

Herald and News

# Editorial Page

## Bigger Role For Food Stamps

Persistent unemployment in excess of 5 per cent of the work force affects this country in many ways. It should occasion no surprise that grants of food to persons on public assistance rolls reached an all-time high last year. Some 7.4 million persons got food under so-called "direct distribution" programs. If food for charitable institutions and school lunch programs be included, more than two billion pounds of it were handed out in 1962.

With some prospect that further enlargements of food assistance may be called for, the Kennedy administration appears concerned at the amount of food distribution now taking place outside regular commercial channels.

Consequently, in President Kennedy's 1963 farm message, he proposes to shift a substantial part of this distribution to the food stamp program.

Up to now this has been a limited, experimental effort—begun in 1961—under which needy persons are issued stamps which they can use for food purchases at local stores.

Administration spokesmen pronounced this plan a success in such places as West Virginia where it has been tried. The new proposal would not wholly replace the direct distribution of food by government agencies, but would do so in all areas where it is considered feasible.

Expansion of the food stamp plan would seem to have an automatic appeal for all those who think it a mistake for the federal government to be in the food distribution business on a large and growing scale. Food retailers evidently would feel substantial benefit if this program is approved.

Present direct distribution involves food valued at around \$365 million in a year's time. The President says the costs of switching to the food stamp plan in many sectors will be largely offset by saving in direct distribution. Chances are, however, that the offset will not be complete.

Even if it is not, however, many in the food field may conclude that some additional cost would not be too high a price to pay for reducing sharply the government's own food operations.

A shift to greater reliance on food stamps may get new impetus also from some recent reports that certain private food handlers are reaping excessive profits from handling the government food packages which are too bulky for needy persons to carry home.

All in all, the proposal to turn far more federal food assistance into private channels through use of food stamps seems a desirable change—assuming always that the inevitable red tape costs can be held to a tight minimum.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Hoover Ouster In Making

By RALPH de TOLEDANO  
As I used to write in my days as a reporter, "It will be denied, but . . ."

It will be denied, but the pressure is on again to force FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover out of his job. The explanation being offered is that Mr. Hoover is not as young as he used to be, that youth should take over.

This is, of course, nonsense. For decades, John Edgar Hoover has been devoting most of his waking hours to the FBI. When he took over, it was corrupt and inefficient. Today, it is a model among law enforcement agencies. Unlike

other government agencies, it discourages clock-watching and time-serving. Against tremendous difficulties and a steady sniping from the bleeding hearts, the FBI has held espionage and subversion in check, helped improve the caliber of local police forces, and freely given its expert help to other agencies in the apprehension of criminals. It has done this without treading on the toes of citizens and with a scrupulous regard for the Constitutional rights of law-breakers and the law-abiding.

Why, then, is the attempt to shuffle off Mr. Hoover being re-

newed? To answer the question, you have to go back to one of the cardinal principles he imposed when he was called in, many years ago, to take over the FBI. That principle was: stay out of politics.

No matter who was in the White House or who ran the Justice Department, Mr. Hoover would not permit FBI files to be used for the kind of quiet pressure which will hold in line a legislator, an official in the Executive branch, or a private citizen. The FBI files were to be used for one purpose only: the apprehension of criminals.

In loyalty-security cases, Mr. Hoover and the FBI made it a point never to pass judgment on those whose activities and associations were being reviewed. The FBI, Mr. Hoover has said repeatedly, is the investigative arm of the Justice Department—not a national police force. The FBI has reported to the President, the Attorney General, and on some occasions to Cabinet members. But it does not recommend action.

It is not telling tales out of school to recall that from time to time strenuous efforts have been made to use the FBI as a club with which to beat political opponents. Now those efforts are being repeated—but with a certain degree of subtlety. Senators on one important committee are being asked by the Justice Department to request the FBI files of individuals on the Administration's "drop dead" list. The contents would therefore be available for political purposes without tainting the Justice Department of the White House.

As I said, "it will be denied. . . ." But the FBI has refused flatly to cooperate. The files, as always, are not to be opened up for this kind of use.

Whether Mr. Hoover will be forced out is a matter for conjecture. I have not discussed this story with him or with any one at the Bureau. I feel that it would be insulting for me to put the question to a man with a career so unblemished that to ask it would amount to an insult.

But if the politicians succeed in "getting" John Edgar Hoover, they may be hoist by their own petard. For one thing, the opening of the files would hurt men of all parties and all stations. Pandora's box would be nothing in comparison. Lives would be ruined, but the rumination would be bipartisan.

Secondly—and this is just a guess—I don't think that Mr. Hoover would sit idly by as his life's work was destroyed. There would be men of power and stature to stand at his side. In the long run, his detractors would suffer.

To repeat: "It will be denied. . . ." As a correspondent who has seen the FBI at work, I hope it is. The important thing for all Americans is to see that Mr. Hoover continues to be the FBI director. When he retires, he should be consulted on the choice of a successor. There are others in the Bureau who have been trained by Mr. Hoover and who share his principles. One of them—and not a man selected for his political services to this or any other Administration—should carry the torch.

FLETCHER KNEBEL



## STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS  
A magazine I was reading in the barber shop not long ago asked a dozen prominent men in various fields, "What do you first notice in a woman?"

Some of the answers, of course, were suggestively facetious, and others were solemn; but the only reply that showed any real insight was made by Oleg Cassini, the dress designer.

He did not mention the figure or the posture or the clothes or any other superficial aspect that might be expected from one connected with costuming. He said, rather:

"What I notice first about a woman is her mouth, then her eyes. . . . Her mouth tells me how she feels about herself. Her eyes say how she feels about other people—including me."

It is astonishing how many women utterly fail to comprehend that what shows in their mouths and eyes can totally cancel out the effect of their clothes and their cosmetics. In fact, the better groomed and the more carefully made-up, the greater the contrast between their external appearance and their inner appeal.

Such women spend billions every year on devices and decorations to improve their figures and their looks—yet if the mouth is resentful and discontented, if the eyes are greedy and calculating, all of their vast expenditures of money and energy and time might as well have been tossed down the drain.

This is especially true of older women, who unmistakably reveal in their eyes and mouths the way they have coped with life, the adjustments or maladjustments they have made, the philosophy they live by, the attitudes they have adopted toward men and other women and status and possessions and the whole fabric of their emotional experience.

If such adjustments and attitudes have been healthy and honest and generous and humorous and compassionate, then the figure and the clothes become wholly subordinate to the personality; after awhile, we see nothing but the spirit shining out from such a person.

Contrariwise, if the emotional structure has been ravaged by envy or petteillance or self-pity or excessive vanity, then the expensive and well-tailored clothes,

the impeccable make-up and hair-styling seem like a clown's costume, showing up in pitiless contrast the bitter mouth and the tortured eyes that disclose a basic dissatisfaction with one's self and with the world.

## POTOMAC FEVER

Don't worry about World War III. First we have to have the nuclear tryouts to see who's left to represent our side, the U.S. and Britain—or France and Canada.

Franklin Roosevelt Jr. is named Undersecretary of Commerce. He's a sports car salesman and that's his job for '64—selling the racy JFK with the button-down rhetoric.

The Senate blocks a drive to end filibusters. A senator's dream of Heaven is a machine that will produce instant talk—on L.P. records.

Sen. Harry Byrd fears the big deficit may lead to inflation. You'll know it's inflation when they start putting out the dollar bill in morning and evening editions.

Maine Republicans have their name for Washington, D.C.: Kennedybunkport.

Canada's Prime Minister Diefenbaker blasts the U.S. very un-sportsmanlike. He's supposed to wait in line. This month it's De Gaulle's turn.

Paul Brown is fired as coach of the Cleveland Browns after 17 years. He won 115 games, but he failed to mold strong minds in strong bodies 49 times.

One kid prefers Ben Casey to Dr. Kildare. He says with Ben Casey's brand of surgery, you get prettier nurses.

Teddy Kennedy is seated as a U.S. Senator. The Kennedys enjoy public service. They should. They're the nation's last unregulated public utility.

## ALMANAC

By United Press International  
Today is Friday, Feb. 8, the 39th day of 1963 with 326 to follow.

The moon is full.  
The morning star is Venus.  
The evening stars are Mars and Jupiter.

Those born on this day are under the sign of Aquarius.  
On this day in history:  
In 1567, Mary, Queen of Scots, was beheaded after being charged with plotting the murder of Britain's Queen Elizabeth I.  
In 1940, every 10th person was shot in two villages near Warsaw, Poland, in reprisal for the deaths of two German soldiers.  
In 1949, an Air Force jet bomber flew across the United States in three hours, 46 minutes—the fastest transcontinental flight to that date.  
In 1953, in a surprise move, Soviet Premier Malenkov resigned as chief of state.

A thought for the day—Greek story teller Aesop said: "It is easy to despise what you cannot get."

## THESE DAYS . . .

### European Nations Fear Super-Yalta In Process

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN  
Political patterns are like the Rorschach inkblot test—the interpreter reads his own hopes and fears into the smudges and curls which he sees before him.

Thus, when De Gaulle maneuvers to keep Britain out of the European Common Market and insists that France must have a nuclear striking force under its own control, our policy makers in Washington fear for the future of our common western defense as represented by NATO.

To certain Europeans, however, the international Rorschach inkblot yields quite a different set of fears. What they see is a United States that is bent on getting all of the elements of international decision into its own hands. And they fear what might come out of it all is not an enhanced western alliance, but a super-Yalta accommodation with Khrushchev that would render Western Europe powerless to fend for itself if an emergency should ever make it necessary.

Such an interpretation of the diplomatic inkblot may be far-fetched, but the smudges and curls that encourage it are all there to be seen. What is not visible is the motivation of President Kennedy, which to many seems an enigma wrapped in a ciddle inside a mystery.

The western European's fears of a super-Yalta rise from the idea, which may be mistaken, that President Kennedy is wiggling to Khrushchev certain signals that a "soft" accommodation from the United States is ultimately possible. The first wiggling signal, to this way of thinking, was the denial to the British of the promised Skybolt air-to-ground missile. Although the denial was couched with the promise that Polaris missiles would be made available as compensation for the lost Skybolts,

the fact that Britain will have to build a fleet of Polaris-carrying submarines from scratch lent an ominous air to the cancellation of the Skybolt program. It will be years before the British can have an effective missile-carrying submarine fleet. Certain interpreters have gathered from all this that Kennedy was obliquely wiggling to Khrushchev that he need not take an independently armed Britain into his calculations for many years to come.

The second element in the super-Yalta interpretation of the diplomatic Rorschach inkblot was the announcement that our own Jupiter land-based missiles were being removed from Turkey and Italy. Though the Administration insisted that the removal was strategically meaningless, inasmuch as the Jupiters would be replaced by Polaris submarines kept "on the ready" in Mediterranean waters, the picture, when coupled with the assertion that it had no connection with Khrushchev's withdrawal of rockets from Cuba, seemed like a confession of wholly voluntary "softness." This implication was strengthened by the fact that the U.S. had not openly demanded a quid pro quo from the Soviets on Berlin in exchange for the removal of the Jupiters. Where we might have made a shrewd horse-trade, we apparently have abstained from taking a tough trading line out of

consideration for Khrushchev's sensibilities.

The third element in the super-Yalta interpretation of the inkblot has been our failure to press for on-the-spot inspection of presumptive missile sites and storage caverns in Cuba. And a fourth element is the revival of atomic test-ban negotiations in Washington, which, however desirable an atomic testing armistice may be, promises to run up against De Gaulle's program for testing his own arsenal of atomic weapons.

Whether the super-Yalta interpretation of the diplomatic inkblot makes sense depends on Mr. Kennedy's own private feelings. When Mr. Kennedy assures Khrushchev that we have no desire to turn small disputes into a big atomic blow-off, it is not necessarily a confession of weakness. Nor does our desire to concentrate the nuclear striking power of the West in NATO necessarily mean that we can't be counted upon to keep the western alliance diplomatically as well as militarily potent.

Nevertheless, Franklin D. Roosevelt misjudged the character of Stalin at Teheran and Yalta—and the fears will not down that Kennedy may have a "grand design" for peace in mind that does not reckon with the real character of Khrushchev.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Import Fees Affect Chicken Shipments

By PETER EDSON  
Washington Correspondent  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.  
WASHINGTON (NEA)—Many Americans couldn't care less about the hassle between French President Charles de Gaulle and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan over Britain's admission to the Common Market.

But there's one angle of this that every American has an interest in. It's how much the Common Market countries will eat, and what the price will be.

Export of American poultry meats to the six EEC—European Economic Community—or Common Market countries has dropped nearly 50 per cent in the last year. It was over 29 million pounds a month at the end of 1961, only 15 million pounds a month at the end of 1962—and headed downward.

A principal reason for the drop was a 25 per cent price increase. This was caused entirely by new Common Market trade restrictions in the form of import fees.

Before the Common Market laid down its agricultural policy last August, American poultry—broilers, fowl, frozen and canned meats—could be landed in Europe at 3.4 cents a pound on the average. The Germans levied a 4.5 cents a pound tariff on that to protect domestic poultry raisers, but the 35.9 cent price was competitive with European wholesale prices.

Under the Common Market, the 4.5 cents duty has been dropped, but four additional import fees have been added.

These extras add up to 13.3 cents a pound. The price of American poultry delivered in Europe thus goes to 44.7 cents a pound average. This is far higher than EEC domestic prices. U.S. poultrymen can't compete with it and their European market is fast disappearing.

The U.S. government is kicking about this, naturally. It wasn't mentioned in the official Communiqué, but when German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer was in Wash-

ington last fall, President Kennedy complained to him about it. After a long debate in the Bundestag, German import fees were cut two cents a pound.

Whether Adenauer and De Gaulle discussed this when they signed their historic treaty of cooperation also was not mentioned in their communiqué.

Other things are involved, though chicken has become a symbol in this battle. The Common Market has thrown up restrictions on U.S. wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, rice, tobacco and vegetable oils. Cotton, soybeans, hides and skins, tallow, oil cake and meal are getting a better break. France has restrictions against American apples, pears, prunes, citrus fruits, canned fruits and juices as well as many industrial products.

New U.S. "trade czar," former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, has gone to Europe as Kennedy's chief negotiator under the U.S. Trade Expansion Act passed by the last Congress. One of his principal jobs will be to work for removal or lowering of all EEC trade restrictions.

This is done by filing what are known as Article 23 proceedings under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The United States already has started such proceedings against France, West Germany and Belgium. Earlier proceedings against Italy resulted in withdrawal of their fees.

The new Trade Expansion Act set a firm policy in attacking restrictions against exports of both industrial and agricultural products.

It provides that the U.S. may take "protective action" by raising similar restrictions on imports from countries that discriminate against American exports.

In the case of France, the United States might impose import fees on such things as, well—French wines, goose liver and cheese. That would create a real test on who would chicken out and be the first to cry "Uncle Sam!"

## Letters To The Editor

### Not Quiet

It was stated in the Herald and News Jan. 25, 1963 that those opposed to government zoning would not quiet down and "listen to an explanation of the facts."

It is true that those opposed are not going to quiet down. But, they have listened and are not under any misconceptions. They are definitely not uninformed. On the contrary, people opposed to government planned zoning are, without a doubt, the most well-informed people on this subject. These people have, through sheer indignation at the whole concept of government zoning, gone out of their way to avail themselves of all the facts available. Yes, these people are much better informed than those who say they are for government zoning because they want to get rid of their neighbor's cow.

We are also told that some sacrifices must be made. Webster's dictionary defines sacrifice as, "goods sold at a loss." No, we do not plan to barter our basic rights. We plan to save our freedom.

I, personally, feel that we, the suburban people, are now in the process of being mentally conditioned to the idea and facts of government planned zoning. In fact, one might call it, brainwashing.

Suburban government zoning is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. Are we in the suburban area so gullible that we will swallow this hogwash? Are we so lacking in personal

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

pride, integrity and good old-fashioned guts, that we will stand still and let our constitutional "right of property" be taken from us? I hope not.

Government planned zoning is unconstitutional. Even if brought to a vote each of us would be voting for or against our constitutional rights for anything as silly as a pretty view or what my neighbor does for his living.

Private enterprise has made this entire country what it is today. America, and our way of life is envied by the people of almost every country in the world. It is high time that each and every American citizen gets over his apathetic outlook towards government. We can protect our constitutional rights only if we make the effort to be well informed on all issues, register to vote and stop letting George do it.

Mrs. Pauline Lubbe,  
3313 Altamont Drive,  
North Altamont, Precinct.

Q—What type social philosophers collaborated in issuing the Communist Manifesto of 1848?  
A—Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Q—What type of star is a nova?  
A—A star which undergoes a sudden and enormous increase in brightness; about 25 appear every year in our galaxy.

Q—What U.S. president delivered a speech in which he used the term "muckraker"?  
A—Theodore Roosevelt used the term "muckraker" in attacking the practice of making sweeping and unjust charges of corruption against public men and corporations.

Q—How long did the Allied evacuation of Dunkirk last?  
A—Began May 26, 1940, it was completed June 3 when some 338,000 British, French and Belgian troops reached English ports safely.

Q—What is the origin of the expression "spic and span"?  
A—"Spic" is short for "spike" and "span" originally meant a chip. So a "spic and span" new ship—the way the phrase was first used—was one in which all the hardware and boards were brand new.

Q—How did the "Quonset hut" get its name?  
A—From the naval base at Quonset Point, R.I., where it was developed.

## THEY SAY . . .

When you look out ahead as to what the next steps are in this nuclear and missile field, there are steps that already tax the capacity of the mind of man, and they involve enormous resources . . . committed to the antimissile missile.

—Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in recently released remarks before a Senate committee.

We must plan for a future with all of Asia behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot predict our security and our future on the hope for a Russian-Chinese split. . . . It is best to overestimate, rather than underestimate, the strength of our enemies.

—Rep. William Jennings Bryan Dorn, D-S.C., discounts present Russia-China disension.

**Mixture**

ACROSS  
1 Neckpieces  
2 Active  
3 Tap gently  
12 Kilt  
13 Asian mountains  
14 — de France  
15 In sheep's manner  
17 Tub  
18 Smooth  
19 Devoted to oneself  
21 Eternities  
23 John  
24 Hypothetical force  
26 Apple and peach  
28 Skating place  
31 To have and hold  
34 Silky envelope  
36 Tent (var.)  
37 Nevertheless  
38 Narrow band (her.)

DOWN  
4 38 Chinese (comb. form)  
41 And (Latin)  
42 For  
43 Masculine name  
44 Wandering  
49 Bird of thrush  
53 Million title  
54 Things neglected  
56 Soap (abbr.)  
57 Try  
58 Certain pace  
59 Color  
60 Small-billed duck  
61 Stitches  
62 DOWNS  
1 Supervisor  
2 Hawaiian island  
3 Afloat  
4 M. cuisine nickname  
5 Salt  
6 Cotton material

**Answer to Previous Puzzle**

7 Garden tool  
8 Give in  
9 Partition  
10 We is met  
11 Feminine nickname  
16 The maves  
20 Impetus  
22 Broods of  
23 Convex  
24 Boy's name  
25 Performer  
27 Part of an act  
29 Part of the face  
30 Fine craft (pl.)  
32 Composition  
33 Dramatic composition  
35 Convex moldings  
40 Urge  
43 Sarcasm  
45 Men's garments  
46 Poet  
47 U.S.S.R. secret service  
48 Mosque official  
49 Tender  
51 Enough (post.)  
52 Type of lending  
53 Maxim

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12				13						14
15			16							17
18						19				20
		21		22			23			
24	25		26			27		28		29
30		31		32	33		34	35		
36							37			
38				39	40					41
			42	43	44					
46	47					49			50	51
52				54						53
56									58	
59				60						61