money easily enough to obviate competition. Where there's enough for everybody, there's no need for acrimonious rivalries. In fact, the norm of Montana is mutual helpfulness. This sense of security in abundance actually seems to make for more efficiency rather than less, and it has one definite result: a margin of free time for everybody.

The usual problem of leisure is what to do with it. The old puritans hated leisure because their experience was that very few people knew how to use it except badly. Missoula and its neighbors have, I think, only a modicum of the depleting kind of leisure routines. There is a modicum of drinking: cases of bourbon are wheeled in high pyramids out of the State liquor store into waiting cars. There is a modicum of gambling. But these international phenomena never go far in Missoula, never culminate in violence or public unpleasantness. The reason is that male energy is happily mated to a pleasure

by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Address delivered by Senator McCLELLAN at the annual dinner of the Traffic Club of New York City on February 20, 1958.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by Senator CASE of New Jersey at luncheon session of Fifth National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, Washington, D. C., February 26, 1958.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Address delivered by Senator GORE at Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, St. Louis, Mo., March 1, 1958.

Article entitled, "NEUBERGER To Push Power Authority for Northwest," written by Malcolm Bauer, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 13, 1958.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by Mr. Randolph A. Hearst at the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, in San Francisco, on February 17, 1958.

Address entitled "Utah and Traffic Safety—A Blueprint for Achievement," delivered by T. S. Peterson, president, Standard Oil Company of California, at annual meeting, Utah Safety Council, Salt Lake City, Utah.

By Mr. BYRD:

Address delivered by Mr. Hugh Gordon Miller in presenting to Dr. Francis Pendleton Gaines the sixth gold medal award of honor of the New York Southern Society, New York, N. Y., January 17, 1958.

Address delivered by Mr. Hugh L. Dryden, director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, on subject Space Technology and the NACA, New York, N. Y., January 27, 1958.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Editorial entitled "Rural Electrification," published in the Giddings (Tex.) News of February 13, 1958.

By Mr. COTTON:

Article concerning billboard advertising on Federal interstate highways, written by Gladstone Williams, and published in the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of February 12, 1958.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Article entitled "Oregon Lays Groundwork for Its Centennial," written by Senator NEUBERGER, and published in the New York Times of March 2, 1958.

By Mr. MORTON:

Letter addressed to him by Robert R. Martin, superintendent of public instruction, Commonwealth of Kentucky, February 26, 1958, regarding library service.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Letter dated February 19, 1958, addressed to the editor of the Portland (Maine) Press Herald by Hon. Roscoe C. Emery, of Eastport, Maine, in regard to economic conditions in Washington County, Maine.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Industrial Development Parley Called by C. & N. W.," published in the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of February 28, 1958; and excerpts from statement by Roy J. Colbert entitled "Tested Procedure for Industrial Development."

Article entitled "18,000 To Take Tests Seeking Gifted Pupils," written by Robert L. Dehon, and published in the Milwaukee Journal of February 16, 1958.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Article entitled "Senate Bill Would Regulate Regulators," published in the Waukesha (Wis.) Freeman of February 20.

Article on the subject of fair trade laws, published in the New York Times.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON BILL TO EXTEND THE AUTHORITY TO REGULATE EXPORTS FOR 2 YEARS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on March 13, 1958, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, on S. 3093, a bill to extend for an additional period of 2 years the authority to regulate exports contained in the Export Control Act of 1949.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible.

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ASKED BY A VIETNAMESE GIRL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the letter to the little Vietnamese girl which appeared in the Washington Post, yesterday, March 2. The letter is Editor Alfred Friendly's reply to Miss Le-My, of Saigon. Miss Le-My's letter was published in the Post last Tuesday, and contained 10 questions concerning America and its relationship with Vietnam.

I believe it is vitally important that these questions and the answers by Mr. Friendly be published in the Record, because we must realize that Miss Le-My's questions are becoming the questions—whether they are Communist inspired or not—of thousands of southeast Asians.

Too many Americans did not seem to realize that they were in Vietnam to serve, not to be served. The Americans did not trouble themselves to learn the language or understand the customs. The apparent secret of Communist success in Asia and throughout the world lies in the willingness of the Communists to take the time and trouble to really understand the Asians.

We are, and always will be, guests in the house of the Asians. The questions asked by Miss Le-My are important. Mr. Friendly's answers to them are good.

But we must go beyond the answers. We must change the ways of our own hearts, so that all the Miss Le-My's of Asia will know we serve their interests—and not our own, alone.

If we show that our interests and theirs are really the same—namely, the arrest of communistic enslavement—we shall be able to work together everywhere, for everyone.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AN ANSWER TO THE LETTER OF A VIETNAMESE GIRL

DEAR MISS LE-MY: Yours is a charming letter; your questions are good ones, set down clearly and frankly. I'm happy to try to answer them, as frankly and clearly as I know how.

In doing so, I can speak only for myself, as one American, for there is no official doctrine that Americans subscribe to; everyone has his own ideas and delights in stating them. But I earnestly think that my views would not be very different from those of the great majority of Americans; that in broad terms they fairly represent the philosophy of our Government and—in this area—of both our political parties, despite those parties' differences on other matters.

OUR OWN INTEREST

1. All governments try to act—and should act, I think—in their own interest. If the acts in their own interest are also friendly and kindly and generous ones, so much the better. And the best of all is when the acts in our own interest are equally in the interest of other nations affected. I believe the American-aid program, to Vietnam and to all the other lands where it operated, was that happy kind of an act.

The real question is what do we mean by America's "own interest"?

It is to live in a world of other free, democratic, and prosperous nations. Such nations, governed by their people, do not want or plot war, for all ordinary people hate war and would never choose it if they could avoid it. With other free, prosperous, democratic nations as neighbors, no country need fear that it will be attacked, or undermined, or subverted. If it is prosperous, it can produce and trade for what it needs, without wanting to grab or dominate the property and people of other countries. In short, an independent country, governed by its own citizens, seeking progress toward a bright horizon of good living, is no threat or menace to anyone, or to the peace. It will resist the attempt by anyone, from within or outside, to overthrow it and replace its democracy with a tyranny.

So the United States sees its best chance for peace and for a happy future in living in a world where other nations are governed by the majority will of their people, are sturdily independent, and can look forward to growing prosperity and improvement in the conditions of life. It has no wish to make those countries similar to the United States in other matters, and does not seek to change their national—and natural—customs, philosophies, values, culture, or civilization.

America's aid program is intended, therefore, to help other countries, particularly the new ones which have gained independence since World War II, establish themselves as strong, secure, and self-governing. This is America's own interest, and the interest for which it acts. Is it not also, fortunately, in the interest of every other democratic nation to be helped in staying free and to be aided toward prosperity, and to find other nations around it similarly helped?

You suggested that the United States helps other lands for its own strategic and commercial reasons. To the extent that a country so helped is better able to resist Communist attempts to poison and destroy its democracy, and to the extent that, with increasing prosperity, it will want and be able to buy and sell more goods from all countries around the world, to that extent I agree with you.

ASSIMILATION

2. Surely America has not assimilated any of the countries it has aided. It spent billions of dollars through the Marshall plan and other programs to help European countries, and I think they would agree they were helped enormously. Yet none of them feel, I believe, that their freedom of action has

been lessened, much less that they have been assimilated by the American aid. Indeed, most of them feel that they have been helped to become stronger, more secure, more prosperous and—and this is the most important—better able to stay free and independent—-independent of the United States and of anyone else. The same, I think, is true with the new Asian nations. Surely India and Ceylon, for example, have been helped in their new independence by American aid, and are receiving American aid to forward them on the path of stability and prosperity.

Think of the course of development of some of the countries which had been helped by large amounts of American aid. Austria and India, for example, became neutrals in the cold war; Greece and Pakistan are allied to the United States by various treaties; Yugoslavia is a Communist country but relatively independent of Moscow control; Egypt is currently unfriendly to us. How different they all are, one from another. But they have one thing in common: none is dominated by America or chained to American policy; none is in any way assimilated.

We might ask ourselves who is the real colonial power these days. Are not Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania enslaved to Moscow in their actions and policies and directions? Did not a brutal military force from Russia smash an attempt by the Hungarians to choose their own government? And as for assimilation, was there ever a greater extermination of national identity and independence than that accomplished by Russia on Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and in its Asian territories?

Wouldn't you agree that America's record in colonial matters has been very good? The United States freed Cuba from Spain, but did not seize it as a colony. At the same time, it took the Philippine Islands, but promised them independence when they were able to govern themselves, and fulfilled that promise. It offered Puerto Rico a choice between independence or remaining as part of the United States, by the free choice of the Puerto Ricans, they decided to join this country as a self-governing commonwealth. America had many chances to win colonies, but it has no colonies.

HOW LONG?

3. You ask whether the Americans will go home or remain for years and years in your country. They want to go home, I can assure you, as soon as possible, because each person likes best to live at home, not in another's country. I cannot make you promise; I can only ask you to look at what has happened in other nations where the United States had aid missions and programs. As soon as the country was restored to a sturdy condition, the aid missions, both civil and military, left.

NO PUPPET

4. Americans do not consider Neo-Dinh-Diem as an American puppet, as you say many Vietnamese people do. I do not consider that he is and believe he is in a vastly different position from the puppet heads of countries which are Russian satellites. And I know, too, that as other democratic nations which America aided grew stronger, their government leaders guided them ever more independently along their own national ways and in their own national policies.

LIKING US

5. I am sure most Americans do not know that, as you say, 95 percent of the Vietnamese do not like them. They will be unhappy in the thought that this is so. It is a failing of Americans, I am afraid, to want everyone to like them. Perhaps, if you will write me again, you will tell me what the characteristics of Americans are that your people dislike. It may be that some Americans are rough in their manners, or, not knowing the customs of others, may seem too rude. And

yet I hope that among our bad habits you do not find the qualities of meanness, or slyness, or deceit, or brutality. We are inclined to sentimentality, and I hope always to a sympathetic and generous attitude when we come to understand the conditions around us.

THE NEGRO

6. You ask whether the Americans consider the Vietnamese as they do Negroes in America. This implies, if I understand you, that we think ill of Negroes here. This is not so. To be sure many of our people in the South particularly, but certainly not a majority of the Nation, see the Negro as less than the equal of the rest of the population. But most of us, I think, see the Negro as endowed with all the rights and dignity of all human beings.

As for the Vietnamese, we know only a relatively few of them in this country, but there is no hostility toward them. On the contrary, they are liked and welcomed wherever they are, principally in American schools where they have come to study.

In the past century there was, in certain parts of the country, some prejudice against Asians. It is rapidly disappearing. Some of our finest citizens, our most distinguished artists, teachers, scientists, businessmen, and workers are of Asian blood. In all but a few places, they are completely part of the community. Their neighbors give their ancestry scarcely a second thought, and their oriental descent is little more noted than the fact that other neighbors may be of German or Polish or Irish forebears.

CAPITALISTS

7. What about the influence of big capitalists on President Eisenhower, you ask. Well, many of his friends and several of his principal Government advisers are men who were successful in large businesses. But he has great numbers of friends and advisers who have not come from the ranks of business, big or little. The only way one can judge their influence is to look to the policies that the President has adopted. Some Americans argue that some of Mr. Eisenhower's policies affecting the domestic economy favor big business, while others argue vehemently the contrary. But few would argue that the foreign policy of the United States, and of President Eisenhower—things which most concern you and your country—is aimed at a goal of helping business, big or little, or is influenced by what could be called business considerations. It is not influenced, I feel, by any thought of favoring one or another individual group, such as business or labor, rich or poor, whites or Negroes, North or South, farm or city, but rather it is influenced by what must be seen as national considerations; that is, what is good for the country as a unit.

There has been much talk from those hostile to this country that our foreign policy is based on the desire of big capitalists for more profits through military production and that they deliberately keep up a war scare, or stimulate world unrest and disturbances for this purpose. For almost 40 years, the Communists have been trying to peddle that absurdity. Nothing could be more ridiculous. In a peaceful, untreatened world, our business and our labor, everyone in our country, would profit vastly more by producing the goods of peace; taxes, a heavy burden on business and individuals here, could be cut in half; all the good things people want—schools and scholarships, roads, household possessions, equipment for recreation and sports, for science and learning, libraries and museums—could be produced in larger measure at just as high wages for labor and just as good profits for business. Yet a war, in today's world, means devastation for the winner as well as the loser, destruction of life and of everyone's property. Big capitalists as well as other people know this. They know they have as

much to lose from war and from this world of fear and tension as anyone else—and maybe more.

RACE QUESTION

8. You turn again to the race question in America. It is a difficult one and I would not want to pretend to you otherwise. It is not true that white Americans think of Negroes as slaves. But many, as I said before, think Negroes inferior to them. In one sense many Negroes are, but only because they have been deprived, through no fault of their own, of opportunities for good schooling, and they have generally been among the least privileged in their economic opportunities, background, and way of living.

Why this was so is a long and complicated and sad story, and one that takes volumes to explain and describe. But it is true, and it represents a blot on America's good name. The Nation has determined that this must be changed. What is now important is that our Federal Government has said that discrimination by reason of race can no longer be permitted in schools, in jobs, in politics, in any of the rights of a citizen. It has set its face firmly in this direction, and is acting on this principle with the support of the great majority of the people.

Its laws and its policies are being resisted in some areas and some of the States of the Union. It will be many years, I think, before prejudice is erased and full justice done. But the direction we are going, and the good speed at which we are moving to this goal, are encouraging.

America's problem here, and its proposed solution, may be much like India's. There, for centuries, there has been a caste system, with cruel discrimination against some classes. But by its laws and by its firm resolve, India has determined to end that unfairness. It will take time and courage to do it.

America, like other countries, has its problems; this is one of its most difficult ones. It is moving the right way to solve the problem and is moving successfully. It is important, don't you think, to observe not only what is bad, but to judge how determined and resolute and effective are the programs to correct what is bad?

Little Rock was indeed a shame that hangs over the United States. It was a shame that a group of people tried to stop Negroes from entering a public school. But it was right, and not a shame, that the Government insisted that there be obedience to its new rules that Negroes be allowed to enter the schools, and that it took action to obtain obedience.

RUSSIANS MOONS

9. Americans were tremendously impressed by the Russian man-made moons. They realized that those satellites demonstrated the Russians' scientific and technical skill. More than that, they realized that this represented a marvellous achievement of man, not of a Russian, or of an American, or of a Vietnamese, but of man.

Now the United States has successfully launched its first artificial moon. Both Russia and the United States will surely put up many more before the year is out. And their success did not, and will not depend upon spying upon each other, but rather on the fact they are studying and developing basic scientific knowledge which cannot and should not be kept secret, but which by its very nature is the property of all men of all lands and cannot be hidden from them.

SECOND PLACE

10. America was second, not first, in launching a satellite not because we were unable to find out, by spying, how the Russians did it. Rather, the Russians decided earlier and perhaps worked harder on the project of launching the moonlet. There has been much talk, most of it foolish, in my opinion, that Russia was able to make an

atomic bomb only because it spied here and discovered how we did it. Perhaps the Russians were helped a bit by getting some American secrets. But I go back to what I said before: there are no secrets to be kept for long in science, and there is no national monopoly in scientific ability.

What there should be, of course, is worldwide cooperation in scientific and cultural work, so that everyone in every country can enjoy the fruits. In a world where no nation threatens another, this will come about. Meantime, because Russia and China declare continually and insistently that they mean to conquer free countries, overthrow their democratic governments, and replace them with a Communist government, which we see as tyranny and despotism, we and our allies turn science to military use, and build weapons, just as Russia is doing. Thus we have built some atomic submarines and doubtless will build some more. Russia will too, I am sure, although whether it will produce 150 or not, I do not know. It has not built one yet, as far as I know.

You and I can agree that making weapons is a wasteful thing to do, when there is so much else to be done that would be constructive. Yet we would also agree, I think, that we must make weapons now if we are to stay free and live by the governments we choose.

JAMES DEAN

11. If you tell me that James Dean is more popular in Vietnam than President Eisenhower, I must take your word for it, but I don't think you can exactly blame Hollywood for it. Hollywood movie companies, all privately owned and not controlled by Government, make films which they think people will enjoy. I suppose they conclude that when people go to the cinema they want entertainment rather than serious politics, and so they make films by entertainers, and often about them. We here would rather be entertained by movies than preached to, and that may also be the case in your country.

What I have written is, as I said at the beginning, just one American's answers. But your questions are so important—and I believe they reflect so well the concern that millions of people around the world, in Vietnam and in many other countries, have about my country—that I think they deserve reading and answering by many Americans.

So—and I hope you don't mind—I am going to print your letter in our newspaper with the request that others write you with their answers. I will not disclose your name or address but am using the pseudonym *Lé-Myé*; our paper will forward the letters to you.

You will, I suspect, get a lot of them. Some may be foolish, a few may even be unpleasant, for America has its share of foolish and unpleasant people—no more and no less, I guess, than other nations. But most letters, I think, will be earnest attempts to tell you about America and its attitudes and aims. Taken together, all the letters may give you the best and most accurate picture of what our country feels and works for and worries about and dreams about. And most of the letters will be written as this one is, with the greatest good will to you and your countrymen.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED FRIENDLY.

P. S.—One question to you: Where did you learn such splendid English?

MISSOULA AND MONTANA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the March issue of Harper's magazine contains an article glorifying and describing Missoula, Mont., and the State of Montana as places of near perfection in

which to live. That is a position with which I heartily agree.

I was especially pleased that the author, Herbert Howarth, was so impressed during his stay in Missoula. It is an exceedingly wonderful community, located in the valley in the heart of the mountains of western Montana. Undoubtedly I am prejudiced, because I went to the university in Missoula, and for a time was a member of the faculty at Montana State University.

Herbert Howarth is an Englishman who recently completed a year as a visiting lecturer at the University of Montana. While most of Mr. Howarth's article, entitled "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway," is largely concerned with Missoula, I feel that what is "good, relaxed, unconsciously kindly" in Missoula can also be found in the entire State of Montana.

Mr. Howarth had an opportunity to become acquainted with one of Montana's greatest assets, its young people. He concurs in the excellence of Montana's State University system and its topnotch faculty, but he also points out that many of the Treasure State's talented young people and its brightest minds go to other parts of the Nation. Montana cannot afford to lose them.

This Harper's magazine article is very readable, and gives a tremendous insight into Montana. I urge all my colleagues in the Senate to read it. I know that each and every one would arrive at the same conclusion that Mr. Howarth does, if given an opportunity to live in Missoula, Mont.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Montana: The Frontier Went Thataway," and editorials published in the *Lewis-Town Daily News* and the *Ekalaka (Mont.) Eagle* be printed at this point in the *Record*, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

MONTANA: THE FRONTIER WENT THATAWAY

(By Herbert Howarth)

We stopped one evening to buy cream at a farm where Missoula ceases the mountains, beyond which Montana becomes Idaho. It was a small farm, started a generation and a half ago by homesteaders from middle Europe. The strong-featured grandmother who poured cream for us in the kitchen still talked with a Hungarian chime in her voice. The family was just sitting down to supper—to cottage cheese and chives, a bowl of steaming buttered corn, another of giant potatoes, a baked meatloaf in 2 inches of tomato sauce, coffee. The cutlery was sterling, heavy, and good. Revere saucepans shone on the range. A small farm, but its prosperity made us, with European scenes still fairly fresh in our memory, reflect, "Who in Europe today has a farm like this?"

We were, as that comparative way of putting it shows, still fairly recent arrivals. My wife was born in Switzerland, I in Britain, and we were in Montana for the academic year—I was lecturing at Montana State University's Missoula campus. This was not our first sight of the United States; we had enjoyed previous stays at other American universities; but it was our first spell in the Rocky Mountains.

As we came out I looked across the plantation of raspberry canes. The hills were pleasant in the sunset. A vacant lot beyond the farm was marked "Five acres for sale."

"Why are we just visitors?" I asked my wife. At that moment it seemed near perfection to have the genial productive life of Missoula, to settle into the rhythm of its hard, clean winters and fruitful summers.

If we could have acted on that thought, would we really have liked it? Arrivals stream steadily into Missoula, but it doesn't keep a hold on all of them. It is growing, but it has a quick turnover of transients. Newcomers separate into two distinct groups—those who find the promise of a satisfying life in it, and will stay; those who come hopefully, but now are restless and will move on.

For Missoula confronts you with this test: can you be content with what is good, relaxed, unconsciously kindly, but short of the stimuli of larger cities? Or must you have, to buoy you, that typical modern urban life where a complex, saturated law, and culture flow above a lower level of complex, saturated anti-law and vice? There are no double levels in Missoula. A minimum of urbanity, maybe, but with it a minimum of trouble. Missoula, like all Montana, has its contradictions, some of which I will try to pin down, but they are innocent, transparent.

MONEY AND PASSION

The first thing about Missoula is its affluence. It insists on the newest in living styles. It puts more up-to-date cars on the street, per capita, than I have seen in a prosperous Michigan town of the same size near the automobile plants. It is building impressive and expensive houses up all the creeks and canyons and equipping them lavishly. Even in the older houses the interiors have comfort and charm.

Beyond the perimeter and into the hills obvious up to catchness diminishes, but spending power is abundant. The day before Christmas Missoula filled with families from outlying ranches. Leatherly men, girls in rough cowbody trousers with yellow hair trailing to the base of their spines, piled out of cars and practically stripped the stores. The packed toy basement of Montgomery Ward had, at dusk on Christmas Eve, been emptied of all but 3 or 4 bicycles.

What is extraordinary is that collecting this spending power does not produce tensions or pressure. No one in Montana is in a hurry. If there were barometers of public anxiety, installed like the temperature clocks over the city banks, they would register low all the way from Glacier Park to Glendive. Men take their jobs, including the heavy and dangerous jobs in forest or mine, at a leisurely pace. The natural resources teeming on the flanks of the Divide seem to turn to money easily enough to obviate competition. Where there's enough for everybody, there's no need for acrimonious rivalries. In fact, the norm of Montana is mutual helpfulness. This sense of security in abundance actually seems to make for more efficiency rather than less, and it has one definite result: a margin of free time for everybody.

The usual problem of leisure is what to do with it. The old puritans hated leisure because their experience was that very few people knew how to use it except badly. Missoula and its neighbors have, I think, only a modicum of the depleting kind of leisure routines. There is a modicum of drinking: cases of bourbon are wheeled in high pyramids out of the State liquor store into waiting cars. There is a modicum of gambling. But these international phenomena never go far in Missoula, never culminate in violence or public unpleasantness. The reason is that male energy is happily mated to a pleasure

always available a mile or two from the doorway. Western Montana is the country of sport: of the primitive, basic sports, hunting and fishing, and, after that, mountain climbing and skiing.

Missoula men invest their passions in these sports. A young student wrote to me: "In the month of September I feel the urge to go hunting. I just can't wait to get sighted in on a deer. I am hunting continually in my subconscious mind." On Sunday evenings in the fall the cars roll back toward with an elk or moose, clotted with blood, over roof or bonnet, and turn it in at their freezer locker. Occasionally a hunter doesn't come home, for they're a trigger-happy and not too prudent crowd, and have been known to pick each other off, or drill a station wagon, by mistake for a deer. In the skiing weeks—a lovely subzero season, when the morning sun comes up orange on the snow—there are new casualties daily swinging on crutches into office or classroom. But in nonchalant Montana nobody minds.

In fact, this sport on the hills and in the rivers is probably the source of the easy tempo and mental cleanness of Missoula. The folk who close their offices or clinics as early as they can on Friday afternoon disappear up the creeks, and come back brown and smiling to the job on Monday, renew their energy while they use it. They remake themselves with age-old sports that play mind and muscle at the pace of nature.

HUGGING TOGETHER

The women, though they do ski and shoot (and once or twice a year fell the bear that intrudes in the backyard), are not focused on sport to the same extent. To handle their leisure—and no European woman would credit how much leisure they have—they follow the regular American trend and invent a round of group activities. They have created enough clubs in Missoula to program the week 2 or 3 times over: religious, charitable, astrotheosophical, literary, factfinding, factdispensing clubs; Friday clubs that meet on Wednesday, As You Like It clubs.

Every male is tempted to caricature club work, in Missoula or anywhere else. But it has a value. It involves at least a minimal sense of social responsibility, produces heightened social consciousness; and some of the clubs require a program of reading, especially the network of book clubs that members of the university have set up (giving their own time) through the country districts over a hundred miles' radius. It is obvious that in isolated areas the book clubs may be the only—and certainly can be a significant—point of exchange of ideas. Still, within the area of Missoula itself there are too many clubs. What people are likely nowadays to need more in a town of 22,000 is a pause in the gregarious life. One or 2 nights a week might, as an experiment, be publicly declared private nights. Instead, the ladies contrive pretexts to get together 3 times every 24 hours.

This hugging together in the mountain communities is surely a folkway formed in pioneer days and out of pioneer conditions, where neighborliness was a necessity against loneliness, accident, and illness. The frontier customs are still alive in Missoula. New arrivals are hailed with a party and presents, and local businesses send round their version of the Welcome Wagon with vouchers and invitations. When there is sickness, every neighbor comes with help and food from her kitchen. When you are in difficulties on the road, every passer-by stops and helps.

Is it also a pioneer tradition that makes Rocky Mountain men prefer plain wives? I noticed that of 20 girls in a group I met, 2 had engagement rings—they were the pleasantly plain girls of the group. Most wives in the city look similar. Sometimes, thinking over this sociological phenomenon, I imag-

ined that it conformed with the male experience in frontier conditions: the old experience that beauty causes trouble and that a fellow can be almost damned in a fair wife. Montana has left many of its pretty girls single, although there is reportedly a girl shortage in the State. The desirable girl is the straightforward girl, who will be master of the house, hold the bank book, drive firmly to the chairmanship of a telephone committee (and so bolster her husband's standing), produce a litter of young, and insist annually on throwing out the old appliances and buying new models.

Incidentally, although they have the latest appliances and superb kitchens, and demonstrate recipes to each other in their clubs, only a few wives can cook (and even these seldom do). Rich Montana—which spends generously on appliances, fishing tackle, and guns—is frugal on food. The monthly food budget is modest and is the first to be cut in any domestic economizing, and there is a tendency to save by taking margarine instead of butter or extending fresh milk with powdered milk. To a Britisher this is an unexpected feature; my wife contrasted the way in which food is the first priority on a British-family budget while the economies are on appliances and equipment. This is partly because Britain undervalues a wife's time and labor, my wife commented; but she also asked whether the steady eating that goes on in otherwise austere Britain is, by a paradox, actually a symptom of the austerity and the paucity of goods. The fact that a place of abundance like Montana rates eating low on the list of activities suggests that eating, in any quantities beyond a very low minimum, is only a psychological necessity, and that the people who are prosperous, both actually and psychologically, can grow and thrive without much eating. Certainly Montanans grow and thrive.

IS IT PROPER OR LEGAL?

It seems curious that Missoula has not attracted more women doctors. As far as I could check in conversation and from the telephone book, no woman physician was practicing there last year. A woman gynecologist could make a fortune, for the town is observant of the proprieties, reticent in personal relations.

Propriety, too, may be a carryover from frontier traditions, when anyone with sense would avoid provocativeness. I should say, however, that to a transatlantic visitor America as a whole seems formal, ceremonious, discreet, attentive to the proprieties. Lurid stories are sometimes told us regarding the big cities of the East or the Pacific, but in brief passage through these it has not been my luck to confirm them. J. D. Salinger's *Catcher* saw marvels through uncurtained hotel windows in New York, but I did not. Whereas from a 9 p. m. electric train threading the London suburbs.

But while Missoula completely respects an unwritten code of behavior between persons, it is superbly nonchalant in its relations with the officially written and impersonal law. The town treats its police with an indifference so unconscious and genuine that there isn't even humor in it. Half the drivers have no licenses. No one thinks of going in to pay a parking fine, or of answering a summons to court. Cars are to be registered by January 31, but no one hastens, and the law acquiesces by gently moving its deadline onward month by month.

This is a typical Main Street incident: A rancher is sitting at the wheel of his car, double-parked, staring at a store. A highway patrolman passes in the opposite direction, stops level with him, hoots to call his notice. He stares at the store, doesn't move his head. Another hoot. When I next look round, the patrolman has moved on and the rancher is still double-parked.

The attitude runs all through Montana and is significant—but not alarmingly significant. It means a simple dislike of regimentation. It is possible just because there is little lawlessness of the criminal degree; it is securely anchored in every man's certainty that he can rely on himself and his neighbors for sound behavior and honesty. A newcomer from the East will characterize Missoula as an extraordinarily honest town, and the absolute honesty and reliability contribute to the overall absence of tension. You can feel confident in every transaction.

Little crime in Montana, and little vice. A girl whose father owns a night club in another Montana city has assured me that the nocturnal offerings of the State are clean. She never saw vice in any tangled scene of the word till she saw California. I don't know whether she is right about California, but I find it easy to think her report on Montana is accurate.

Her remark about California arises, I fancy, from a widely prevalent Montanan conception of that State, which is just near enough to be the natural objective for the ambitious, just far enough to be the screen for strange and colorful projections. California is the Montanan's heaven and hell. It is a heaven in its opportunities: once there, they tell each other, you never leave. It is hell in its supported complications: you must keep an impassive face as you walk those west coast streets, or your glance will be taken as an invitation. Having met in Oakland and Los Angeles the same quiet corrections as elsewhere, I suppose that my friends who say this are only doing what is currently popular: localizing the mythical perversions of our time elsewhere.

A LEAP IN THE DARK

Quite independently of these fantasies, Montana feels a strong pull from the coast. Those transients who do not think they can adapt to Missoula's life will move on into Washington State, then perhaps work southward. For transients, that is all very well. It is not so obviously well if young men and women growing up in Montana homes come under the same magnetism, or, for that matter, if the somewhat fainter pull of the East draws them. There may be—and I believe that there already is—an outflow of the brightest minds, which the State cannot afford to lose.

The excellence of Montana's State University system actually sharpens this problem, though it also promises the best hope of a solution. The university has units in a number of centers. I saw only the Missoula unit, but if the others are as good, they are very good. A tiptop faculty teaches there. Many of the men have come from other States, deliberately choosing the mountains because, they say, the students bring unspoiled minds to their work, free from the sophisticated resistances that are sometimes a product of urban growing up.

It is remarkable to watch the interaction of faculty and students. When they arrive as freshmen, the boys and girls sometimes bring barely the first rudiments of academic habits of mind. They may have come from small, lonely, rural schools. Or, if they have had the fortune to grow up in a town (say, in Missoula itself with its splendid new million-dollar county school), they may have, offsetting their better academic preparation, a fear of privacy like their elders—in the dorms they shy away from the few single rooms and choose shared rooms, where they prevent each other from studying.

On the other hand, almost all young Montanans have an important asset: they have a knowledge of life that comes from spending vacations in responsible and tricky jobs: logging, trucking, tractor-handling. Unlike the young in other places, where maturing still has to follow learning, they have begun to mature before they have begun to learn in

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2455

alive and their moral resistance against Soviet tyranny continues.

This moral strength of the Estonian people is deeply rooted in the conviction of theirs, that the United States will never give up its efforts for the liberation of Estonia and the other captive countries, before this aim has been fully achieved.

Every reassurance on continuation of this policy of liberation would serve as greatest moral support to this anti-Communist spirit of the captive Estonian nation. It also would encourage the anti-Communist activities of the free Estonians all over the world.

All statements, messages, and greetings on occasion of this great Estonian holiday will be broadcast to Estonians behind the Iron Curtain, published in the free Estonian press, and read at solemn commemorative meetings of Estonians in all continents.

The Estonian National Committee in the United States, representing all Americans of Estonian descent, has the honor of extending to you its deepest gratitude for the warm interest in the Estonian cause you have shown hitherto, and into the continuation of which we trust.

Very truly yours,

AUGUST KARSNA,
President.

THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., February 28, 1957.
THE HONORABLE WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: On behalf of the Americans of Estonian descent and the Estonian refugees in this country, the Estonian National Committee in the United States takes the liberty to bring to your attention the enclosed declaration adopted unanimously by the people assembled in New York at the solemn commemoration of the 39th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

We hope that you will support our cause which is aimed at a more resolute and active policy against communism and toward the liberation of Estonia and other captive countries.

Very truly yours,

AUGUST KARSNA,
President.

DECLARATION

The U. S. S. R. has committed multiple crimes against the rights of the Estonian nation and against liberties, properties and lives of Estonians. The perpetration of these crimes continues in violation of precepts of international law and solemn commitments of the U. S. S. R.

The same pattern of crimes is being practiced over other Soviet dominated countries, and preparation for new aggressions and other crimes is underway on a worldwide scale. Millions are suffering under Soviet imposed terror and misery. No people in the world have accepted voluntarily the Soviet system. All are longing for the opportunity to overthrow the Communist regime.

Throughout history Estonians have been fighting against the foreign invaders until they regained their independence after the liberation war against the Soviet Union. The same spirit prevails at present. Only overwhelming Soviet forces stationed in Estonia prevent the people from driving out the enemy.

In their tragic situation they are looking for support from the free world. Sporadic declarations about law, liberty, and rights of subjugated nations are not sufficient if they are not implemented.

We declare that for achievement of international peace and justice it is necessary that the free world condemn Soviet acts of aggression as international crimes, exercise pressure for the termination of these crimes and as a first step demand the withdrawal

of all Soviet forces and administration from Estonia and the other occupied countries. This should be the primary condition in any dealings with the U. S. S. R.

MARCH 22, 1955.

HON. JUHAN VASAR,
President, the Estonian National Committee in the United States, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. VASAR: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of recent date which has arrived, concerning the resolution adopted by members attending the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

I appreciate your kindness in sending this to me.

With just every good wish and hoping you are well, I am,

Sincerely,

MARCH 8, 1954.

HON. JUHAN VASAR,
President, the Estonian National Committee, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. VASAR: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of March 4th and the attached resolution in behalf of the Estonians in this country. I am taking the liberty of putting this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,

BUSINESS RECESSION AND THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is a day of miracles. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] commented on news stories which appeared in this morning's New York Times, Washington Post, and other newspapers regarding the increase in the cost of living, notwithstanding a recession.

We have just witnessed another amazing event over the past weekend. The press carried the story that consumer prices rose to a record high, despite recession.

The New York Times story reads in part as follows:

The United States consumer price index for January was 122.3 compared with 121.6 in December. The base of 100 equals the price average for the years 1947-49. The rise from last December amounted to six-tenths of 1 percent and was the steepest since July 1956, when the increase was seven-tenths of 1 percent.

In the Wednesday, February 26, issue of the New York Times, in a feature article by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., we read the following:

Food prices are up—buying power drops, and a full scale business recession is under way.

All of this appears at a time when farmers' income is down and farm prices are dropping. Furthermore, the administration insists upon pursuing an agricultural policy which will cause further declines in prices on farm production. These price reductions at the producer level are not translated into reduced prices at the consumer level.

The consumer is the victim of an ever rising cost of living, and the agricultural producer is the victim of a cost-price squeeze. To put it bluntly, something is cockeyed.

The administration's economic policies have resulted in higher interest rates, inflation, recession, growing un-

employment, heavy losses in the stock market, increased burdens upon the taxpayers for financing the public debt, and a recordbreaking level of private indebtedness.

The answer of the administration to these mounting problems and distressing developments is, according to the President, "That things will be better in March." This is the 1958 version of that familiar old GOP refrain entitled "Prosperity Is Just Around the Corner."

Added to this dismal picture is the report of a gathering in Valley Forge, Pa., where the former President, Mr. Herbert Hoover, in addressing the meeting, informed the press that he used the same speech in February 1958 that he had used in 1931. It was that speech which, in 1931, proclaimed that the economic problems of today would soon be overcome and that things would soon be much better. This reply of history should send a cold chill through our political and economic system. The Republican President in 1931 assured the Nation that all would be well. The Republican President in 1958 gives us the same assurance.

President Eisenhower said on Wednesday, February 12:

We have had most of our bad news on the unemployment front. I am convinced that we are not facing a prolonged downswing in activity. Every indication is that March will commence to see the start of a pickup in job opportunities.

Shades of Hoover. This is a Valley Forge speech of 1931 repeated word for word in 1958 by its original author and rephrased again in 1958 by the first Republican President since 1932.

The Nation's economy is in trouble. The time for action to stem the recession is now. Many practical suggestions have been made, and more will be outlined in explicit detail. My advice to the Congress and to the administration is get busy. Get on with the job of checking the recession before it gets out of hand. The least that we can do is to plan projects and be prepared to move quickly and effectively. The strength and prosperity of the American economy is not only vital to all our people, but to the hopes and aspirations of mankind everywhere. The success of our foreign policy, the durability of our defense are dependent upon a strong, vital, and expanding economy.

The Soviet Union could win no greater victory than to witness a major recession and depression in the United States.

Mr. President, I wish now to refer to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

PROBLEMS OF DISARMAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the first of two articles by Mr. Harold Stassen, the President's former Special Assistant on Disarmament, which appeared in today's New York Times.

The subject of disarmament is becoming of increasing concern as the world attempts to find some way to halt the arms race in which we are engaged. More and more voices throughout our country are speaking up on this vital

matter and one of these that deserves to be listened to is that of Mr. Stassen. Mr. Stassen advocates in his article a step which is very close to one I suggested in my speech of February 4 in this Chamber on "United States Foreign Policy and Disarmament." This step is the breaking up of the present complex disarmament package of the Western powers.

Mr. Stassen advocates a 2-year suspension of nuclear weapons test explosions under a rigid reciprocal system of inspection. Mr. Stassen believes such a step could possibly be negotiated within the next 6 months. I believe that all Americans should give earnest thought to this proposal to see whether it would not, if adopted, help to alleviate the great tension which exists in the world today.

I should also like to add that on Friday, February 28, in the Senate Caucus Room at 10 a. m., the Subcommittee on Disarmament will have an opportunity to discuss the problem of disarmament with Mr. Stassen in open session. This hearing is the first of a series which the subcommittee plans to hold over the next several weeks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STASSEN ASSERTS AN ACCORD ON ARMS IS FEASIBLE IN 1958

(By Harold E. Stassen)

PHILADELPHIA, February 25.—I believe that a trial agreement for 2 years between the United States and the Soviet Union on a first-step limitation of armaments and the suspension of nuclear explosions under a rigid reciprocal system of inspection can be negotiated within the next 6 to 9 months.

I am convinced that such a first step, calling for equal sacrifices by both sides and affecting both evenly, could pave the way for a longer and more lasting control and limitation of armaments while at the same time lessening the dangers of war.

Such a trial agreement cannot and must not be allowed to be a substitute for our continuing a powerful and alert military position. But it would give us time to seek and make further progress toward a more inclusive and lasting agreement.

FACT HELD NO HANDICAP

Should the trial period end in failure, or if we are unable to convert it into a more substantial agreement, this 2-year agreement would not and could not constitute a handicap to our security or to our efforts to maintain the peace.

After a long study and first-hand dealing with the major problems affecting peace, I propose that the first step or trial agreement consist of four basic parts:

First, the establishment of a special agency of the United Nations with the responsibility of inspecting and assuring the fulfillment of the steps agreed upon by signatories for the reduction, control, and limitation of armaments.

Second, the installation of necessary inspection posts inside the territories of the Soviet Union and the United States, equipped with scientific instruments designed to verify the ending of nuclear test explosions.

STEPS TERMED FEASIBLE

Third, the Soviet Union and the United States to agree not to conduct any nuclear explosions for 2 years from the date the treaty is ratified both by the United States Senate and the Supreme Soviet.

Fourth, the setting up of a negotiating group to work effectively and seek diligently

additional steps of disarmament during this first 2-year period.

In my opinion, these four measures of a first step are feasible. On the basis of the progress made in the thorough and persistent negotiations in London in 1957, I believe that such a first-step agreement could be worked out during 1958.

In fact, I think it should be possible to work out such an agreement so that it would be available for ratification by the United States Senate before it recesses in July or August of 1958, and for ratification at the same time by the Supreme Soviet.

We must expect that such an agreement would put some brakes on research and further development and advance in nuclear weapons by the United States.

But it would likewise put some brakes on further advances in nuclear weapons by the Soviet Union.

In this period of 2 years more time would also be provided for scientists to follow through in their research on the effects of radiation from strontium 90 and cesium 137, thrown into the atmosphere from the nuclear tests.

NO CAUSE FOR ALARM SEEN

Research thus far seems to make it quite clear that this radiation is not grounds for the kind of alarm that some have expressed. But it also seems clear that this radiation is not entirely harmless and that the degree of harm has not yet been adequately measured by essential and thorough research.

The trial period and first-step agreement I propose would have the effect of opening up both sides to a beginning of necessary United Nations inspection and would develop experiences in the methods of limitation and control. It would put the United Nations realistically and practically in the field of armament control, and this is the role envisioned for the United Nations in article 26 of the charter.

But what is most important is that this first step would afford an essential opportunity for both sides to observe how each acts under an agreed system of continual inspection.

I am convinced that no agreement is workable and the future will be one of increased terror and uncertainty if either side seeks special advantages in any arrangements set up between the United States and the Soviet Union. Certainly we cannot agree to any one-sided arrangement, such as one that does not provide for adequate and effective inspection.

WARNS ON UNDERRATING

On the other hand, we must not make the mistake of underrating the intelligence of the Russians and believing that the leaders of the Soviet Union would be unable to recognize any one-sided advantage we might seek for ourselves at their expense.

The necessary system of inspection to monitor a cessation of nuclear test explosions is one that is practical and capable of being installed within 6 months.

It would require 11 or 12 inspection stations on each side, appropriately and effectively distributed geographically, and equipped with seismic, acoustic, electromagnetic and radiation-measuring scientific instruments.

Each station would need to be manned by qualified personnel of the United Nations, including experts from the United States and the Soviet Union.

AUTHORITY FOR INSPECTORS

The United Nations inspectors would need the authority—if their scientific instruments indicated that an illegal nuclear explosion had occurred—to go promptly to the location indicated by their instruments and make an on-the-spot investigation.

This is an essential part of the whole plan, and I believe it possible and reasonable and practical to achieve and maintain in operation once negotiations have brought about this first-step trial period of 2 years.

I consider it urgent, therefore, for us immediately to make the necessary moves seeking to bring about such an agreement.

The first essential move is for the United States to inquire whether other countries associated with the United States in mutual defense are agreeable that the United States make such a proposal to the Soviet Union.

This means we should consult the Governments of Britain, France, Canada, West Germany, Italy and the other NATO countries, as well as those countries associated with the United States in collective security agreements in the Near East, the Far East, and the Western Hemisphere.

OTHER NATIONS WELCOMED

If other nations express any wish to join the trial agreement to suspend nuclear explosions under a rigid system of inspection for 2 years, then we should, of course, welcome them.

But the most important requirement is to get the Soviet Union and the United States into a mutual agreement, even if no other country joined in the first instance, for an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States is basic.

Britain has made some nuclear test explosions and has done extensive research. The British may feel that they need to conduct a few more tests before they are willing to stop. This would be understandable.

France has done research. France may feel that she wishes to conduct a first nuclear test before she agrees to join an agreement to suspend nuclear explosions. This, too, would be understandable.

These are decisions for Britain and for France and for other sovereign states to make.

DESTRUCTIVE POWER GROWS

But everyone knows that both the Soviet Union and the United States have conducted extensive nuclear test explosions. And everyone knows that both now have tremendous destructive power within their armaments.

Therefore no time should be lost in starting negotiations aiming to bring about the installation of the necessary inspection for nuclear explosions and the setting up of the exact legal terms to be fulfilled by both.

What is essential is that the other members of the United Nations agree that the supervision of this trial period between the United States and the Soviet Union be in the hands of a United Nations commission.

It is fair to ask whether this trial period would necessarily bring about an even more substantial agreement in the limitation of armaments in the immediate future.

It is my view that the prospects for the future would be far better than if the present deadlock continues, giving rise to increasing tensions and a terrific arms race.

I believe that this first step of a 2-year trial agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union with the guaranty of rigid inspection would improve prospects of a lasting peace. It would be and should be acclaimed by millions of people around the world.

APPRAISAL OF WORK OF HAROLD STASSEN, SPECIAL ADVISER ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, February 23, a provocative and challenging article by Mr. Jerome H. Spingarn entitled "Appraisal of Stassen's Mission Shows Frustration, Achievement."

Mr. Spingarn discusses with objectivity and candor the work of Harold Stassen, Special Advisor on Disarmament. He also points out the conflicts in the administration over the handling of the disarmament question and refers to the