

UP53

~~ADD 2 IKE-FOREIGN~~

HE LEFT UNCHALLENGED, HOWEVER, A STATEMENT BY SECRETARY DULLES  
YESTERDAY THAT THE ALASKAN-SIBERIAN-NORTHERN CANADIAN AREA MIGHT BE THE  
BEST PLACE TO SET UP A TRIAL OF AN AERIAL INSPECTION SYSTEM TO GUARD  
AGAINST ANY SURPRISE ATTACK BY EAST OR WEST.

INFORMED SOURCES SAID A DECISION FAVORING THIS NORTHERN AREA MAY BE  
REACHED SOON.

5/15-P1118A.

# Record of Secretary Dulles News Confe

Special to The New York Times  
**WASHINGTON, May 14**—Following is the State Department's record of Secretary of State Dulles' news conferences today:

**SECRETARY DULLES:** I will be glad to receive questions.

**Q.** Secretary of State Dulles, in the policy of the United States with respect to the creation of a neutralized or demilitarized zone in Europe based on the Iron Curtain division inside Germany?

**A.**—The policy of the United States is not to accept any procedure along the lines which you indicate. In the first place, we do not accept any arrangement which is based upon the present partition of Germany. And there seems to be perhaps some misunderstanding about the so-called open formula, which, as submitted at the summit conference, did not involve any demilitarized zone at all. It was a plan for reciprocal inspection of what presumably would be militarized areas. If the areas were demilitarized, then your inspection would not prove anything as to the same for consultation?

**A.**—Well, I think that they have reached a point there where it may be appropriate that he should come back again. There have been put forward, I think, a total of fifteen different proposals; they have gone through their agenda; and I think that it is possible that a stage has been reached to make it desirable for Governor Stassen to come back again. There has been no final decision reached in that respect, probably there will not be for a day or two, but that is one of the things being thought about.

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, just for clarification, are you saying that the reunification for Germany is still a prime condition for consideration of any security arrangement in Europe?

**A.**—I said that we would not deal with disarmament in Europe in any way which could bear upon the reunification of Germany unless we were in that respect working in close cooperation with Chancellor Adenauer and the Federal Republic.

**Q.**—Does that rule out that pilot area for Central Europe that has been discussed as a test for inspection and other devices for security?

**A.**—Well, as I said in answer to an earlier question, we do not exclude the possibility of having such a zone in Europe. If there is such a zone in Europe, it would have to be worked out in cooperation with NATO, with the Federal Republic. There are very considerable complications about

that, so that in line with policy which I enunciated in my New York speech a month or so ago, where I said that progress will probably have to be taken by steps carefully measured and carefully taken, it may be that that is not the best place to start because of the complications.

### Non-specific on Areas

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, you gave a priority to the Far East as a possibility. Is the United States willing to accept or negotiate on the Russian proposal for opening part of Siberia in exchange for Alaska and the United States west of the Mississippi?

**A.**—Well, I wouldn't want to try to define here what the area would be, because we have not yet had the consultations here in our own Government which would lead to any conclusions about that. I did say that I thought that the Arctic areas and the less densely populated areas and the areas which involve less political complications might be an easier place to start.

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, do you have in mind on that from the Supreme Court? **A.**—Yes, I will do it through Mr. Berding. My legal adviser got this up several weeks ago.

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, does that now mean that you are waiting for the newspaper fraternity to come up with a proposal still for meeting this question of newsmen traveling into Red China?

**A.**—I have indicated that it is possible that the news gathering community might be able to devise a plan sufficiently limited so that I would feel that it could be accepted consistently with our foreign policy objectives. A number of suggestions have been made more or less of an individual character along those lines which we are studying. Whether or not they can be reconciled with the foreign policy objectives, and whether or not they would be accepted by the news gathering fraternity as a whole are two questions which are not yet answered, but both of which are being studied.

### Looks to Courts on Passports

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, there has been some worry expressed in editorial and on the part of publishers that the position you have taken on a Constitutional question you enunciated in your letter to Mr. Sulzberger means in essence, since you control passports, that the American press can cover foreign news only on the sufferance of the Secretary of State. Is this a correct interpretation?

**A.**—No, I would say it is not a correct interpretation.



our standpoint.

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, do you consider it possible or desirable for a foreigner to cover news for American news sources? **A.**—No, I don't think it is as desirable, but in these matters you have got to strike a balance of convenience.

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, doesn't your policy amount to using newsmen as a weapon to force the Red Chinese to do what we want them to do? **A.**—It is, I think, a policy which is designed to secure respect for American citizens, American lives, and the American passport throughout the world.

**Q.**—To put it another way, sir: Is it not true that your policy amounts to making the press, the American press, an instrument of American foreign policy? **A.**—No, because our policy applies not only to the American press, but to all Americans.

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, could I ask you an ethical point on this: Would it be correct to infer from what you have said that we would not be violating the spirit of your regulations if we were to employ a foreign national to cover news in Communist China?

**A.**—That is quite right, because the United States Government has no responsibility for the welfare and safety of the national of another country. Our responsibility is to protect Americans wherever they go, and there is no American that can even waive that right. That is a right which inheres in the nation. And it is not consistent, I think, with the dignity and respect for

not seem to be clarifying.

### Awaits Arab Envoys

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, as you know, over the week-end there was made public a rather dramatic appeal by Messali Hadj [president of the Algerian National Movement] to President Eisenhower to speak out against French atrocities in Algeria, and as a group of Arab envoys are coming to see you here later in the week on the same issue, do you think there is anything we can do about that situation?

**A.**—Well, I don't know that there is. We are waiting to see, of course, what these gentlemen have to bring to us, and wouldn't want to anticipate the result of their visit.

**Q.**—Mr. Secretary, President [Syngman] Rhee of South Korea has indicated that the United States has assured him that modern weapons will be sent to Korea. Could you say if this means the United States is considering altering the armistice agreement with the Chinese Communists or the North Koreans?

**A.**—The armistice agreement has to be interpreted, I think, in a realistic way. It was made nearly five years ago, presumably for a brief duration, and called for a replacement of weapons only on a piece-by-piece basis of comparable quality. Well, now in the passage of that five years much of the stuff that was there is no longer made, has become obsolete. Therefore, it is not practical to replace it exactly on a like-for-like basis, and there must be some elasticity there. Furthermore, we have

good evil  
Commun  
are intro  
into the  
which de  
means a  
complan  
agreeme  
circumst  
introduc  
more ef  
salves i  
Korea.  
**Q.**—M  
Government  
nounced  
East sh  
Canal.  
Israel  
United  
this ma  
United  
gard to  
**A.**—Y  
advised  
therefor  
policy  
particul  
news w  
be alw  
the r  
through  
els of  
nce wit  
**Q.**—D

don't  
ALL  
Co  
plan" i  
in Euro  
appreh  
atmosph  
"We  
rangem  
the pro  
many,"  
"and le  
anything  
of indir  
its pros  
we woul  
cert wit  
The s  
support  
were re  
cant. Th  
is not t  
but the  
started.  
are sho  
the stru  
many, a  
supporte  
wants n  
might a  
ficial di  
This is  
reports h  
of the p  
will try  
ocrats d  
German  
ing, late  
paign,  
the Ger  
cept n  
trial out  
Treaty O  
Mr. D  
take c