

Editorial Page

An Instrument Of Peace

It is fitting, we think, for the times, that we reflect on the unusual wisdom and writing talents of St. Francis of Assisi, who gives us these words to ponder:

"Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is discord, union; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

"O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console, to be

understood as to understand, to be loved as to love; for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

We do not mean to be preaching — St. Francis' eloquent words speak for themselves. We would only ask that every reader, in studying these simple phrases apply them to his or her actions and thoughts in analyzing the course of action pursued. It is not more difficult to be constructive than it is to be destructive — that is the message St. Francis brings to us.

Wheat Referendum Vote Important

On Tuesday, the 21st of May, the wheat farmers of this country will make a decision which with full justification is described as one "... of extreme importance to American agriculture. ..." The outcome of this referendum to be conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, will go far beyond the desires and problems of the wheat farmers alone. It will have far-reaching effects—one way or the other upon all farmers, processors and consumers.

The referendum will call for a yes or no vote on a plan providing unprecedentedly strict acreage allotments and marketing quotas. The Secretary of Agriculture would be given vast powers to regulate all handlers, processors, and distributors of wheat, all the way from the farm to the consumer. The proposed compulsory wheat program is designed to dovetail with similar proposals for other grains. Should this happen, the livestock feed grains would inevitably come within the system, and the nation's meat production would be definitely, perhaps drastically, affected.

The vote, according to observers, is apt to be a close one. There is a belief that large numbers of farmers, busy with planting and other chores, won't turn up. The argument presented in favor of a yes vote is that it would produce \$2 per bushel as against \$1 per bushel wheat. The Secretary of Agriculture is authority for this. But there are grave doubts that his view is a correct one. The market system, plus existing support plans, plus restrictions on the sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, plus the ever-present possibility that Congress would act should a crisis occur, supports these doubts.

Richard Wilson, Washington correspon-

dent for the Des Moines, Iowa, Register, has provided a forthright argument against approval of the proposal presented in this coming referendum. As he sees it, wheat farmers are being asked to decide "whether to take the final plunge into the strictest form of control and regimentation of private enterprise ever seriously proposed in this country." Then he says: "The absurd claim is made ... that farmers are choosing between \$2 per bushel and \$1 per bushel wheat. This is not even statistically correct. ... This is so unrealistic that few farmers will be fooled.

"Farmers won't be left in the lurch. They are given a chance now to escape a new regulation that they will come to hate even more than some of them detest their present restrictions. If the wheat farmers say no, Congress will come immediately to grips with this problem again, and there is no lack of effective programs which could be enacted.

"The choice is not between \$2 and \$1 wheat. It is a choice of freedom and responsibility or the intensification of control systems which haven't yet been able to do the job."

Another dissenting voice is that of President Shuman of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Here, in a sentence, is the substance of a case he has developed in detail: "A 'no' vote in the referendum would be a signal to discard the outmoded farm program concepts of the depression thirties that have created burdensome surpluses in the controlled commodities and move in the direction of a dynamic and expanding agricultural economy."

The tale will be told on the 21st of May. It is unthinkable that once independent farmers will vote away their freedom, as they are now being pressured to do, by the public officials who would be their bosses.



IN WASHINGTON ...

NLRB Acts Arbitrarily

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

When the National Labor Relations Board was created, its function was simply to supervise collective bargaining. In the years since, it has set itself up as prosecutor, judge, and jury. That these powers, sometimes in direct violation of the statutes as enacted by Congress, usually favor unions is no reason for the labor movement to applaud them. A swing of the pendulum could have the NLRB acting as arbitrarily and illegally against the unions it now codifies.

The extent of the perversion of law and logic by the NLRB is hardly realized by Americans. But the present chairman of the NLRB has stated that the body's role is not to carry out policy set down by Congress but to create that policy. The NLRB, moreover, has repeatedly held that precedents set by the Federal courts in labor-management cases are not binding on its future decisions. Labor and management, guiding their actions by these decisions, have found themselves in trouble when the NLRB, in effect, has overruled the courts.

It will come as a surprise to most citizens that in the Haynes-Stelle case, the NLRB ruled that management was unfair because it told the truth to its workers. In the Barker Brothers case, however, the NLRB ruled that the union was not unfair even though it had lied to the workers.

In short, the NLRB has set up two classes of citizens and two sets of books. Labor has the right of free speech in dealing with workers. Management does not, though this is guaranteed by the law. Management must bow to the letter of the law, as "interpreted" by the NLRB. Labor, however, has been allowed wide latitude and given the "right" to ignore certain provisions of Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin — two laws on labor-management which the NLRB does not like. Congress has already begun to stir restlessly, but the pressure

from the politicians has kept this down to a minimum. The House Committee on Education and Labor, some years ago, felt compelled to warn that in neither the Wagner Act nor the Taft-Hartley Act "did Congress delegate (to the NLRB) or any other instrumentality) any discretion to determine what the country's labor policy ought to be."

The NLRB, having assumed a policy-making posture, has gone beyond ignoring the courts and the Congress. In a series of decisions, it has made it plain that an employer cannot even be guided by NLRB precedents. Having "interpreted" the law in one way yesterday, the NLRB sets its own decision on its ear by coming to new and radically different conclusions today—based on what its members "feel" to be the national interest.

Interestingly enough, the NLRB has reinstated one of the abuses that led to the American Revolution. According to the Constitution, to the common law, and to ordinary decency, no man can be tried for any action which was not a crime at the time he committed it. This would make him guilty ex post facto. To put it in very simple terms, if a city council reduces the speed limit from 50 to 25 miles an hour, no man can be arrested because he drove 50 miles an hour before the new regulations were passed. Not so with the NLRB, which held otherwise in the Town & Country case. Employers who have followed the dictates of the NLRB have been fined and otherwise penalized subsequently, when those dictates have suddenly been changed.

It will also come as a surprise to some that the NLRB has ruled that a company cannot go out of business without the permission of the union. The Darlington Mills case was the first in this category, but there have been others. The right of a company to dispose of its property and to make contractual and sub-

contractual arrangements has been rescinded by the NLRB. In the Town & Country case 1 mentioned, the board ruled that the company was "unfair" and should have consulted with the union in advance.

This harks back to an old proposal by UAW President Walter Reuther, who urged that the number of cars produced each year should be determined by a national referendum. Mr. Reuther, in another plan, called for union participation in all production decisions of management.

In short, the NLRB is busily writing off those guarantees of "life, liberty, and property" inscribed in the Constitution. It is hardly any wonder that increasingly there is sentiment for some restraint on the NLRB's open seizure of improper powers.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Thursday, May 9, the 129th day of 1963 with 236 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The morning stars are Venus, Saturn and Jupiter.

The evening star is Mars.

Those born on this date include abolitionist John Brown in 1800.

On this day in history: In 1502, Christopher Columbus, accompanied by his 13-year-old son, set out from Spain on his fourth and last voyage to the new world.

In 1926, Commander Richard E. Byrd of the U.S. Navy and Floyd Bennett became the first men to fly over the North Pole.

In 1933, the Nazis began their series of book burnings by throwing 25,000 books into a huge bonfire in Berlin.

In 1946, King Victor Emmanuel III of Italy abdicated, yielding the throne to his son, Crown Prince Humbert.

"... And Let's Not Change the Style, Ludwig!"



THE GLOBAL VIEW

No Decline In Prestige Of Castro

By LEON DENNEN

Newspaper Enterprise Analyst
MEXICO CITY (NEA) — There is little evidence below the Rio Grande to back the Kennedy Administration's view that Fidel Castro's popularity is on the decline in Latin America.

As seen from here, the over-optimistic report by deLesseps S. Morrison, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, that Castro's prestige "has taken a real nose dive" was more wishful thinking than fact.

For the fact is that even in Mexico — which claims to have had its socialist revolution more than 30 years ago and needs no inspiration from Cuba — Castro's image as the "Yanqui Killer" is brighter than ever.

After the Cuban crisis last October, which revealed Castro as a Russian puppet, some Latin American "revolutionary intellectuals" were beginning to have second thoughts about the independence of Havana's bearded dictator. But all doubts were soon dispelled by President Kennedy's failure to press the terms of his "dismantling" ultimatum to Premier Khrushchev which called for on-site inspection in Cuba.

Rightly or wrongly, some Latin American politicians are convinced that there is a secret deal on Cuba between the United States and Russia. This conviction has been reinforced by President Kennedy's feud with the anti-Castro exiles from Cuba.

"How do we know what concessions President Kennedy made to Khrushchev in their private correspondence?" a foreign policy expert of Mexico's dominant Party of Revolutionary Institutions asked this writer. "The fact is that the United States accepted meekly Fidel Castro's ban on on-site inspection."

"This was the first time in history that mighty North America was really thwarted by a tiny Latin American nation."

Even Latin American politicians and opinion makers who oppose Castro and castigate him in private fear to criticize him publicly.

En route to Mexico, this writer attended a Pan-American conference of journalists called to discuss the positive and negative features of the Alliance for Progress.

A majority of the Latin American journalists who took part in the New Orleans conference were quite uninhibited in their verbal shafts against "Yanqui imperialism."

The "progressive" newsmen accused the United States of the old charge of "exporting capitalism" through the Alliance for Progress in an effort to enslave Latin America.

Latin Americans of rightist persuasions objected to the fact that the Alliance for Progress stressed social, agricultural, economic and tax reforms. They saw the Alliance as a sinister conspiracy to "soak the rich." Thus, the rightists in turn charged the Kennedy Administration with "exporting socialism" to Latin America.

However, in three days of discussions there was hardly any reference to Castro's and Mos-



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Purely Personal Prejudices: The trouble with the conservative approach to society is that it wants to deal with men as they used to be, and the trouble with the liberal approach is that it wants to deal with men as they ought to be; thus, men as they are tend to be ignored by doctrinaires of both factions.

It is easier to make history than to write it: the lunatic who killed Lincoln made it, but no single historian has yet succeeded in giving us the definite portrait of the Civil War and its aftermath, despite thousands

of books on the subject in the last century.

The author who sits down to write a certain book or play, and knows exactly what he intends to say in it, and keeps unservingly to this original purpose—such a man cannot write a genuinely imaginative or creative work, for unless the creation takes over and guides the author to a purpose and in a direction he did not conceive in the beginning, his work will be stillborn.

When a person says with great finality, "I know my own mind," what he commonly means is that his feelings have ordered his mind to stop thinking on the subject.

A certain amount of jealousy is natural and reasonable; but the unreasonably jealous man, far from valuing his wife or sweetheart, is really depreciating her, for his jealousy is based on the hidden assumption that she will easily capitulate to anyone as attractive who comes along, that she is cheap, easy and fickle.

Vegetable Talk

ACROSS
1 Hardly cabbage
5 — of lettuce
8 Red vegetable
12 Assam
13 Guano's note
14 Within (comb. term)
15 Terminal
17 Solar disk
18 Squatter
20 Changes
22 Bitter-vetch
23 American fuel
24 Noth
27 Vigor
28 Hood
31 Maine
32 Sugar
33 Make a mistake
34 Poem
35 Circle
36 Hamlet for me
37 Existed
38 Goddard of
39 Infatuation
40 Palm leaf (var.)
41 Coriander
42 Search
43 Orange-red vegetable
49 Scope
50 Boy's name
52 Low (comb. term)
53 Rise
54 Loblentz
55 Vult
56 Italian city
57 Scottish "me"
58 Large plant

DOWN
1 Sharp
2 Finnish name
3 Covers
4 Oriental
5 Brains
6 Samuel's teacher (Bib.)
7 Impairing
8 Cudgels
9 Grafted (herb)
10 German stream
11 Units of weight
12 Chest rattle
13 Before
14 Legume
15 Flat-bottomed boat
16 Final musical passage
17 Native metals
18 Weathercock
19 Vegetable
20 Ceramic piece
21 Narrow inlet

Answer to Previous Puzzle

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 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

STRICTLY PERSONAL

of books on the subject in the last century.

The author who sits down to write a certain book or play, and knows exactly what he intends to say in it, and keeps unservingly to this original purpose—such a man cannot write a genuinely imaginative or creative work, for unless the creation takes over and guides the author to a purpose and in a direction he did not conceive in the beginning, his work will be stillborn.

When a person says with great finality, "I know my own mind," what he commonly means is that his feelings have ordered his mind to stop thinking on the subject.

Why the country life is called "the simple life" has always baffled me—in terms of the diverse number of things one needs to know, and the multifarious activities one needs to engage in, the country life is the most complex of all; but its very complexity provides a personal satisfaction not found in the automatism of urban living.

A certain amount of jealousy is natural and reasonable; but the unreasonably jealous man, far from valuing his wife or sweetheart, is really depreciating her, for his jealousy is based on the hidden assumption that she will easily capitulate to anyone as attractive who comes along, that she is cheap, easy and fickle.

Vegetable Talk

ACROSS
1 Hardly cabbage
5 — of lettuce
8 Red vegetable
12 Assam
13 Guano's note
14 Within (comb. term)
15 Terminal
17 Solar disk
18 Squatter
20 Changes
22 Bitter-vetch
23 American fuel
24 Noth
27 Vigor
28 Hood
31 Maine
32 Sugar
33 Make a mistake
34 Poem
35 Circle
36 Hamlet for me
37 Existed
38 Goddard of
39 Infatuation
40 Palm leaf (var.)
41 Coriander
42 Search
43 Orange-red vegetable
49 Scope
50 Boy's name
52 Low (comb. term)
53 Rise
54 Loblentz
55 Vult
56 Italian city
57 Scottish "me"
58 Large plant

DOWN
1 Sharp
2 Finnish name
3 Covers
4 Oriental
5 Brains
6 Samuel's teacher (Bib.)
7 Impairing
8 Cudgels
9 Grafted (herb)
10 German stream
11 Units of weight
12 Chest rattle
13 Before
14 Legume
15 Flat-bottomed boat
16 Final musical passage
17 Native metals
18 Weathercock
19 Vegetable
20 Ceramic piece
21 Narrow inlet

Answer to Previous Puzzle

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 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100



EDSON IN WASHINGTON ...

Railway Labor Issue Could Bring Changes

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA)—Whether new restrictive labor legislation comes out of Congress this year may be determined by the outcome of the railway labor work rules issue.

President Kennedy's Emergency Board reviewing this four-year-old dispute between America's railroads and their on-train employees is expected to file its report about May 10.

Members of this board are Judge Samuel I. Rosenman of New York, President Clark Kerr of University of California and Nathan P. Feinsinger, University of Wisconsin law professor. All three have been fact-finders and arbitrators in numerous labor disputes for 25 years.

There will be 30 days after the board reports for the carriers and the brotherhoods to work out a settlement.

If they do, and if there is no strike, pressure for new legislation to restrict unions is expected to vanish in Congress.

But three times this year representatives of railroad management have walked out of negotiations on the work rules issue. They have insisted upon acceptance of the 1962 recommendations of a 15-member Special Railroad Commission appointed by Kennedy—backed by a Supreme Court decision on March 4 upholding the right of management to change work rules.

Representatives of the operating brotherhoods have been just as adamant in opposing the work rules changes they claim would destroy 65,000 jobs.

If coming negotiations end in stalemate and there is a strike, Congress will have a new reason for legislating to protect the public interest.

A new labor bill just introduced by Sen. Jacob K. Javits, N.Y., is regarded as significant in this connection. He proposes that the strike provisions of both the Railway Labor and Taft-Hartley Act be amended.

He would authorize the President to appoint boards of inquiry into labor disputes. These boards would be given a new power to make recommendations for settlement, in addition fact-finding.

In place of the 30-day court injunctions now obtainable under Taft-Hartley for "cooling-off" periods, the Javits bill would pro-

vide for a 30-day required bargaining period on a board's recommendations, even though neither side would be required to accept the recommendations.

This apparently would eliminate employee elections on acceptance or rejection of management's last offer in a labor dispute. While maritime industry representatives have testified before the House Merchant Marine Committee in favor of the last-offer provision, government conciliators have not found it to be effective or workable.

Railroad management formerly opposed arbitration of its labor disputes but has now swung round to support it. The brotherhoods oppose it and have even refused to consider the presidential commission recommendations to allow changes in work rules.

Daniel P. Loomis, American Association of Railroads president, believes that "the final answer to recurring crises in transportation lies in making board recommendations final and binding on disputing parties."

"I believe that once binding arbitration is set up, you will get a rebirth of real collective bargaining to get mutually satisfactory agreements."

The argument seems to be that labor and management will strive to reach agreement in order to avoid arbitration in which either side might lose. This is a negative approach which seasoned labor mediators are inclined to believe will not work.

All these developments come at a time when labor relations appear to be improving a little, after a bad winter.

With the long New York and Cleveland newspaper strikes ended, two smaller rail disputes settled, rubber workers reaching new agreements with the major tire companies, and auto and steel worker unions holding pre-negotiations talks intended to head off strikes later in the year, there is a little labor spring sunshine on the labor front horizon.

A major achievement has been to get Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz out of the business of having to devote so much time to putting out strike fires, for which he is neither staffed nor equipped.

The big effort now will be to get collective bargaining back in the hands of labor and management representatives, where it belongs.



WASHINGTON REPORT ...

Russ Missiles, Men Remain Cuba Threat

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Soviet missiles, capable of raining nuclear destruction on U.S. cities, remain in Cuba.

The charge is made by Ruby Hart Phillips, one of the country's foremost experts on Castro Cuba. Mrs. Phillips, for more than two decades the New York Times' Havana correspondent, left Cuba in 1961 and now writes from Miami. Her pipelines into Cuba are known for their accuracy.

In a telephone interview with my associate, Bill Schulz, Mrs. Phillips was blunt:

"Intermediate-range ballistic missiles with a range of 600 to 700 miles are stationed throughout Cuba. There is no question about that."

The charge is backed up by two Americans who returned recently from Cuba after eight years. They turned over voluminous information to the Central Intelligence Agency and broadcast their story over Radio Station WGBS, Miami.

The station did not disclose their names for fear of reprisals against friends in Cuba. Their report is based on firsthand knowledge plus what "completely reliable" sources—as well as Russians—told them.

At least 1,000 two-stage, 45-foot rockets—with a minimum range of 300 miles—are in Cuba, many of them stored in caves.

The Soviets have cleaned out, reinforced and ventilated about 30 huge natural caves in Oriente and Las Villas Provinces alone and are using them as military depots for tanks, rockets and planes.

Submarine "pens" have been built under the guise of "fishing ports" at Mariel, near Havana, and at Banes, in Oriente Province. These serve as an estimated 30 Russian bloc submarines operating in and around Cuba.

High-speed vessels, about 100 feet long and carrying no flag or insignia, are "running" small arms and trained saboteurs to Haiti, Guatemala, Venezuela, Chi-

le, Peru, and Argentina on a regular schedule of shipments.

The Soviets did not remove all their bombers or long-range missiles—measuring 70 feet without warheads—despite claims to the contrary.

In her telephone conversation with this office, Mrs. Phillips indicated that President Kennedy's statement was misleading in reporting that several thousand Soviet troops had been withdrawn from Cuba.

"Some troops have been withdrawn," she said. "That is true, but an equal number have arrived from Russia. The Soviet troops are not being withdrawn. They are being rotated."

Mrs. Phillips said it was "impossible" for the Administration to estimate the number of Soviet troops now in Cuba at 13,000. Reliable reports to her put the number at 30,000. "An exact figure," she said, "is impossible to arrive at; however, for so many soldiers wear civilian clothes and do not live at military installations."

Mrs. Phillips' view of Soviet troop strength is backed up by Hanson Baldwin, the Times' distinguished military editor. A graduate of Annapolis, Baldwin is recognized as Washington's outstanding journalistic authority on military matters. He said recently:

"There appears to be a consensus that no major reduction in Soviet strength has taken place and that the Russians are rotating troops, rather than withdrawing them."

Baldwin disclosed that a recent reassessment of Russian strength had convinced some intelligence experts that there may be 30,000 to 40,000 Russian military personnel on the island.

Government experts cannot, however, really know the number of Soviet troops in Cuba. Despite Presidential assertions, "some of the highest government officers and many intelligence officers admit that they do not know how many troops are on the island," Baldwin says.