

Herald and News

Editorial Page

A Day Of Decision

On May 21 the U.S. Department of Agriculture will conduct a referendum for the nation's wheat farmers. This referendum confronts wheat producers with the responsibility for a momentous decision on the future direction of American agriculture.

The multiple-price certificate plan being submitted to producers includes the tightest, most binding government controls ever seriously considered for any farm commodity. It provides much stricter acreage allotments than growers have experienced over recent years and a new type of marketing quota and other restrictions. It gives the Secretary of Agriculture vast powers to regulate all handlers, processors and distributors of wheat from the farm to the ultimate consumer.

The proposed compulsory wheat program was designed to operate in conjunction with a compulsory feed grain program. This is creating pressure for new feed grain legislation. If producers go the supply-management road with wheat, then with feed grain, they will have taken a long step toward adoption of compulsory controls for livestock, dairy and poultry products.

Writing for the Des Moines, Iowa, Register, able Washington correspondent Richard Wilson says in part: "Thirty years ago this month the New Deal was beginning the most audacious adventure in economic control ever undertaken. Now it is \$48 billion and six secretaries of agriculture later. . . not even a close approach has been made to an economically sound and permanently workable solution. . . After the passage of all this time and the spending of a vast treasure to increase farmers' incomes the great farm technocracy is facing a key decision: whether to take the final plunge into the strictest form of control and regimentation of private enterprise ever seriously proposed in this country."

It now remains to be seen whether U.S. farmers have been so indoctrinated with the glories of bureaucratic control of their activities that they will vote away their independence and freedom of action on May 21. It will be a sorry day for our country if they do.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

If you are normally a right-handed person, try a little experiment for a half-hour or so: do with your left hand everything that you usually do with your right.

The most simple and obvious acts will become complicated and cumbersome. You will hardly be able to write or cut or eat your food; and you will quickly become baffled, frustrated and exasperated.

Now imagine this lopsided process intensified a thousandfold, and you may have some idea of how painful and difficult it is to think "with the left hand"—that is, to reverse our customary process of thought.

Why has science made such enormous strides in knowledge and development, while human affairs still remain largely as they were in the days of the Assyrian Empire? Largely because every advance in science is gained by reversing the spool of thought—by thinking in a way that is opposite of the traditional and customary ways.

Of all the habits of mankind, the habits of thought are the most persistent, the most tenacious, the most enslaving. We put on an idea in the morning as we put on a shoe, left or right first, unconsciously and without ever varying the procedure by a fraction.

And our resistance against changing our habits of thought is immense and unrelenting. If we try, briefly, we find it as vexing and unrewarding as writing a letter with the left hand. What we are used to is comfortable; what is comfortable is good; and what is good is right—this is the unspoken belief of almost all people everywhere.

STRICTLY PERSONAL

THE GLOBAL VIEW . . .

'Freedom Academy' Necessary

By LEON DENNEN
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

NEW YORK (NEA)—The influx of Russian, Cuban and Red Chinese agents into Latin America points up the urgency for the creation by the United States of the long-delayed Freedom Academy to train leaders in cold war techniques.

A bill (S. 414) to establish an academy to teach Americans and anti-Communist foreigners how to counter the Reds' non-military drive in sensitive areas was reintroduced in the Senate last January. It was sponsored by 13 Democratic and Republican senators and a group of private citizens, including the eminent American philosopher, Sidney Hook and Leo Cherne, president of the Research Institute of America.

Even Mexican intellectuals who once sneered at the "Yankee hysteria" about communism now realize that they are being swamped by Red propaganda. I learned during recent visits to Latin America.

What we need badly to check Castro's growing influence are knowledgeable Americans who will help us combat Communist propaganda as the Peace Corps is fighting to stamp out illiteracy and disease," a Mexican leader told me.

The political warfare relentlessly waged by international communism in Latin America is as much a threat to United States security as Soviet missiles stockpiled in Cuba. For 40 years the Russians have operated super-secret schools for the training of Soviet and foreign agents in political work and underground operations in non-Communist countries. Most Soviet "diplomats" were trained in political warfare at Moscow's Sverdlov University before they were assigned to missions in Latin America. There are 150 such diplomats in Mexico alone.

The Russians and their allies have developed their nonmilitary conflict to a point where they are waging the cold war in every possible field and with a variety of propaganda weapons.

Unfortunately, the techniques employed by the United States to combat Red propaganda do not cover the wide range of the East-West political conflict. They leave the Communists substantially unchallenged in vital areas of the cold war.

There is no doubt that many dedicated United States diplomats and employees of the United States Information Agency are doing their best to bring the message of freedom under extremely trying conditions.

Traditional diplomacy is no longer able—if it ever was—to cope with the upsurge in Red subversion in Latin America.

This was made clear by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy after his return from a world tour. He said:

"In every country well organized and highly disciplined Communist cadres concentrate their activities in universities, student bodies, labor organizations and

ter with the left hand. What we are used to is comfortable; what is comfortable is good; and what is good is right—this is the unspoken belief of almost all people everywhere.

When a scientist, however, tackles a problem that has hitherto seemed insoluble, he abandons all his preconceptions, and all the preconceptions of the past. Only when he begins to question the basic assumptions he has always held can he make an utterly fresh start, unencumbered by the intellectual baggage of the past.

I am not suggesting that a knowledge of the past is not useful, or that history and tradition have little to offer us—but they must be used as tools, not as points of departure. Our thinking about them must involve a painful reevaluation of our most cherished ideas and ideals.

Not one person in a thousand is willing—although many are able—to think left-handed for more than a few minutes at a time. Yet every important discovery has been made in this way, from Harvey on circulation of the blood to Freud on the role of the unconscious. And we know what derision and abuse such men were subjected to for daring to violate the right-handedness of their times.

QUESTIONS

AND ANSWERS

Q—What breed of dog cannot bark?
A—The Basenji.

This and That

ACROSS	DOWN
1 Apex	40 Metal
4 Vend	41 Green
10 Cease	42 Vegetable
12 Hail	43 Trickle, as a tear
13 Large plant	45 Supper richly
14 Delicacy	49 Reprising
15 Injurer	51 Anger
16 Maryland city	52 Spanish pot
18 Heavy hammers	53 Poker stake
20 Choose	54 Chemical suffix
21 Burr	55 Tinted
22 Ogled	56 Shoshoneans
24 Lease	57 Fiber knots
26 Belgian stream	DOWN
27 Mr. Minors	1 Scottish caps
30 Each	2 Ellipsoidal
32 Breed of sheep	3 Unceasing
34 Equipped	4 Scaffold
35 Redacted	5 Sea eagle
36 Selected (ab.)	6 Eyes of cameras
37 Scandinavian deity	7 Meadow
38 Shrewd (coll.)	8 Berate
	9 Yarn

Answer to Previous Puzzle

10 Auditory	51 Church
11 Nuisance	52 Cookery term
12 Looked closely	53 Baby
13 Hinder	54 Homeric work
14 Arabic nation	55 Tops of heads
15 Tattlers	56 Footpath
16 Weapon used	57 Depend
17 In dueling	44 Small island
18 Kind of spruce	46 Grafted (her.)
19 Locality	47 Gaelic
20 Dill	48 Profound
21 Mineral vein	50 Greek letter



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Republican Dilemma

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Those who insist that Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's remarriage to the recently divorced "Happy" Murphy is a "private matter" are far less realistic than the White House or the Democratic National Committee. All available evidence indicates that behind locked doors, a massive reevaluation of Democratic policy is taking place.

Until the remarriage, Democratic strategists had been making future projections on the theory that Governor Rockefeller would be the GOP Presidential candidate. It would be fair to sum up their thinking this way: "We don't know whether or not Barry Goldwater can carry the South and Midwest against the President. We don't know how strong or weak a candidate he would make. But we do know we can beat Rocky hands down. So let's get him nominated."

There were, of course, many willing hands in the Republican Party to help bring about a Rockefeller nomination—for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is his family's nationwide financial muscle. There were even Republicans who still insisted that Governor Rockefeller was "the only man who can beat Kennedy," although their arguments grew less convincing day by day.

The Democrats, however, were counting on the power within the national GOP of the group known either as "the Eastern liberal wing" or "the Wall Street group"—depending on where you sit. It is very difficult for many

people to realize that a substantial part of the Republican Party is suspicious of Wall Street, and always has been. However you may want to designate the group, it has named the GOP's Presidential nominee in every election since and including 1940—with the exception of 1960, at which time the group made an uneasy alliance with the Midwestern, Southern, and West Coast wings of the party.

The remarriage changed the picture somewhat—and the growing Goldwater boom didn't help any in maintaining the status quo. No one with any political sense, of course, is writing Rockefeller off. The public tends to be whimsical—and if the new Mrs. Rockefeller is as captivating as some say, she may turn out to be an asset. But in making political decisions, politicians go by the scratch sheet. There is no doubt that Rockefeller P.D. has slumped.

Therefore, a new strategy. While the Rockefeller forces in the GOP keep their fingers crossed, the far more practical Democrats have been casting about for a substitute, acceptable to the Eastern liberal Republican wing but still no threat to President Kennedy. So, through friends in court on the nation's leading newspapers and TV stations, the boom for Gov. George Romney of Michigan has begun. Qualities ignored when he was running against and defeating a Democrat for the governorship have suddenly been discovered in Mr. Romney.

I am sure those qualities exist. Mr. Romney is an able and ad-

venturous businessman—at a time when businessmen tend to be timid and to operate by the rule book. He defeated the Walter Reuther brigades in Michigan, which took some doing. He may be excellent presidential timber. The operative word, however, is "may." Governor Romney has not proved himself in public life. His ideas on national and international questions are not known.

Far more important, he himself is not known to the American public. One highly regarded speech or several appearances on Meet the Press do not give a man the kind of national reputation that is necessary to win the Presidency. Governor Rockefeller's reputation was built-in with his name—and there are millions of people today who owe their lives to Rockefeller Institute medical research.

Senator Goldwater has become even better known than the late Robert A. Taft. Some may damn and some may praise, but they know he exists. If he becomes the Republican presidential candidate, they will also know why he exists. But Mr. Romney is tailor-made for the Democrats. In the last week, his name has probably been mentioned more by Democratic strategists than any other as their choice.

My own feeling is that while the Eastern Republican king-makers were able to sell a relative unknown like Wendell Willkie in 1940, they cannot repeat that virtuoso performance. This time they're up against something new. It is the conservative wing of the GOP which has beat them to the slogan. In the past, it was always, "Taft can't win"—or substitute another name. Now the conservatives are saying "Rockefeller can't win, Romney can't win, and neither can your other candidates." This leaves one man. Guess who?

Almanac

By United Press International.
Today is Friday, May 17, the 137th day of 1963 with 228 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1875, the first "Kentucky Derby" horse race was held at Churchill Downs in Louisville, Ky.

In 1877, former President U. S. Grant sailed from Philadelphia for a round-the-world trip.

In 1954, in a unanimous decision the Supreme Court ruled that racial segregation in the nation's public schools was unconstitutional.

In 1960, summit talks collapsed as Nikita Khrushchev demanded an apology from President Eisenhower for the U2 spy plane flights over Russia.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Citizens Political Party Romney Aim

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—There may be a long-range political appeal in the line that Gov. George Romney of Michigan handed out here recently before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce annual meeting.

What Romney is advocating is a "citizens' political party," directed, controlled and financed by citizens and not limited to the views of business or labor or any other special interest group.

This is nothing that is likely to spring up overnight and sweep the businessmen-turned-politician into the Republican presidential nomination in 1964. Romney insists in fact, that he is not even a candidate. Until he changes his mind, he must be taken at his word.

Also, it does not take a political seer to predict that the odds now favor re-election of President Kennedy next year. Any Republican who runs against him is therefore just a brave man likely to take a licking.

If the situation does develop this way, the smart Republican with presidential ambitions is the one who plays coy in 1964 and builds himself up as Mr. Frontiersman.

By that time the Kennedy administration may have made so many mistakes that everyone will be sick and tired of the New Frontiersmen.

Then it will be high time for a change to some backwoods boy preaching the simple virtues of good but less government.

"We definitely must mobilize those who are not advocates or beneficiaries of nationalized government," Romney told the attentive Chamber delegates. "We do not want the federal government to dry up state, local or individual responsibility."

"To stop this, we must go to the ultimate source of power in a democracy—the people. If they are not sufficiently informed, don't take the power from them. Enlighten them. Save America from federalization."

This is no new line for Romney. It has been the basis of his campaign for reform in Michigan.

He began his crusade with six associates who got together to save their state from what they considered political bankruptcy. They finally got some 5,000 followers, held a constitutional convention, instituted changes which Romney now is trying to carry out.

He can't complete this job in one two-year term. He needs at least four years, maybe six. By that time it should be apparent whether his drive for good state government—to take over more of the job from bad federal government—makes sense and has the makings of a national political crusade.

Romney's performance in Washington was appraised as having a lot more to commend it than the recent capital appearances of New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and former Vice President Richard M. Nixon or even the long-play records of Arizona Sen. Barry Goldwater, criticizing almost everything and everybody.

Romney didn't mention Cuba or communism, Laos or Latin America. Khrushchev or Kennedy. He spoke on subjects closer to his heart at this time.

Romney assailed attempts by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to dictate relief policies to its state. He condemned big business-big labor massive collective bargaining which fosters monopoly in violation of the anti-trust laws.

"Until such conditions are altered," he declared of the latter, "we are not going to have adequate growth, and we will be headed down the road to disorder and destruction."

More than 1,000 Chamber delegates stood and applauded Romney, even after he told them to stop coming to Washington with their problems.

If all these delegates were to start selling a line like this, hard after they got home, something might come of it by 1968, if not sooner.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

House Committee Probing Defectors

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Congressman Francis Walter, seriously ill in a Washington hospital, will urge Attorney General Robert Kennedy to prosecute several score Americans who have slipped into Cuba within the past two years.

The Pennsylvania Democrat, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, last year ordered an investigation into violations of federal law which prohibits such travel.

Committee investigators discovered that some 100 Americans had entered Cuba in violation of State Department regulations, issued Jan. 16, 1961, which ban trips to Cuba without specific passport authorization.

With the single exception of William Worthy, a left-wing newsman, not one American has been indicted for violating that ban.

One such person is Edward Walter Shaw, a wheelhorse in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Committee investigators discovered that Shaw left the United States for Mexico City in September, 1961, and then flew to Cuba, where he spent a month in the workers' paradise. Upon his return, Shaw addressed Fair Play meetings in New York, Chicago and Detroit, lecturing on the "truth" about Cuba, and showing slides.

Shaw is an old cohort of Robert Williams, the North Carolina integration leader who fled to Cuba when sought on kidnapping charges.

Intellectual groups. Against these there is no one to question their positions, their facts; no organization, no disciplined and calculated effort to present the other side. And so it is that a small and well-trained (Communist) unit can take over a meeting, or an organization or even a government."

Why, then, is the Senate dragging its feet on the bill to create a Freedom Academy?

"The Communist world is fearful of military conflicts and will never risk its survival in any war except one it believes it is certain to win," Professor Hook recently told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "But today it is engaged in a full-scale cold war against the West," he said.

The Freedom Academy, in Hook's view, should be part of the Free World's front line defense in the cold war.

Called to testify before a HUAC hearing last week, Shaw refused to deny that he had violated federal law, invoking the Fifth Amendment more than 40 times. He would not answer questions about membership in the Communist or Socialist Workers Party. The latter has been cited by the Attorney General as a subversive organization.

Another witness called by HUAC probers was Freddy Jerome, 24-year-old son of V. J. Jerome, "cultural commissar" of the US Party. The younger Jerome, who has been identified under oath as a Communist, traveled to Cuba three times in 1960, before the State Department ban.

Committee counsel asked him: "Did you in Cuba receive any information or any matter that you were requested to impart or deliver to persons in the United States known to you to be members of the Communist Party?"

On this and virtually all other questions, the pale, dark-haired young comrade took the Fifth. Sullivan, then sorry, Jerome called the hearings a "farce" and protested that his honeymoon had been interrupted by subpoena—serving agents of the committee.

Committee probers wish to discover why State Department officials gave permission to LeRoy McLucas, a "photographer," to enter Cuba, Department officials in New York rejected his application for Cuban travel, but were overruled in Washington.

McLucas told officials he was working on a book for Simon and Schuster, showing a letter from Elizabeth Sutherland, a senior editor, to prove his point.

McLucas received permission to stay in Cuba until Dec. 31, 1961. On Feb. 2, 1962 he showed up at the Swiss Embassy and asked officials there to contact Washington and have his passport extended.

After McLucas' passport was extended he then informed Washington—through the Swiss—that he was rejecting his passport to remain in Cuba.

Sometime later McLucas changed his plans and came back home. He has addressed at least one meeting of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee since then and written articles for New Horizons for Youth, a Communist publication.

McLucas could not be located for a committee subpoena. The HUAC investigation will continue, however, and McLucas will again be sought.

BERRY'S WORLD



"The only place they want to go is, quote, 'fun-loving, carefree Haiti!'"