

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Victory For The Human Spirit

We were all up there with Gordon Cooper, through the dark hours and the light. We should have been.

Some say we should not be exploring the unknowns of space while so many of the known things of earth are in disarray.

By this reasoning, Christopher Columbus should not have sailed in quest of a western passage to the Indies so long as peasants in Spain and Italy were hungry and ill-clad.

But even as it is troubled with its failures in zones of life already known, the human spirit must aspire, must search ahead, must soar. President Kennedy wisely described Gordon Cooper's great space flight as a victory for the human spirit.

We must all marvel at the precision which enables our space engineers to thrust a tiny capsule into a "slot" in the sky, send it hurtling through 22 orbits of the globe and then bring it splashing down to the sea within a few miles of its target ship.

Cooper's calm expertness, his sense of mastery over the curious vehicle that carried him, gave a richly human touch to his unique adventure—far and away the longest space flight of any American.

If comparison must be drawn, he did not, of course, match the 64 orbits and the 48 orbits of the two Russians who soared aloft last

August. But the difference has to do with Russia's superior rocket thrust. In the quality of our space flight, we are at least equal before the world.

And it is no small triumph that we have now managed six consecutive successful space flights in six tries. The Russians have mounted just four, even though they hold the orbital record. Moreover, strong rumor has it that they have suffered at least a few failures, with disastrous consequences for their pilots.

This nation having done so well, we cannot now break off and bury ourselves in our laboratories for a long hibernation. We must program more visible ventures soon, to impart to our explorations the competitive drive they need in a great competitive struggle.

Free world security is bound up in this race with Russia to master space and reach the moon and the planets. But there is more.

Space is one great frontier of the human spirit today. If free men are right in saying freedom gives the human spirit its fullest rein, how can we dare be second in the adventuring at that frontier?

To fail thus might be to fail in the supreme tests of will on earth between freedom and tyranny. Gordon Cooper has acted for us all in a remarkable flight which says that must not happen.

The Anatomy Of A Phrase

(Star-News, Pasadena, Calif.)

In a column recently commending the proposal to confer honorary U.S. citizenship on Winston Churchill, Marquis Childs touched adroitly on his invention of the phrase "Iron Curtain" to describe the dividing line between free Europe and the part of it that has fallen under Russian control. Churchill, of course, is the most celebrated phrase-maker of our age; any schoolboy today can quote him—or should be able to—the way those of earlier generations quoted Patrick Henry's and Nathan Hale's ringing declarations.

Childs' comment set us to musing about what it is that goes into a telling descriptive. Such analysis probably is as fruitless, as hot-

tom, as attempting to determine precisely what makes for a successful song or poem. It is easy to report how one reacts, but less easy to say just why.

But at least we can have some fun trying. "Iron" was precisely the word; it connotes brutality, imprisonment, and crudity in a way that "steel" or "stone" never would. And "curtain" is much better, than, say "wall"; it connotes concealment for concealment's sake. It also holds out hope; a curtain that is rung down can also be rung up. Together the words conjure up an image that is striking because it combines familiar elements in an unexpected way. Besides all this, the phrase was calculated to make the captors squirm.

IN WASHINGTON . . .

GOP Merry-Go-Round

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

In politics things are seldom what they seem—until they become precisely what they looked like from the beginning. This is what drives politicians mad and reporters to drink. It also makes life a little less humdrum.

The current shenanigans in the Republican Party are a case in point. For example: There is some bee-hawing because General Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, and Governor William Scranton of Pennsylvania are supposedly meeting "secretly" in some motel hideaway.

"That," says one correspondent looking for confirmation into his glass, "proves it. Ike and Dick are shuffling George Romney. They're convinced that Rockefeller can't go the distance. So they're interviewing the new help."

But it proves nothing at all, not really. True, Mr. Eisenhower has in the past expressed his satisfaction with Governor George Romney of Michigan and indicated that he would support him for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1964. And true, again, the Eisenhower-Nixon team believes that the Nelson Rockefeller escutcheon has been soiled by his precipitate marriage to a woman barely free of previous marriage bonds. But Eisenhower-Nixon-Scranton meeting is a meaningless straw-in-the-wind.

The devious or surface meaning of the confrontation vanishes when to this intelligence is added a rather important fact. Just prior to the reported meeting, Governor Romney spoke at the National Press Club. Mr. Nixon was secretly in Washington at the same time. Since Dick Nixon is acting as General Eisenhower's honest broker, those few people who (as of this writing) knew of his presence in the nation's capital are certain that he had a significant conference with Mr. Romney.

One set of facts cancels out the other. Two other sets of facts must also be weighed in the balance. Is Governor Nelson Rockefeller as through politically as

the smart money says? And where does Mr. Nixon stand?

Those who have written off Mr. Rockefeller are making a mistake quite common among politicians and newspapermen. They do not consider their own reactions or those of their friends. They think in terms of what the mythical other man "must" be thinking. No concerted and unbiased effort has yet been made to determine how the various voting blocs really feel about the Rockefeller double re-marriage. It is conceivable that it has really done him so little harm that it will be forgotten by the time the convention rolls around. By the same token, it may have blown the governor out of the political water.

Mr. Nixon's intentions are something else again—and as the Rockefeller forces retreat temporarily, the belief is widely held that the former Vice President is thinking of a possible deadlock which would turn the convention to him. He has lost his California base, but he still keeps his supply lines open to the California contingent in the House of Representatives. The wise money argues that Mr. Nixon moved to New York at the behest of Governor Rockefeller but no one has proved this yet.

So it's a question of what lies on the surface and what may swim below it. Scramble these facts and another conclusion can be reached. In fact, all it means is this: General Eisenhower, Mr. Nixon, and the Eastern Republican kingmakers have gotten a little panicky at the thought that their front-runner, Governor Rockefeller, seems to be in a slump. So they are casting about possible substitutes. They have not made up their mind—and you can bet your last dollar that they have not made any deals. It's much too early.

The real panic, however, is only tangentially connected with Nelson Rockefeller. What worries the kingmakers in their executive suites is the quiet confidence of the Barry Goldwater forces. The reports reaching the Republican National Committee and the work-

ing politicians in Washington are too consistent to be overlooked. The kingmakers, as they evaluate these reports, tend to give the impression that they'd rather lose with anybody than win with Senator Goldwater.

What happens between now and the summer of 1964 in the Goldwater camp may determine the outcome of the convention and the Presidential election. Mr. Goldwater, you may be assured, is no show-in for the nomination. But for the first time in decades, a conservative is the front runner. In 1962, the Republican Party wanted Senator Robert Taft, but the people wanted General Eisenhower. Today the roles are reversed. The professionals want Rockefeller or Romney or Scranton or you name him. The voters, at least in the South and the Midwest heartlands, want Barry.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Wednesday, May 29, the 149th day of 1963 with 216 to follow.

The moon is at first quarter. The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars. Those born today include John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 33rd President of the United States, in 1917.

On this day in history: In 1790, Rhode Island ratified the U.S. Constitution by a vote of 34-32. It was the last of the 13 colonies to do so.

In 1863, President Andrew Johnson issued a proclamation of amnesty extending a presidential pardon to all Southerners who participated in the Civil War.

In 1953, Edmund Hillary and Tensing Norkay reached the top of Mount Everest, the first persons in history to top the world's highest mountain.

A thought for the day—French philosopher Montaigne said: "Intellect, when misapplied, is a dangerous tool."

"All I Said Was, 'We Must Put Our Differences on the Table!'"



A Serious Danger In Pesticides

(In The New York Times)
By WILLIAM L. LAURENCE

The President's Science Advisory Committee issued a report last week cautioning the nation against the indiscriminate use of pesticides. Stressing that their use must be continued to maintain the quality of the nation's food and health, the panel of distinguished scientists also called for more research into potential health hazards and, in the interim, for more judicious use of the chemicals in homes and in the field.

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology who is also chairman of the committee, told a Senate Government Operations subcommittee that the uncontrolled use of poisonous chemicals, including pesticides, is "potentially a much greater hazard" than radioactive fallout. However, he added that no one knows the full story of the effects of this pollution, and he urged that Congress support creation of a large environmental health center to get the facts.

Pros and Cons

President Kennedy said he has already requested Government agencies to implement recommendations in the report, including the drawing up of legislative proposals.

In attaining greater ability to manipulate his environment, the report states, man has sometimes inflicted damage on himself and on his surroundings.

Besides enabling spectacular increases in agricultural production, the report states, pesticides have freed man from communicable diseases to an unprecedented extent. In less developed areas of the world, malaria, typhus and yellow fever, which

caused the death and disability of millions, are now limited and in some locations eradicated.

Pest control has also resulted in foodstuffs of the highest quality, and the cost of animal protein is lower because large losses of cattle from sick fever and grubs no longer occur.

On the other hand, the report points out, it has now become clear that while pesticides destroy harmful insects and plants, they may also be toxic to beneficial plants and animals, including man. Their toxic effects in large doses are known and precautions can be taken. "But we must now take measures to ensure that continued exposures to small amounts of these chemicals in our environment will not be harmful over long periods of time."

Little is known, the scientists say, about the consequences to man when he accumulates more than one pesticide in his body. Synergism, or potentiation, is the joint action of two agents which results in an effect that is much greater than the sum of their individual effects. "Some combinations of two organic phosphates have produced effects ten times those observed when either compound was fed separately."

Accidental acute poisoning in man, the report adds, has been caused by about fifty pesticides, including at least one compound from each major class. Each year, approximately 150 deaths are attributed to the misuse of pesticides in the United States.

Many kinds of insect control programs, the report states, have produced substantial mortalities among birds and other wildlife. Some fatalities have been the result of carelessness or nondirected use; others have followed

programs carried out exactly as planned.

Bird Mortality 80 Per Cent

Mortalities among birds have approached 80 per cent in areas heavily treated with DDT for Dutch Elm disease control, with heptachlor for imported fire ant control and with aldrin and dieldrin for controlling the Japanese beetle. Fish losses have been extensive even with lower rates of application in programs such as spruce budworm control using DDT.

Pink shrimp have been experimentally poisoned by 0.9 parts per billion of heptachlor. Other marine organisms are also highly sensitive. The growth of young oysters has been inhibited by concentrations as low as 3 parts per 100 million of chlordane, heptachlor or renoneone.

The science panel urged the development by the Department of Health, Welfare and Education of a comprehensive data gathering program so that the levels of pesticides can be determined in occupational workers, in individuals known to have been repeatedly exposed and in a sample of the general population. As a minimum the survey should include determinations on fat, brain, liver, and reproductive organs in adults and infants; examinations to determine if placental transmission occurs; and determination of levels in human milk. "These studies should use samples sufficiently large and properly drawn to obtain a clear understanding of the manner in which these chemicals are absorbed and distributed in the human body."

Restricted Use

As a first step, the panel recommends that the various agencies of the Federal Government restrict wide use of persistent insecticides except for necessary control of disease vectors. It also recommends that toxicity studies include determination of:

1. Effect on reproduction through at least two generations in at least two species of warm-blooded animals. Observations should include effects on fertility, size and weight of litter, fetal mortality, teratogenicity, growth and development of sucklings and weanlings.

2. Chronic effects on organs of both immature and adult animals, with particular emphasis on tumorigenicity and other effects common to the class of compounds of which the test substance is a member.

3. Possible synergism and potentiation of effects of commonly used pesticides with such commonly used drugs as sedatives, tranquilizers, analgesics, anti-hypertensive agents and steroid hormones, which are administered over long periods.

"In the end," the report states, "society must decide, and to do so, it must obtain adequate information on which to base its judgments. The decision is an uncomfortable one which can never be final but must be constantly in flux as circumstances change and knowledge increases."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—In his orbit did Commander Schirra pass over any Communist countries?
A—No.

Q—Why was the Republic of Liberia established?
A—As a home for freed American slaves.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Wheat Ballot Muddies

Legislation Picture

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Political implications of the farmer's referendum rejecting the Kennedy administration 1964 wheat program may not be clarified much before next year's presidential and congressional elections. Of perhaps even more importance, the wheat vote muddies the whole farm legislation picture, greatly impairing needed new cotton and dairy programs.

Republican leaders hail defeat of the administration wheat program as a repudiation of all farm control policies advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Orville S. Freeman. They call for his resignation, even though the President expresses confidence in Freeman and gives him credit for working to increase United States farm income to the highest levels since 1953.

At the same time, Republican farm belt congressmen are rushing in with new wheat legislation they want passed this year to raise support prices well above the levels of \$1.25 a bushel, which will be in effect under existing law.

Sen. Karl Mundt, R-S.D., is introducing a bill to continue the 1963 wheat program, which would mean a government support price of \$2 a bushel. GOP Reps. Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, Bob Dole of Kansas, Don Short of North Dakota and others are sponsoring new wheat legislation which would reduce the support price to between 65 and 90 per cent of parity, which would be \$1.62 to \$2.25 a bushel.

Department of Agriculture experts admit that as a result of the farm vote rejecting stricter controls, government wheat program costs may be reduced on the 1964 crop.

But if the prospect of lower wheat prices causes farmers to put more 1963 wheat under government loan—and if the removal of strict controls of planting causes a 25 to 30 per cent increase in planting for 1963—the government wheat program costs may rise by \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year. And it will take longer to get production back under control.

If the situation should develop in this way, the Republicans are proposing a program that will

wipe out about all the economy cuts they now hope to make in the Kennedy budget.

Republican farm leaders under Rep. Charles B. Hovsen of Iowa nevertheless hope to sell a new wheat program to the GOP leadership and make it party policy. The pitch seems to be to blame the Democrats if a new wheat bill is not passed.

Department of Agriculture officials concede that if new wheat legislation can be passed before the end of August it will be in time to control 1964 winter wheat crop planting. If only Republicans vote for it, however, it is almost sure to be defeated because of the 3-to-2 Democratic majority in the House and the 2-to-1 Democratic majority in the Senate.

Democratic congressional leaders are all insisting that there will be no new wheat legislation passed this session. This is based on the fact that defeat of the proposed controls in the wheat referendum does not mean that there is no wheat program at all for 1964.

Congress last year adopted permanent wheat legislation with minimum 50 per cent of parity price supports for farmers who comply with limited production controls. This point is said to be not well understood generally.

Furthermore, there will be another referendum on wheat marketing quotas and acreage allotments prior to June 13, 1964, to govern 1965 wheat crop planting. This offers a chance to correct any faults which develop before election day.

While the 1963 referendum result is hailed as a great victory for the American Farm Bureau Federation which campaigned heavily against Freeman's program, it is notable that no one in this dispute advocates a completely free market with all government controls, price support and conservation payments removed.

Desirable as such a development might be from the viewpoint of government economy, it is conceded that a completely free agriculture, suddenly imposed, would produce only chaos.

The drop in wheat prices after the referendum result became known is considered indicative



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

In his recent book, "On Knowing," which I unreservedly recommend, Jerome Bruner, professor of psychology at Harvard, observes that, "In time, and as one comes to benefit from experience, one learns that things will turn out neither as well as one hoped for nor as badly as one feared."

We can learn fairly early in life that our fears are generally exaggerated—the "bad" things that happen to us are not nearly so bad after they happen as they seemed in anxious expectation of them. There is some compensation in almost every loss; the mind takes care of that.

What is much harder to learn, however, and what is usually not learned until quite late in life (unless we are possessed of exceptional maturity) is that the "good" things that happen to us are not quite as fully satisfying, do not solve our problems, as we had hoped.

Every gain seems larger before we have it than after we have achieved it; the raise that looked so considerable a year ago has added to our expenses without substantially increasing our savings; the woman who fitted our needs so exquisitely during the engagement is a moon whose "dark side" we begin to glimpse only after the marriage.

Unless we are able to hold our fears and our hopes in a more or less sophisticated equilibrium, we are continually in danger of losing our emotional balance, of pinning too much on the Big Break or shrinking away too fearfully from the specter of failure and disaster.

If we look back upon our childhood, we can plainly see how obvious this is: neither the catastrophes nor the triumphs were as meaningful or decisive as we had imagined. Yet the time ahead of us is not much different from the time past—it is the same psychological game, played on a larger scale, for larger stakes, but still not as consequential to our souls as we still, half-childishly, imagine.

The public is baffled, and a little contemptuous, toward those celebrities (usually in the entertainment world) who despite, fate, fortune, extraordinary good looks and all the other desiderata we

so ardently yearn for, nevertheless are disgruntled, unhappy, confused, and sometimes embittered to the point of suicide.

Such personalities cannot be understood unless we recognize that they have been betrayed by their hopes coming true. They delusively believed that things would be well once fame and fortune were theirs; and all their fanatical striving for success was directed toward this end. When their infantile wishes were gratified, however, they quickly found that some basic satisfaction had eluded them. They had climbed to the peak—but the top of the mountain is cold, windy, and lonely.

Hope, of course, is a better comrade—in arms than fear, if we must make a choice. But both attitudes must be tempered by the calm recognition that: neither leads us to heaven or to hell.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

No Favor

We keep reading about all of our children being equalized under a one district county unit system. It sounds nice, but what does it mean? If it means they will all have equal educational opportunities and school facilities, it sounds even better. All mention of rural tax increase is carefully avoided.

If we rural people felt there were advantages to having our rural schools equal to RU, we would have voted ourselves a tax increase. Please don't do us any favors!

But if you mean you want us rural people to help you with your overcrowding problem at RU, why not quit putting fancy names on it and admit you plan to stick us with the bill?

Virginia Kent,
Langell Valley.