

Official White House Transcript

of

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S PRESS AND RADIO CONFERENCE #33

Held in Room #474 Executive Office Building
Wednesday, March 31, 1954
At 10.28 a.m., e.s.t.

This Copy For:-

The President

(the Honorable Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman
of the Atomic Energy Commission, accompanied
the President to this press conference)



(newsreels and stills were taken of this
conference)

THE PRESIDENT: Excuse me, sit down, ladies and
gentlemen -- unless you are interested in this (picture
taking).

As you can suspect, ladies and gentlemen, from the
picture-taking this morning, we are trying a little bit of
an innovation. There has been some slight interest shown in
the tests recently conducted in the Pacific, and for this
reason I have brought along with me this morning the expert
in that field; and after I take a certain share of the press
conference time, I am going to turn the rest of it over to
him. And of course, this will also give me the unique privi-
lege of seeing someone else in this particular spot.
(laughter)

* * * * *

One of the things I should like to take a moment

REPOSITORY Eisenhower Library
Ann Whitman File
COLLECTION Press Conference Series
BOX No. 2
FOLDER Press Conference 3/31/54

to talk about is the excise taxes. Now, excise taxes, of course, have reduced revenues a very considerable amount, more than I recommended. Nevertheless, from the beginning, it was acknowledged that here was a field that was open to discussion. There is one school of thought that believes that cutting excise taxes can have such a great effect in stimulating business that your revenues will not be hurt as much as we estimate.

In any event, the bill, as it does, continuing certain needed excise taxes on -- beyond April first, that tomorrow, is going to be signed.



I will sign it today.

And certainly I accept it wholeheartedly; and certainly hopeful that results -- any damaging results will not be as great as might be.

I should like to call your attention to this one fact, on figures furnished to me by the Treasury, this will be the greatest single tax reduction in dollars ever accomplished by the American government: 7 billion, 400 million reduced in one year in taxes.

This includes, of course, the reduction in income taxes January first, the abolition of the excess profits tax, and this reduced excise tax. That will be a huge amount of money in the hands of private citizens to spend themselves. And certainly we have every reason to believe that it will be a stimulating factor in our economy.

* * * * *

Another point to discuss just briefly is housing. Now there have been a lot of different kinds of thinking on public housing. I think most of you are aware of the general provisions of the plan that I submitted to the Congress some couple of months ago. And I am informed that Mr. Wolcott's Committee is bringing out that program largely in the same form as presented to you.

Now the -- in the public housing factor, there has been a very considerable struggle, but I am delighted that yesterday the leadership succeeded in getting the necessary appropriations, so that approximately 35 thousand public housing units can be constructed this year. And the authorization will certainly be accorded to go for a like amount, or something of that order, next year in the authorization committee.

* * * * *

Oh, the other item that I wanted to mention was the Randall Report and a Message to Congress on foreign trade.

I think the Report and the Message largely speak for themselves, but I do want to make this one observation. In making this kind of adjustment, in trying to move from an era in which our friends abroad had to depend so markedly on direct aid into an era where expanded trade will be of benefit to all of us, certain difficulties -- even certain hardships -- can occur, not only in our country but in others.

The government is alert to that situation, will constantly be vigilant to see that any damage of that kind does not become one that is unjustified in assuring the welfare of 160 million people, and will take such steps as are necessary to prevent them from becoming either widespread or severe. But that there will be some adjustments of that kind is, of course, inevitable.

I do believe that in this day and time the free world must come more and more to realize that in an expanded, healthy, two-way trade lies our best insurance that the doctrines of statism cannot come in and overcome our whole idea of free government.

Now, within our own country we don't feel that danger so intimately. The danger, in other words, is not in a position, let us say, of breathing down our necks; but in some of the others, it is. And we have got to take all of those things into consideration, as we stand firmly for a principle that in the long run is for the good of all of us. And it is going to take very great firmness, because as I say, there are bound to be some maladjustments and difficulties.



* * * * *

And now, that was my speech for the morning, ladies and gentlemen, and the rest of my time that I have allocated to myself I will take up with questions.

Q. Mr. President, Smith, United Press. I wonder if you could explore for us, or amplify on Secretary Dulles's speech the other night, in which he spoke of our readiness to take united action in the Far East?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, the speech must stand by itself, and I should say that I was over every word of it beforehand. Secretary Dulles and I, as usual, find ourselves in complete agreement.

Now, I have forgotten the exact words that he used with respect to the question you raise, but he did point out that it is in united action of all nations and peoples and countries affected in that region that we can successfully oppose the encroachment of communism, and should be prepared to meet any kind of attack that would come in there, because, he pointed out, of the great value of the region to all the free world and what its loss would mean to us. And so I think, aside from just the assertion that we are seeking that kind of united action among all our friends, that speech otherwise must stand by itself.

Q. Mr. President, Agronsky of the American Broadcasting Company. I wonder if I could ask one more specific question along those lines? The "united Action" has been interpreted generally as indicating, perhaps, intervention -- direct intervention -- or direct use -- more accurately -- of our American troops. Could you comment on that? If necessary.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I have said time and again that I can conceive of no greater disadvantage to America than to be employing its own ground forces and any other kind of forces in great numbers around the world, meeting each little situation as arises.

What we are trying to do is make our friends strong enough to take care of local situations by themselves, with the financial, the moral, the political; and certainly only where our own vital interests demand it, any military help.

But each of these cases is one that has its own degree, let us say, of interest for the United States, its own degree of risk and danger. And consequently, each one must be met on its merits. I couldn't possibly give you a general rule of what the United States would do in a situation, because no one could know of all the circumstances surrounding it.

I think the best answer I have heard in diplomacy was that given by France, I believe, to Germany, in late August or -- late July of 1914, when Germany asked her intentions. She said France will do that which her best interests dictate. And that is about the only answer I believe you can give, except in terms of very great generality.

Q. (Garnett Horner, Washington Evening Star) Mr. President, reports from Europe represent that the EDC is bogging down. That raises again the question of whether we have all our policy eggs in that EDC basket, or whether there is some alternative in mind if EDC fails. Could you comment on that?



THE PRESIDENT: Well, I just say this: I have been threatened with defeat before, and I don't fight my second battle on the supposition that it is going to occur. I am all-out for the approval of EDC, and establishing it as a factor that will insure Europe's safety. Until that question is definitely settled, I still firmly believe in the affirmative. I am not going to comment on it any further.

Q. Mr. President, ---

Q. (interposing) Mr. President, ---

THE PRESIDENT: (interposing) All right.

Q. Robert Spivak, New York Post. An explosive situation seems to be building up in the Middle East between the Arab States and Israel, which the Soviet Union seems to be exploiting, if not fomenting. I wondered if you favored bringing the Israel-Arab dispute before the United Nations Security Council as a whole?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I couldn't comment on that at the moment. It would be, I think, speaking a little bit recklessly. We have had a very definite program of our own that we have supported. I say of our own. I don't mean it quite that way. We have thoroughly approved the idea that is implicit in the United Nations plan, that through some economic unity there we would achieve a better, let us say, psychological and political unity. Therefore, we have been very strongly supporting a plan of development, including water development, and sharing, that we hope to be effective.

There is, of course, so much emotionalism in the thing that you can't tell day by day how it is going to come out. But I do say it is a case where both sides ought to restrain their partisans and their extremists, and use a little bit of reason and depend upon the judgments of outside people, perhaps, a little more.

Q. Mr. President, Stevenson, New York Daily News. I was wondering, is the government planning to take any action in the New York waterfront strike?

Q. What?

THE PRESIDENT: His question was about the New York waterfront strike. I of course want to be careful that I don't pretend I am going to get into fields where it is so technical that I couldn't possibly expect to know the answers. So I will talk a little bit in generality, but I think clearly enough to show intention and concern.



Any strike of this kind is of the utmost importance to the whole Nation and therefore to your Federal government. Now, whenever we touch this delicate transportation scheme -- system -- of the United States and affect it seriously, we affect the economy, we affect the living and welfare of many thousands. We affect even such things as health, and sanitation. So these things become serious instantly.

The second they occur, every department of government that has any possible connection instantly keeps abreast of the situation. The Attorney General, the N.L.R.B. largely independent -- of course does so; and determines such things as elections, and all that sort of thing. At the same time, Federal courts -- an independent branch -- take action. Finally, it becomes necessary to make sure that their orders are obeyed.

It is also, of course, the understanding in America, that everything is handled locally as long as it can be, and you don't bring down Federal agencies until it is necessary. There are city authorities; there are State authorities, doing their best, and again we have one of those cases where partnership must be observed.

The Federal government has certain grave responsibilities imposed by law. But there are also the police powers, and all that sort of means of keeping order, which reside in the local authority. So it is a question of partnership, and the Attorney General, the N.L.R.B. and the Secretary of Labor -- everybody -- is keeping up with this as closely as possible, to keep me informed as to the whole situation, so that if it does become the responsibility of the Federal government to take more positive action, that we are ready to move, and in accordance with the law, the Constitution, and the merits of the case. Now, there's very little more you can say, I think, on that matter.

Q. I am authorized in behalf -- I represent the of Vienna, Austria, and Swiss and West German newspapers. Mr. President, do you consider or contemplate any new initiative, despite your name, to obtain an Austrian independence treaty or withdraw all occupation forces, or at least to ease the occupation of Austria?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I am not sure that I understood every single implication of your question. But generally it was, do we have any new approach now to secure a general approval of the Austrian treaty.

Q. Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: About the only observation I could make on it is this: for some six or seven years, we have



stood firmly for the early completion of the Austrian treaty, believing it to be wholly unjust and unnecessary to continue the occupation of that country, in view particularly of the fact that early in the war it was agreed that Austria had been an occupied country and not an instigator of war. So I know of no reason that we shouldn't continue to stand on that belief -- as a matter of fact, I know we do. And we will certainly be alert to every possible way of easing the situation. But when you come down to ask me to predict success, or what could be a brand new approach, I couldn't comment.

Q. Mr. President, in the last few weeks -- this is George Herman, CBS Radio -- the Soviet Union has broken a considerable amount of precedent by publishing the details of nuclear and thermo-nuclear explosions. Could you tell us what your feelings are on their policies and intentions in making public these facts lately?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, No, I don't really know. We have had many discussions on them, and I would say inconclusive. But there are some who believe that it is indicating a slight change in public policy that might indicate a greater readiness to negotiate earnestly and honestly.

We are trying to keep ourselves in position so that at any sign of negotiating honestly, we can do so with confidence on the plan that I suggested last December which would be merely a beginning. All things like that we would certainly welcome, in view of the situation in the world today.

Q. Ray Scherer, NBC. Mr. President, in the last couple of weeks several members of your team have announced they are returning to private life, with C. D. Jackson, Mr. Kyes, and Mr. Dodge. Could you discuss with us the problem of inducing such men to stay in government?



THE PRESIDENT: Well, today I think it is perfectly clear to all of us, with the family responsibilities that men have, with the tax situation that they have, the children to educate, and all that sort of thing, it is only natural that they think this kind of public duty should be shared.

Now, each of the three men you name promised to stay a year. In each case, because of certain changes in the program, and the need for having very intelligent expositions before the Committees of the House and Senate, they agreed to stay a little longer. They are going -- they are difficult to replace, but in at least two instances I am sure that we have two very able and capable men to take their places. I believe that any government such as this is not wholly damaged by some rotation of people, and bringing fresh people in from the outside, as long as they are capable in themselves, and

dedicated.

Now the three men that are going, and you just named I couldn't speak of them in terms of too great praise. I think they have done a remarkable job. I am indebted to them, and I think the people are indebted to them. And so it is not easy for any people to fill their shoes. But when you can do it, a certain amount of that rotation is good rather than bad.

Q. Mr. President, Clark Mollenhof, Des Moines Register. Several weeks ago I asked if the White House had given up its efforts to obtain the resignation of Chairman Johnson of the ICC. At that time you couldn't comment because you had no knowledge of that, and I wonder if you had an opportunity to acquaint yourself with ICC problems?

THE PRESIDENT: I forgot that question -- as a matter of fact ... (here Mr. Hagerty conferred with the President). As a matter of fact, Mr. Hagerty suggests that I give you an answer that is very, very unusual for me. He says no comment because I don't know anything about it. (laughter) I will try again to look it up. (more laughter)

Q. Mr. President, ---

THE PRESIDENT: (interposing) But -- just a minute -- that was my last question. Now Mr. Strauss is going to take over. I didn't realize the time had gone that fast.

MR. STRAUSS: Shall I go right ahead, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: I think you had better. Let them distribute the Statement to them first.

(Mr. Strauss did not read this Statement literally. What follows is what he actually said. The Statement as given to the Press, therefore, is made a part of this conference, for comparison purposes)



MR. STRAUSS: Ladies and gentlemen, the President has authorized me to make available those portions of my report of yesterday to him, the publication of which would not compromise information vital to our national security.

In order to be precise and as brief as possible, I have prepared this Statement, and I believe it is being distributed, and I shall only read highlights from it, in order to conserve your time, and the time of the President.

I have just returned from the Pacific proving Grounds of the Atomic Energy Commission, where I witnessed

the second part of a test series of thermonuclear weapons. I will describe it as well as I am able. And in this Statement before the description there is a short historical background summary which for this morning I shall skip, unless you care to ask me questions about it later.

Early in January of this year, men and supplies began to move out to the Proving Grounds for this series. The first shot took place on its scheduled date of March 1, and the second on March 26. Both were successful. No test is made without a definite purpose and a careful determination that it is directed toward an end result of major importance to our military strength and readiness. That is to say, there are no idle or wanton tests. The results which the scientists at Los Alamos and Livermore had hoped to obtain from these two tests were fully realized, and enormous potential has been added, in consequence, to our military posture from what we have learned.



I would also like to note that the testing of weapons is important, in order to be fully aware of the possible, future, aggressive ability of an enemy, for we now fully know that we possess no monopoly of capability in this awesome field.

Now as to this specific test. The first one has been variously described as "devastating," "out of control," and with other somewhat exaggerated and mistaken descriptions. I would not wish to minimize it. It was a stupendous blast in the megaton range, but at no time was the testing out of control. The misapprehension seems to have arisen due to two facts. First, that the yield was about double that of the calculated estimate -- a margin of error which I submit is not incompatible with a totally new weapon. In fact, the range of guesses on the first A bomb covered a relatively far wider spectrum. The second report was because of the results of the fall-out.

Now, as I think you know, when a large explosion occurs on or within a certain distance of the ground, an amount of earth or water, or whatever is beneath the center of the explosion, is sucked up into the air. The heavy particles fall out quickly. The lighter ones are borne away in the direction of the wind until they, too, settle out. If the explosion is a nuclear one, many of these particles are radioactive as are, also, the vaporized parts of the weapon itself.

This is the reason that the Atomic Energy Commission, from the beginning, has conducted the tests of its larger weapons away from the mainland, so that the fall-out would occur in the ocean, where it would be quickly dissipated both

by dilution and by the rapid decay of most of the radioactivity, which is of short duration. The Marshall Islands were selected for this purpose, as a matter of fact, before the Atomic Energy Commission was created, in connection with Operation Crossroads, which was conducted by Admiral Blandy.

During the months of February, March, and April of each year, the Marshall Islands are usually favored by winds which blow away from any inhabited atolls. The two atolls of Bikini and Eniwetok were chosen as the base of these operations. Each of them is a large necklace of coral reef surrounding a lagoon two to three hundreds of square miles in area, and at various points on this reef, like beads on a string, there are multitudes of little islands, some of them a few score acres in extent, but most of them little sandspits. It is these small, uninhabited, treeless sand bars which are used for these experiments. As a matter of fact shot one was fired on such an island, which was created for the purpose by dredging.

(here Mr. Strauss walked over to the maps) That's a chart -- that's a map of the atoll of Bikini. The shaded portion represents a reef, the boundary reef, and the black spots on it are the pieces of land or sand and coral, which are above normal high water.



Now, before a shot takes place, there is a careful survey of the winds at all elevations up to many thousands of feet. This survey is conducted by weather stations on islands and on Fleet and Air Force units at widely separated points. Contrary to the notion I had, before I was acquainted with the subject, winds do not blow in only one direction at a given time and place. At various heights above the earth, winds are to be found blowing frequently in exactly opposite directions, and at greatly varying speeds. An atomic cloud, therefore, which pushes up through these air masses, is sheared in the direction in which the winds blow. The staff of meteorologists attempt to forecast the wind direction for the optimum condition, and the Task Force Commander thereupon decides, on the strength of these weather reports, what day he is going to shoot. Weather forecasts have to be a little bit long-distance -- long-range, because it is the custom -- it was the custom in connection with this test, and the preceding ones, that there is a search of the whole range, visually and by radar, conducted from a squadron of planes, the day before the search and up to the time of the shot. This search covers the warning area -- and I think you might put up that map -- the green on this map is the warning area and the little -- place where I put my finger is the location of this particular group of atolls.

The "warning area" surrounds the proving grounds within which a hazard to shipping or aviation is believed to

exist. We have a large area off the Pacific coast, Point Magu. There is a big area from Florida out across to the Bahamas for guided missiles; a big area in the Hawaiian Islands; the British government has one off the coast of Australia, and in toto we have established some 447 different warning or danger areas, including continental areas.

Despite these notices, there are many instances where accidents or near accidents have resulted from inadvertent trespass in such warning areas. The very size of them makes it impossible to fence them. And on the day of shot number one, the meteorologists had predicted a wind condition which should have carried the fall-out to the north of the group of small atolls.

Will you show the direction in which -- that line shows the direction of the wind predicted by the meteorologists.

The survey aircraft carefully searched the area and reported they found no shipping. The shot was, accordingly, fired. The wind failed to follow the predictions, but shifted south of that line, and the little islands of Rongelap, Rongerik, and Uterik were in the edge of the fall-out. A Japanese fishing trawler, the FORTUNATE DRAGON, appears to have been missed by the search, but based on a statement attributed to her skipper, to the effect that he saw the flash and heard the sound of the concussion within six minutes, he must have been well within the danger area. The 23 crew members on the ship, 28 American personnel manning weather stations on the little islands, and the 236 natives on these islands were also within the area of the fall-out. The supposition that the actual blast of the bomb extended over such enormous areas is, of course, strictly untrue.



The Task Force Commander, General Clarkson, promptly evacuated all of the people from these islands. They were taken to Kwajalein, where we have a naval establishment, and there placed under continuous and competent medical supervision. I visited them there last week. Since that time, it has been determined that our weather personnel could be returned to duty, but they are still being kept on Kwajalein for the benefit of further observations. None of these 28 weather personnel has any burns. The 236 natives also appeared to me to be well and happy. There were two exceptions, one an aged man in advanced stages of diabetes, and the other an old lady with crippling arthritis. Neither of these cases, of course, had anything to do with the tests. And today, a full month after the event, the medical staff on Kwajalein has advised us that they anticipate no illness, barring of course the possibility that diseases hereafter contracted might always be experienced.

And as a matter of fact, we have more natives than

we started with. One child was born while I was there, and four more were expected. (laughter)

They named the child -- a little girl -- after my wife, ---

Q. What was the name of the child? (interposing)

MR. STRAUSS: (continuing) --- and I thought she ought to be dowered, and since they have no use for money, I gave her ten pigs, and she is now the heiress of ---

Q. (interposing) What's the name of the child?

MR. STRAUSS: I think the family name is Majuro, but I am not certain of that.

Q. What is your wife's name?

MR. STRAUSS: Alice.

Q. Alice.

Q. Alice.

MR. STRAUSS: That is not a part of this prepared statement. (laughter)

The situation with respect to the 23 Japanese fishermen is less certain, due to the fact that our people have not yet been permitted by the Japanese authorities to make a proper clinical examination.

When I wrote this last night, I was unaware of the fact that there was a message on the wires. I received it this morning, indicating that those restrictions would be removed today, and that we would see these people today. But it is interesting to note that the reports which have recently come through to us indicate that the blood count of these men is comparable to that of our weather station personnel who, as I told you a moment before, are fit to return to duty. Some skin lesions which have been observed are thought to be due to the chemical activity of the converted material in the coral rather than to radioactivity, since these lesions are reported to be healing. The men are under continual observation by Japanese physicians, and we are represented in Japan very adequately by Dr. John Morton of the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission and Mr. Eisenbud of my office.

I am going to skip these other points, unless you wish to discuss them.

I would like to remark that a recent comment that I have seen, which has suggested that the incident involving



the fall-out on inhabited areas was actually a planned part of the operation, has greatly distressed me. I would not wish to comment on that other than to characterize it as irresponsible and utterly false, and is doing a grave injustice to the men who are engaged in this patriotic mission.

And finally, I would like to say that one important result of these hydrogen bomb developments has been the great enhancement of our military capability to the point where we should soon be more free to increase our emphasis on the peaceful use of atomic power, at home and abroad. It will be a tremendous satisfaction to all of the men who participated in this program that it has hastened that day.

Q. Mr. Chairman, ---

Q. (interposing) Mr. Chairman, ---



Q. (interposing) Mr. Chairman, Scheibel of the Gannett Newspapers. You said that this particular explosion was not out of control, but is it possible that in any series of tests that a hydrogen explosion, or series of them, could get out of control?

MR. STRAUSS: I am informed by the scientists that that is impossible.

Q. Mr. Strauss, von Fremd, CBS Television. Yesterday at his news conference, Secretary of Defense Wilson said the results of the March first blast, I believe is the one he was referring to, was unbelievable. Would you comment on that?

MR. STRAUSS: No. I don't think I should comment on that. The use of that adjective, I think, was played up beyond the point where the Secretary intended it. I don't know what is meant by "unbelievable," and I would rather not comment.

Q. Mr. Chairman, Finney, Buffalo Evening News. Do you intend to imply, by the last paragraph in this Statement, that the work on -- on the weapons phase of -- of the atomic is -- is -- reaching a completion that -- that we are approaching the point where pursuit of this will no longer yield very large profits, and that we will therefore turn our research power to the -- to the peaceful application?

MR. STRAUSS: Mr. Finney, I think the answer to that is this: the military have certain requirements. The Commission is engaged in attempting to fill those requirements. The ability of the Commission to devote attention and fissionable material to peaceful requirements, peaceful needs, is always junior to the defense needs, by definition

of the Act itself.

The result of these tests has brought us very much nearer to the day of the satisfaction of military requirements -- put us within sight of them. So that we can see the ability to proceed aggressively with the peacetime development of power to an extent that we were not able to, before the tests.

Q. Admiral Strauss, Wilson of the Cowles Publications. Can you go beyond this Statement and describe the area of the blast, the effectiveness of the blast, and give a general description of what actually happened when the H-bomb went off?

MR. STRAUSS: The area of the blast, Mr. Wilson, would be ---

THE PRESIDENT: (interposing) They're going to see those pictures ---

MR. STRAUSS: (interposing) I understand you are going to see a film of the "Mike" shots -- 1952 shots.

The area, if I were to describe it specifically, would be translatable into the number of megatons involved, which is a matter of military secrecy.

The effects -- you said "effectiveness." I don't know exactly what you mean by that, sir, so I don't care to answer it.

Q. (Wilson) Well, I don't mean the percentage -- of effectiveness of the -- or the efficiency of the blast itself, but many people in Congress, I think many elsewhere, have been reaching out and grasping at some information on what happens when the H-bomb goes off. How big is the area of destruction in its various stages? And what I am asking for now is some enlightenment on this subject.

MR. STRAUSS: Well, the nature of an H-bomb, Mr. Wilson, is that in effect it can be made to be as large as you wish, as large as the -- as the military requirement demands; that is to say, an H-bomb can be made as -- large enough to take out a city.

Q. A what?

Q. (Agronsky) (interposing) Mr. Chairman, ---

Q. (interposing) A what?

Q. (Agronsky) (interposing) Mr. Chairman, ---



MR. STRAUSS: (interposing) To take out a city.

Q. What?

MR. STRAUSS: To destroy a city.

Q. How big a city?

Q. (Agronsky) (interposing) Mr. Chairman, ---

MR. STRAUSS: (interposing) Any city.

Q. (Agronsky) (interposing) Mr. Chairman, ---

Q. (interposing) Any city? New York?

MR. STRAUSS: The -- the metropolitan area, Yes.

Q. (Agronsky) Mr. Chairman, may I ask you a specific question? If you were to make a comparison, duplicate the explosion that occurred at Eniwetok, with this building in which we are right now as its center, what would be left of this city, Washington?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, I couldn't say, Mr. Agronsky, because the precise measurements of these two shots have not been completely calibrated. It may be as much as a month or two before I know the answer to it. It would be very extensive.

Q. (Agronsky) Would you provide that answer some time, sir?

MR. STRAUSS: I won't make a definite commitment, but I will -- I would certainly like to.

Q. (May Craig) Mr. Chairman, ---

Q. (Smith) (interposing) Thank you, Mr. President! (hurried exits)

Q. (May Craig) Who do they represent? There ought to be a revolution about that now. How does he get the authority to do that?



(Notebook E-9 -- Page 54 -- J. Romagna)