

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Suburbia Distorts U.S. Perspective

In the days when Hollywood was flooding the nation and the world with more than 500 movies a year, a standard complaint — not unjustified — was that they painted a distorted picture of this country's life.

The motion picture industry is no longer given sole blame, since its influence has waned. Yet some scholars and other observers suggest that the distortion today is greater than ever.

Those who talk about the "hidden America" of poverty, disease and distress which exists in our generally affluent nation are arguing, in their way, that the country's image is out of balance.

The reverse side of that coin has now been defined for us by educator Harold Taylor. At a Washington meeting of the National Committee on Support of the Public Schools, of which he is a vice chairman, Taylor said matters had reached the point where the largely prosperous U.S. suburbs were being portrayed as the sole symbol of American life.

For many decades our great growth has been in the suburbs. For the most part they are now the "home" of middle class America. They will get virtually all the fantastic new growth which lies just ahead. And it is to them that, with few exceptions, we hold the

mirror when we think to picture the America of 1963.

The scholars say that more and more the central cities are the abode of the rich and the poor. Except in occasional "realistic" films, plays or novels, life at the poor extreme is seldom presented.

No one can object, certainly, to representations of America which stress the solid, rewarding substance of middle class living. But that life needs to be seen — and lived — in full perspective.

Taylor's complaint, echoing some before him, is that for too many people, and especially growing youngsters, the good things of suburbia are being taken in isolation.

Thousands grow up with no thorough knowledge of the cities, their often beleaguered peoples, and their crushing problems. The cities are merely something to pass through to reach the magnet of downtown entertainment and shopping.

Taylor's point seems well grounded. To isolate a steadily enlarging segment of our people in the sanitized air of the suburbs is to render them ill-equipped for the rude shock of meeting the rest of America — as many of them surely must — at some stage in a mature, useful life.

Trade Act Troubles Mount

It now develops that the Trade Expansion Act of 1961 — hailed as the major achievement of the Kennedy administration in the last Congress — cannot begin to be effective before Jan. 1, 1965. It will take that long to negotiate major tariff cuts authorized by the act.

These negotiations will be conducted under the direction of Christian A. Herter, former Massachusetts governor and congressman and President Eisenhower's last secretary of state.

Named by President Kennedy as his special assistant on international trade, Herter has made one trip to Europe. Now he's preparing for two years of difficult bargaining.

There is wide suspicion of the new U.S. trade act in Europe and among the less developed countries as well.

What they seem to fear is that the United States is trying to capture their markets. They're reluctant to lower their own trade barriers against U.S. exports.

Two major political hurdles must be crossed.

First is the French veto of Britain's admission into the Common Market. This thwarts trade act authority given the President to negotiate 100 per cent tariff reductions on items in which 80 per cent of the trade is between the United States and the Common Market. This was put in the law in anticipation that Britain would be admitted.

The second hurdle is that Russia, its satellites and some of the neutral nations are advocating a United Nations world trade conference. What the Communist countries want, of course, is removal of strategic materials trade restrictions against them.

A U.N. trade conference might cause considerable difficulty if held while another round of rate reductions under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade — GATT —

was being negotiated.

The preliminaries to these negotiations are considered more important than the negotiations themselves. They'll determine what tariffs are to be cut and how the negotiations are to be conducted.

Trade experts from most of the 41 countries now in GATT have just begun meetings in Geneva to do some exploring. The idea is to negotiate on broad trade classifications rather than item by item, which is slow going.

The last round of tariff negotiations took 445 days. The present plan is to have the experts' preliminary recommendations ready for a trade ministers meeting to begin May 18. A final approval ministers meeting would then be held in January 1964.

Meanwhile, here in the United States, a list of imports on which tariff reductions might be made, along with the proposed new rates, is being prepared for issuance by Kennedy in July or August.

Public hearings then would be held on what to include in the GATT negotiating package. These probably will take the full six months allowed by the new trade act.

The final list of commodities on which tariff reductions are to be negotiated must then lie before Congress for 60 session days for its approval.

So the actual trade negotiations can't possibly begin before April 1964, or even later.

One of the principal American objectives is to insure that agricultural products are included in the coming negotiations, along with industrial products. In the last round of tariff negotiations, agricultural items were pushed to one side because the Common Market at that time did not have an agricultural policy.

Common Market agricultural policies are still cloudy, but the United States cannot get caught in this bind again.

"Let's Lock It Up Before It Has Pups!"



THE GLOBAL VIEW...

Army Chafes Under K's Party Rule

By LEON DENNEN
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
NEW YORK (NEA)—Six years after he purged the popular Marshal Georgi Zhukov, Nikita Khrushchev is facing an uphill struggle in his efforts to control the Red Army.

The Soviet Premier's fall from power may not be imminent but this is the real story behind the rumors of his domestic and international troubles.

The Red Army officers, especially the young ones, are beginning to voice boldly their views against the Communist party's tight control of the military.

This is revealed, among other things, in a remarkable book recently printed in Moscow. Entitled "Military Strategy" (Voenno-Military Strategiya), the book was written by a group of Russia's top military experts and edited by Marshal of the Soviet Union V. D. Sokolovsky.

Russia's strategists, the book makes clear, have little faith in local "brush-fire" wars with conventional armies. As Red Star, the Kremlin's military newspaper, said in a review of the book, the next war will be atomic and short and the decisive period will be the first strike.

"Rockets with nuclear war heads are the basic weapons for a quick defeat (of the enemy) and the paralyzation of entire countries," Red Star wrote. "Such weapons now determine the main direction in the buildup of (Russia's) military forces and in the methods for the conduct of the future war."

The review agreed with the "collective" authors of "Military Strategy" that "the problem of how to exploit outer space to forestall the aggressive designs of the imperialists must be seriously considered by the strategists." Nevertheless, the Soviet rulers were extremely critical of the book and its editor, Marshal Sokolovsky. The reason for their displeasure, however, was not strategy but politics.

Red Star, which is controlled by Premier Khrushchev's backers, reproached the writers of the book for their failure to underscore the role of the Communist party in the organization of Russia's military forces. For in a manner unprecedented in the Soviet Union, "Military Strategy" emphasizes the need for a "unified command" and a "centralized command" in the conduct of war.

Russia's top strategists, it is clear, hold the view that the army should be led and guided by professional soldiers and military specialists and not by the politicians of the Communist party.

Discontent with Political Commissars (Politruks) appointed by the party has been simmering in the Red Army since the death of Stalin in 1953. Khrushchev thought he gained the upper hand in 1957 when he fired Zhukov from his job as Defense Minister.

Zhukov, charged with opposing the party's control of the military, was replaced by the pliant and unpopular Marshal Rodion Y. Malinovsky. At the same time, Marshal F. I. Golikov was appointed chief of political surveillance of the armed forces.

Golikov's appointment was seen



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

I admire and envy a writer friend of mine, who takes the proper stance on a matter I feel strongly about, but rarely have the courage to enforce.

Sitting with him in his study a few weeks ago, I overheard a telephone conversation between him and a man from a radio station. The man had called my friend to participate in a round table program; as he had a loud, clear, radio-type voice, I could

hear both ends of the conversation. "I get the picture," said my friend. "What fee are you prepared to pay for this job?"

"Well," said the radio man, "it's a sustaining, public-service program, you see, and so we don't have any money allocated for speakers."

"Are you being paid for your work on it," asked my friend, "or are you contributing your services, too?"

"Naturally," said the man, "I'm getting my regular salary. It's part of my job."

"It's not part of mine," said my friend. "What about the engineer in the control booth for the program. Is he getting paid?"

"Well, certainly," said the radio man. "It's his job too."

"I thought that perhaps he was volunteering after hours, as a gesture of generosity and good will," my friend remarked. "Now tell me this — what about the announcer, the producer, the director, and the man who comes in and sweeps the floor afterwards? Are any of them doing it as a public service?"

"No, of course not," admitted the radio man. "But we just don't have anything in our budget for speakers. There's no money available."

"I can go along with that," said my friend. "I'm not greedy for money. But I'm sure you don't want charity either. Since you're asking a service of me, why can't you reciprocate with one for me?"

"Such as what?" asked the radio man.

"There's a lot that needs doing around my house — the walls need washing, the basement should be calcimined, and some bookshelves have to be put up. Why don't you come around on Saturday, or send someone around, to do these chores — and then I'll gladly let you have my services for the program."

"I've never heard of such a thing in my life," sputtered the man.

"Neither have I," purred my friend, "but I think it's high time we both heard it. You'll let me know, won't you? Thank you — and good-by."

STRICTLY PERSONAL

BERRY'S WORLD



"Do you give trading stamps?"

EDSON IN WASHINGTON



Foreign Aid Bill Just Looks Smaller

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA) — President Kennedy's foreign aid message to Congress turns out to be a request for more money for next year in spite of a tremendous effort to make the amount look smaller.

The message is three times as long as last year's. The first nine pages deal with what an insignificant thing the whole U.S. foreign aid program really is — only seven-tenths of 1 per cent of the gross national product — but look how much good it does.

There is extra emphasis on how much the President himself has cut back the program from his January estimates.

There is full endorsement of the recent report from the President's Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. It called for a cutback of foreign aid to more realistic levels that both giver and receivers could afford.

Then, like a night club check at the end of the party, you get the bad news. The foreign aid bill for the year beginning July 1 — even after being cut \$420 million by the President — still comes up \$4.5 billion in new obligation authority.

This is still \$600 million more than Congress appropriated for the current fiscal year.

If this amount is intended to be chicken fat which Congress can cut out of the new program, the President probably will be accommodated by the budget cutters.

Military assistance requests are for \$50 million more than this year.

Economic assistance requests are for \$516 million more, though \$210 million of this is for increased loans which presumably will be paid back. And over 80 per cent of this money is spent in the United States.

The only really new initiative in the foreign aid program for the coming year is a double-barreled proposal to increase private investments in the developing countries. This is a perfectly laudable effort since the intent is to reduce the government's outlays for foreign aid.

The first part of the program calls for revising the existing government guaranty on private investments abroad.

More than \$900 million guaranties is now outstanding. The total

grew by \$300 million in fiscal 1962 and for the first half of the current fiscal year the amount issued is \$160 million.

In spite of this commendable increase there is much concern that the program is not working as effectively as it should because foreign governments won't sign the necessary agreements to make the guaranties effective.

The second proposal calls for amendment of U.S. tax law to give American taxpayers a credit for new investments in developing countries. Europe and Japan would thus be excluded.

The present idea is to grant this tax credit for a trial period of undecided length to see how it would work.

It is still an extremely fuzzy thing because the Treasury Department, which is working out the details, hasn't come up with anything definite on how big the credits would be. Present thinking is that they would be larger than tax credits granted on new investments which promote domestic growth.

This is an extremely tricky proposal. If the foreign credit is bigger than the domestic credit, it might become an incentive to build plants abroad to employ cheaper foreign labor.

Such investments also might have a bad initial effect on America's balance of payments position, though this might be offset in part by the fact that equipment for any new investment abroad would have to be made and purchased in the United States.

The tax credit would be a one-time thing, applying only to the original investment. Foreign earnings from the original investment would not be eligible for the tax credit. A credit on reinvestment abroad of such earnings is being considered.

Net capital outflow from American investments in Latin America, Asia and Africa is reported by Department of Commerce at \$395 million in 1961. Reinvested earnings in 1961 were \$333 million for a total investment of \$733 million. Figures for 1962 are not yet available.

In a speech in Mexico City last year, however, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon declared that investments could be increased by \$300 million to a \$1 billion-a-year level.

This would reduce government foreign aid somewhat. But the tax credit cost is unknown.

WASHINGTON REPORT...



Government Red Tape Snarls Juice Saving

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

This is a story of frozen orange juice and federal government.

It's a tale of \$2 million in savings that taxpayers might have gained, but won't. It is best told by Pennsylvania Congressman Dick Schweiker, a member of the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, who has probed the case. He says:

"At the same time one federal agency was having to pay \$13.50 for a case of frozen orange juice concentrate, another agency was giving up its right to buy at less than half that price."

Representatives of Orville Freeman's Agriculture Department have acknowledged that they cancelled a contract to buy more than 383,000 cases of concentrate at \$5 each, although the Defense Department needed the juice for its troops and was paying premium prices for it.

"After prodding by the citrus industry last year, the Agriculture Department decided there was a surplus of frozen orange concentrate on the market. Producers complained the excess supply was driving down prices paid by consumers across the country."

Under the surplus commodities program, the department agreed last November to buy more than 1.1 million gallons of the frozen orange juice from processors with surplus stocks.

More than 360,000 cases, each containing 12 32-ounce cans, were to be delivered between December 3 and January 12 to individual state agencies. They would, in turn, distribute the juice to private charitable institutions, to schools and public welfare agencies.

Contracts were signed by officials of the Agriculture Department and various processors calling for an average price of \$5 per case.

Then on December 12, the situation changed — for the producers and for the public. A series of severe freezes hit Florida, badly damaging the citrus crop. The orange juice, as housewives soon found out, skyrocketed.

The processors went to the Agriculture Department and asked

to cancel the contracts. The reason, says Rep. Schweiker, was obvious: "Once prices had soared with news of the freeze, the industry hardly wanted to be bound by its contract to sell to the government at the agreed-upon lower price. If it could succeed in getting the contract cancelled, the industry could then put the juice on the market at a much higher price."

On Friday, December 14, a representative of industry called Agriculture and asked privately that the orange juice contract be broken. Agriculture obliged by issuing a press release within hours inviting industry to request an end to the contract.

The official requests were made. On Monday, December 17, Agriculture cancelled the contract, forfeiting the government's right to the orange juice.

Floyd Hedlund, director of the department's fruit and vegetable division, was called before Schweiker's subcommittee. He was asked what consideration was given to saving the taxpayers some money by turning over the orange juice contracts to the Defense Department.

"I did not give that consideration because I did not know it was possible," he replied.

George Cooper, a member of Secretary Freeman's legal staff, admitted that it was very possible, however. He testified that existing law permitted the transfer of the government's contract rights to the Defense Department, which needs more than a million gallons of the juice each year.

Such a move would have saved over \$2 million, said Schweiker, "didn't know what the left was doing and the potential savings went out the window."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—How can leap years be determined?

A—Any year divisible by four is a leap year, excepting century years, which must be divisible by 400.

Foodstuff

ACROSS
1 Food fish
4 Gumbo
6 Vegetable
8 Bakery item
12 Mail
13 Machine part
14 Great Lake
15 Encountered
16 Turquoise
18 Gift
20 Make amends
21 Legal point
22 Silkworm
24 Domesticated
26 Mine entrance
27 Short-napped fabric
30 Nullified
32 Tranquil
34 Folk
35 Anatomy
36 Observe
37 Ribbed fabrics
38 Rivers deposit

40 Variable star
41 Dry, as wine
42 Feminine appellation
43 Convenience
49 Decided against
51 Ignited
52 Polynesian god
53 Sprawl
54 Brevity
55 Shipped
56 Gaelic
57 Depot (abbr.)

DOWN
1 Summer
2 Above
3 Ordain
4 Monsters
5 Sharp
6 Raved
7 Exult
8 Lariat
9 Order (Latin)
10 Mortgage

11 — majesty
17 Spot
19 Soars
23 Lets up
24 Hardy heroine
25 Toward the
26 Viper
27 Handbags
28 West Indian shrub
29 Denomination

31 Weirder
33 Flowers
38 Wanees
40 Entangled
41 Move sideways
42 Witticisms
43 Grandparental
44 Italian painter
46 Lampreys
47 Turned
48 Volcano
50 Cauchy

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Friday, April 19, the 109th day of 1963 with 256 more to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning stars are Venus and Saturn.

The evening stars are Mars and Mercury.

On this day in history:

In 1775, the American Revolutionary War began.

In 1933, the United States went off the gold standard.

In 1951, Gen. MacArthur ended his military career.

In 1956, movie star Grace Kelly of Philadelphia was married to Prince Rainier III of Monaco.

A thought for the day—Aesop said: "It is not only fine feathers that make fine birds."

THEY SAY...

Any government which asks us for help in this matter will receive help.

—Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, saying U.S. will send military aid to any Latin country threatened by Communists.