

Herald and News

Editorial Page

The Power Of Words

In American political life, those who hold stoutly either to liberal or to conservative doctrine are by that fact much attached to the power of words.

Many liberals made no secret of it that their durable affection for Adlai Stevenson, the 1952-56 Democratic presidential nominee, was due in considerable part to his superb command of the English language.

Beyond Stevenson, the liberals have shown greatest interest in those figures who, like Minnesota's Sen. Hubert Humphrey, tend to articulate the liberal philosophy in "fighting terms."

It should be no surprise that matters are exactly the same on the right. A substantial part of Sen. Barry Goldwater's appeal to conservatives is his dramatization as a fighter, a man who rips the opposition up the back.

It is not in derogation of the "word fighters" on either side to observe that they can with little difficulty find "applause points" which touch their audiences off in outbursts of cheering.

A liberal, chiding our leaders for too much emphasis upon the military element in our ties to foreign friends, can raise the roof with: "What we need is more warm hearts and less cold steel."

A conservative, rapping big government, can do the same with: "Let's get the government out of our private lives, and let the people in their infinite wisdom make their own decisions."

Yet stony silence can greet the middle-roader, addressing either liberals or conservatives, when he says:

"Restoring the nation's economy is a very complex matter, with no black and white solutions. This year we are trying this particular tax formula. If it doesn't work, we'll try something else."

A typical response of the doctrinaire liberal or conservative to such talk: "What did he say?"

The truth is, the doctrinaire people are worshipers of order in a world with not much of it. In small matters they seek the neat package. In large affairs the grand design. They are not readers of history but persistent revisers of history.

They believe that the leader who expresses such designs through a pattern of firmly uttered words will succeed in imposing order on events.

Certainly there are moments in history when this may be so. Sir Winston Churchill's eloquent utterances in World War II bespoke a grand design: the survival of Britain and all free lands. Our founding fathers gave historic expression to a national purpose that has guided us nearly 200 years.

Forceful words are always an important ingredient of leadership, but they have their limits. Even in crisis, their usefulness is governed by the hard realities in the field of action. It is especially so in times of sharply divided outlook like the present.

We need the seekers after order. But we need not buy their argument that all is lost without it. For most of the order the world has had was provided by those after-the-fact packagers we call historians.

The Right To Know

(The Christian Science Monitor)

The one important fact about the current battle over "managed news" is that it will not, and should not, come to an end.

Reporters will continue to press for the maximum of news and often to fight for it. The degree of responsibility and irresponsibility which they exercise will vary according to occasions, individual reporters and news media.

Officials will continue to do a variety of things: follow an open or a closed news policy depending on their inclination and instructions; put out favorable publicity for their policies and actions; try to suppress or muffle news of their mistakes; safeguard diplomatic and military secrecy; use the cloak of that secrecy to keep prying reporters at bay; coddle "friendly" reporters and hold others at arm's length.

Some reporters will respond to blandishment or banishment. Others will just do their job.

This is a built-in conflict which is in the

public interest. There have always been checks and balances in the realm of public information about government. They are sometimes painful because there are abuses on both sides, but they add up to a system that is better than any other system.

The public has a right to know as much as government can tell without violating genuine security or the indispensable need to keep policies and negotiations secret until they are ready to announce. In the long run the public has a right to know virtually everything.

This right is best served by public officials who believe in keeping the public as well informed as possible, and by reporters who are responsible as well as hard diggers for news. It is best safeguarded by the means available to government to keep a secret if it really wants to, and the tenacity of reporters in blasting loose anything else. And it is finally preserved by the kind of public inquiry and debate that is now taking place. Both sides are examined for what they have done, not done or overdone.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

What Price UNESCO?

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

UNESCO is an agency of the United Nations. It concerns itself with such activities as plumb the depths of the Indian Ocean, organizing youth conferences at which the United States is roundly criticized, and publishing political tracts.

The UNESCO budget is for \$39 million, of which the United States pays 30.56 per cent. The Soviet Union contributes 13.18 per cent, which is pretty cheap considering that it uses UNESCO, as even the State Department will grudgingly admit, as a propaganda sounding board.

The State Department gets very distraught at UNESCO's performance and promises Congress faithfully that it is doing everything within its power to make sure this U.N. boondoggle straightens out and flies right. What "everything" means is one of those mysteries which our legislators on Capitol Hill fail to solve.

Some members of UNESCO don't pay their assessments, but the United States, like Ol' Man River, just keep rollin' along. The U.S. doesn't have to belong to UNESCO, or to share its problems with the other 112 members, but it chooses to do so on the principle that the U.N. is our last, best hope of peace. Amen.

UNESCO publishes books and pamphlets which are distributed free to libraries around the world. By this method, humanity's store of knowledge is presumably increased—at a substantial cost, of course. But UNESCO publications are not bound by the rules of historical accuracy one would expect from a bona fide world organization. In fact there are few, if any, regulations or guidelines to ensure that what is issued

under UNESCO's imprimatur is at all accurate.

Recently, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made an inquiry into one of UNESCO's publications, a book entitled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." Since this book is distributed as gospel truth to students of the United States and other nations, it might be assumed that the assignment for this project would have gone to a scholar known for his objectivity. Instead, UNESCO gave the job to a Soviet writer, which is pretty much like asking Frank Costello to write about New York's racketeers.

The Kremlin's propaganda ministry couldn't have done any better, which is hardly surprising since the propaganda ministry probably wrote the book. What does it say? Here are a few examples to remember when Congress debates appropriations for the United Nations:

Page 37: "In 1940, the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia), which voluntarily joined the Union." The facts are somewhat different. The Baltic Republics were free and independent until 1940 when the Soviet Union invaded them, called for elections in which only Communist candidates were permitted to run, and then incorporated them into the U.S.S.R. During the war and afterward, a large proportion of the Baltic peoples were tossed into boxcars and kidnapped into Siberian exile.

P. 42: "The unification of all the elements of the Ukrainian people within the framework of a national Soviet state was finally achieved in 1945 after the de-

struction of German fascism by the Soviet army, when Transcarpathian Ukraine became part of the Ukrainian S.S.R. under a friendly agreement between the U.S.S.R. and the Czechoslovak Republic with the wishes of the people concerned."

What really happened? After World War II, the Soviet Union seized parts of Poland which it claimed as Ukrainian, harking back to Tsarist Russian boundaries wiped away by the self-determination clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. The U.S.S.R. also seized parts of Czechoslovakia which had never been part of the Ukraine or Russia. The people of these regions voted to become Czech rather than Polish or Russian. The territory was forcibly seized. There was armed resistance from the people until at least 1950. Bands of guerrillas still roam the countryside, but their numbers have steadily decreased.

On page 36, the UNESCO book strives desperately to cover up or excuse Soviet anti-Semitism. It states, for instance, that "the vast majority" of Soviet Jews have "freely" given up their former language and culture. The facts: 800 Jewish-language schools have been forcibly shut down by the Soviet government. The 2.5 million books in years in Yiddish published prior to World War II have been cut down to zero. Every aspect of Jewish culture has become verboten—and the government systematically excludes Jews from many professions and institutions of higher learning.

This is the kind of material UNESCO publishes, using U.S. dollars. The State Department is upset, but nothing is done. Doesn't it make you wonder?



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

I was about to recommend a newly published book of essays by that remarkable Frenchwoman, Simone Weil, who died during the Second World War at the age of 34, and who has been described by T. S. Eliot as having "a kind of genius akin to that of the saints."

One of the essays in the book, titled "The Power of Words," more effectively analyzes the false and irrational conflicts in the modern world than anything else I have read.

Yet it occurred to me that it is precisely the people who most need to read it who will not bother, and the ones who will read it are the ones who need it least. This is the most frustrating aspect of communication—that only the converted have open ears.

From the letters I get in response to many columns, it is evident that, whatever their views, most people do not listen to their antagonists. They are looking only for arguments that will confirm their existing opinions. They do not know how, and do not want to, receive any kind of stimulation from the other side.

But a real education is obtained only in this way. Those we disagree with are the only ones who can stretch our intellectual muscles, who can make us question and re-examine our basic beliefs.

For example, I have recently been reading a slim paperback edition of "Nietzsche and Christianity," by Karl Jaspers, the fine theologian. Nietzsche was a bitter enemy of Christianity in all its aspects—and yet Jaspers finds in his pages many illuminat-

ing insights into the nature of religion.

His willingness to delve into Nietzsche's thought, honestly and deeply, has clarified, strengthened and purified his own beliefs; for nobody who fails to understand the enemy can truly understand his own position, its implications and its limitations.

Likewise, one of the strongest opponents of Plato's thought in modern times has been R. H. Crossman, the British political theorist. But, as one of Plato's severest critics, Crossman has concluded:

"I still find the Republic the greatest book on political philosophy which I have read. The more I read it, the more I hate it; and yet I cannot help returning to it time after time."

This is the only civilized attitude a man can take toward his serious adversaries: it is the only way we grow, learn, change, develop, and genuinely mature into a human being. But the ones who most need to know this are the ones who stopped reading at the second paragraph.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—Why are bats clumsy on the ground?

A—Because their wings get in their way and their knees bend backward.

Q—Who first portrayed Santa Claus as he is represented today?

A—Cartoonist Thomas Nast first pictured Santa Claus in today's image in an 1862 cartoon.

This and That

1 Bathroom accessory	20 European region
4 Be borne	40 Hamlet, for instance
8 Diminutive of Margaret	41 Land parcel
12 Mariner's direction	42 Lamb
13 High cards	45 Color
14 Rainbow	49 Squatter's domicile
15 Kind of chaos	51 He indebted
16 Sea frontier	52 Greedy
17 Hard salary	53 Grafted (verb)
20 Lariat	54 Nothing
21 Bow slightly	55 Possessive pronoun
22 Ages	56 Paradox
23 Children	57 Staccato (adj.)
26 Cury	
27 Bare course	
28 Circuit	
29 City in Missouri	
32 Chinky	
34 Straight	
35 Genus of woolly plants	
36 Imply (adj.)	
37 Streamlet	
38 Second-year sheep (pl.)	
39 Distinct part	
40 Neophytes	
41 Spread	
42 Statue	
43 Muffin	
44 Worm	
45 Measures of distance	
46 Assam	
47 Shrew's staff	
48 Rustic	
49 Fountain drink	
50 Scandinavian god	
51 Fabric	
52 Sole	
53 Continent	
54 Fruit	
55 Fragments	
56 TV's burr	
57 Historical narrative	
58 Legal documents	
59 Persian title	
60 Ground ivy	
61 Prince	
62 Proportion	
63 Uphold	
64 Lamprey	
65 Collier's moun	



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Johnson Tries To 'Manage' History

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent
WASHINGTON (NEA) — The most important correction of history since Nikita Khrushchev took Joe Stalin's name out of all the Russian school books has just been made by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson.

People who saw the ABC television "Conversation With the Vice President" thought they heard him say that he had not sought the presidency in 1960.

If this is the way it was, 10,000 reporters in Los Angeles in July 1960, including this one, must have been nuts.

But you know how these just-before-bedtime television shows are. You only half listen. You don't take notes. You're never quite sure that you heard right what you thought you heard.

The next day's newspapers, however, confirmed it. And the transcript of the proceedings checks it out completely.

The vice president was interviewed by Bill Lawrence, Ed Morgan and John Rolfs, which is as good a team of political reporters as you could ask for. Near the end of the proceedings, the transcript reads like this:

Morgan: "I ask this question generally, as well as specifically. Does a man, an accomplished politician, such as yourself, who has once reached for the presidency, at least for the nomination, and failed, reconcile himself not to reach again, or is it in his blood, and he would like to?"

After clearing the interference of all those commas, which showed even on the television screens, back came this reply: Johnson: "Well, Mr. Morgan, I don't consider that I ever reached for the presidency. My friends put me in the race in 1960. They felt that they should have representation, and my name should go before the convention."

"I doubted the advisability of this, and so stated on many occasions. . . . As late as July 5, when I announced I would let my name go before the convention, I did not feel that I was seeking the presidency. My friends thought they ought to have an opportunity to vote for me, and I agreed. . . . I didn't feel I was a candidate. I didn't go into any primaries. I didn't go out and ask any delegates to commit themselves to me in 1960. And I have no plans to do so now."

There wasn't time for the three

ace reporters to nail the man down on this new version of history. Or maybe they felt this is what Texas is famous for, and let it slide.

But it would be logical to observe that if the vice president is no more of a candidate for the presidency now than he was in 1960, he has already started to run for the nomination in 1968.

And his disclaimer could be interpreted as an effort to put himself in the position of not being a once-defeated candidate for the job but a fresh, dewy, thornless yellow rose of Texas just waiting to be picked for the first time.

What most people thought happened in 1960 was a good bit different from this. It forces this writer here and now, with full apologies, to correct all the obviously false and misleading stuff he wrote about events of that time. Like as follows:

In April, 1960, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn began to campaign for Johnson for president. (But Johnson wasn't a candidate). In May Johnson won a near sweep for the presidential nomination in Texas primaries. (But he wasn't a candidate).

In June Rayburn opened Johnson campaign headquarters. (But Johnson wasn't a candidate).

On July 5 Johnson announced at a press conference that he was "a candidate" for the presidential nomination. (He wasn't a candidate?) He said he would be a "working president" rather than a talking or traveling one. (Still he wasn't a candidate).

Then, a week later in Los Angeles, there was that never-to-be-forgotten debate between Kennedy and Johnson, arranged at Johnson's suggestion to discuss campaign issues. Johnson scored Kennedy's Senate absenteeism, his lack of experience, his youthful haste in seeking the presidency, his bad voting record on farm, power and natural resources development.

Or was this all just a bad dream? It must have been. Because Vice President Johnson now says he was never a candidate.

But give the man credit for his honesty. In the opening line of his interview, after Bill Lawrence had asked him how he happened to run for the vice presidency, Johnson began:

"Well, Bill, after I was defeated for the presidency in Los Angeles. . . ."

He should have stood in that bed.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Fair Play For Cuba Group Red Fronted

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

A Florida congressman will soon demand that Attorney General Robert Kennedy list the Fair Play for Cuba Committee as "subversive."

Tampa's Bill Cramer, a Republican, told this reporter that Kennedy has been derelict in his failure to include Fair Play on his list of subversive organizations. In 1961, the annual report of J. Edgar Hoover said:

"FBI investigations have also shown that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, and these parties have actually organized chapters of the committee."

On the floor of the House Representative Cramer made these charges:

Committees of House and Senate have probed Fair Play, coming up with hundreds of pages of testimony indicating that Fair Play has been a Castro-financed, Red-run operation from the very beginning.

One of the original founders of Fair Play was Joanne Grant, a little young Negro identified under oath as one of the country's "most promising" Reds.

In Chicago, the Fair Play operation is under the control of John Rossen, a veteran Communist who has headed up the St. Louis branch of the party.

Los Angeles Fair Play is run by leaders of the Socialist Workers Party, an organization listed as subversive by the attorney general. Mrs. Dorothy Healy, paid Communist organizer for Southern California, has been active in Los Angeles Fair Play.

In Fair Play's short history there have been three directors of the organization. None is alleged to have been a Communist.

The first man to run Fair Play was Robert Taber, an ex-convict who served time for armed robbery, auto theft and kidnapping. He defected to Cuba with \$19,000 in Fair Play funds; then returned to the states last year.

The second director of Fair Play was Richard Gibson, "A

campus bum who moved from campus to campus for 11 years setting up Communist front groups," according to Sen. Tom Dodd. Gibson has since left the United States for Algeria. He is said to be working as a "journalist" for several newspapers.

The present director is Victor Theodore Lee, a seaman who formerly published a Florida paper in which he referred to President Kennedy as a "jack-ass."

According to security reports, Lee left for Havana late last year as a "journalist" for radio station WBAI-FM. That station, incidentally, was the recent target of Senate probes who sought to determine whether or not it was Communist-controlled.

Lee returned to this country in January and has since lectured on the "Truth About Castro Cuba." He has told newsmen that he does not care if there are Communists active in Fair Play.

Lee is by no means the only Fair Play to make a pilgrimage to Havana within the last year. There is Gerald Quinn, a Michigan Negro not a Communist, who left for Cuba a year ago. A "journalist," he claimed to represent the Los Angeles Herald-Dispatch.

Quinn has written for Freedomways, a Communist publication, and is active in the Monroe Defense Committee, a group set up to defend Robert Williams, North Carolina integration leader sought by the FBI on kidnapping charges. Williams is now in Cuba, broadcasting rabid messages over radio Havana throughout the hemisphere.

Representative Cramer has turned over to the House Un-American Activities committee the names of 94 Americans—some with long backgrounds of Communist activity—who have violated U.S. law and traveled to Cuba within the past year. He calls upon Attorney General Kennedy to invoke the law, prosecute these Americans and "close this open door to subversion in the United States."

Floy Johnson, 419 Delta.