

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Action In The Boondocks

There is nothing like healthy, constructive counterargument to give force and life to public debate in a democracy. Luckily, we are beginning to get more of it.

Not long ago Republican Gov. William Scranton of Pennsylvania chipped in with a useful bit. Some lesser figures have contributed. And now GOP Gov. George Romney of Michigan has had something to say.

What are these people talking about? They are asserting—quite bluntly—that there has been far too much negative moaning and groaning in this country from the "loyal opposition" and other more frantic critics of the broadly ruling Democratic party.

Scranton said many businessmen who complain about the federal government "taking over" have simply defaulted on their own responsibilities in the areas of encroachment.

He is not the first to say that. Years ago the late Russell Davenport, writing in the respected businessman's magazine, Fortune, laid a heavy charge against businessmen for falling down on their wider public responsibilities.

Scranton noted that in one quick sampling of businessmen, a good number had to confess they had not voted in recent elections. A top Ohio Republican politician reported similar findings.

Harry Hall, an official of the Michigan State Chamber of Commerce, says the time has come for management to assume its full political responsibilities:

"The future belongs to men who have positive partisan convictions and have the desire, the knowledge, the inspiration and the courage to fight for them."

Governor Romney, a highly successful automaker before entering politics, wants not just businessmen but all citizens to jump into the fray. He gets laughed at by some who dismiss this talk as naive, fanciful nonsense.

But Romney has one leg up on these people. He practices what he preaches.

He is right with the folk who say government in Washington is too big. But he has little use for those who just complain and don't do anything about it.

Many say: "Restore state's rights, return power to the states."

Romney says fine, but that the way to do that is "reinvigorate state governments, rather than to emasculate the national government."

Michigan's new constitution, sparked by Romney, is specifically designed to modernize the lower echelons of government so they can do a better job and keep mayors, schoolmen and others from running to Washington.

The thesis underlying all this is simple: Men who don't attack their problems vigorously at home can't gripe when people take these matters elsewhere for solution.

There's a moral in this for those who consider in responsible fashion what must be done for schools in Klamath County.

The Train Stops Here

(The New York Times)

The recommendations submitted by a Presidential emergency board offer a sound basis for strike-free resolution of the long dispute over excess manpower on the nation's railroads. They go even further in protecting locomotive firemen against the impact of rapid technological change than the report Mr. Kennedy received fourteen months ago from a special White House commission set up by President Eisenhower.

Since the initial proposals carefully balanced the railroads' need for greater efficiency against the workers' right to economic safeguards, the more generous treatment now available should halt union foot-dragging and clear the way for a prompt agreement. The freeing into train crews of unneeded men imposes on the roads a financial burden they cannot carry without continued loss of

traffic to competing forms of transportation. The end result is job insecurity for all classes of rail employees in an industry that has already had a 50 per cent shakeout of personnel since World War II.

President Kennedy, who helped make the earlier recommendations meaningless by refusing to put the prestige of his office behind them, now has urged both sides to accept the present proposals as the bedrock for a contract. Any disagreement over whether specific classes of jobs ought to be retained can be disposed of through binding arbitration, under the procedures outlined by the emergency board. No such dispute can be considered serious enough to justify a national tie-up. As Mr. Kennedy said, in appealing for a harmonious settlement, the survival of free collective bargaining may be determined by the success of the railroads and the unions in keeping the trains running.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Transport System Fails

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

In assessing the Soviet Union's cold and/or hot war potential, most commentators think in terms of missiles, bombers, other military hardware, and numbers of troops. These are, of course, important variables in determining the Communist defense posture. But they are meaningless unless weighed against Soviet transport.

Napoleon once said that an army travels on its stomach. But an army can only travel as fast as its supplies, no matter how well fed. And a nation at war can only furnish those supplies if its transport is in good shape. And this, the experts note, may be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union. James Sites, an official of the Association of American Railroads, has been making first-hand comparisons between the U.S. and the Soviet railroad systems. What he has discovered should give small comfort to the Kremlin.

Point 1 in his survey: The Soviet transport system is one vast bottleneck. In apportioning investment capital, Sites points out, Soviet planners have "shortchanged transport in favor of more glamorous space technology, steel mills, and factories. As a result, railroads, the primary carrier, are an overstretched tendon, straining under mountainous loads."

Where most industrialized nations have a rail-truck-airplane combination in transport, the Soviet Union is tied down to an antiquated system. Russian railroads carry 90 per cent of all intercity freight travel and 75 per cent of all passenger traffic.

In the U.S., the comparable figures are 43 per cent in freight and three per cent in passengers. Thrust upon the Soviet transport system the added loads of wartime conditions and a breakdown is inevitable.

The United States has three trucks to Soviet Russia's one, but one hundred times as many automobiles. More precisely, one American in three has a car; one Russian in 330 can say the same. The significance of this figure is in the small productive capacity of the Soviet Union's automotive industry—150,000 trucks and cars a year. In World War II, American Lend-Lease made up for this deficiency.

The United States has surplus transport capacity, yet in wartime this is strained. How would the Soviet Union fare? Though it has twice the land area of the U.S., its 75,000 miles of railroad track are one-third of America's. The Kremlin boasts that by 1960 it will increase its rail mileage by 30 per cent, but this will give it one-half of what the U.S. has at present. Soviet rolling stock, moreover, does not compare in capacity with that of the United States. And it is severely handicapped because it is broad-gauge for use on Russian trackbeds. Shipments to the captive nations must be unloaded and then reloaded on European narrow-gauge stock.

In a wartime situation, manpower becomes a vital factor. In spite of leatherbedding on U.S. railroads, they are enormously more efficient than their Soviet counterparts.

It requires five times as many

railroaders to operate Soviet roads as it does to keep America's trains moving. In other words, the Soviet-American ratio in operating manpower is 8-to-1 per mile of railroad, or 30 per cent more men per unit of traffic handled.

Had the presumably foresighted Soviet planners been as smart as they claim to be, they would have begun a drastic modernization of their railroads at the end of World War II. Much of their trackage and rolling stock in European Russia had been destroyed and should have been replaced by equipment designed for use on Europe's narrower gauge roads. Highways should have been built and the automotive industry given investment priorities to expand. Instead, the Kremlin bosses simply replaced what had been destroyed.

The wide-gauge roads, which have been a serious barrier to Russian transport since the days of the Tsars, were perpetuated. Today, Soviet experts admit that one of their major needs is the modernization and expansion of all transport. But the Kremlin will not put up the money for it—and since there is no private source of capital, this means that nothing is done.

In terms of the Soviet defensive and offensive posture, it adds up to an inescapable conclusion: Even if Comrade Khrushchev's boasts about Soviet military power were true, they would be meaningless. An army is not much good if you can't get it—and its supplies—from here to there.



A BOOK REVIEW . . .

Retain Connally Amendment

By W. H. CHAMBERLAIN
(In The Wall Street Journal)

As an experienced lawyer Mr. Denison Kitchel has prepared many briefs. But it is doubtful he ever presented such an excellent case as he does in "Too Grave a Risk," a little book in which he argues that the Connally Amendment—restricting U.S. acceptance of the jurisdiction of the World Court—should be retained.

The World Court is composed of 15 special judges, elected for nine-year terms with a three-year rotation system, so that one-third of the Court is re-elected every three years. Its function is to render judgments and opinions on disputes between nations involving points of international law. Its jurisdiction does not extend to matters of internal concern. But who is to determine what is a matter of internal concern? This question was left ambiguously open when the Senate was debating U.S. acceptance of World Court jurisdiction in 1946.

Then Sen. Tom Connally, of Texas, filled in this gap with an important specification in six words: "As determined by the United States." In recent years it has become a matter of the liberal faith to attack the Connally Amendment as an obstruction to the realization of that mirage-like goal: "World peace through world law." Some well-meaning people have gained the impression that the U.S., by maintaining the Connally Amendment, is failing in its duty to give leadership for world peace and lagging behind the rest of the world.

The U.S. Commitment
Mr. Kitchel, with his full knowledge of the facts, has little difficulty in demonstrating that this is just not so. "The truth is," he writes, "that the United States is

further committed to the World Court than any other major power."

Only about one-third of the members of the United Nations have followed the American lead in accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. And of the 35 which have accepted almost all have carved out much bigger escape hatches than the United States. France, Great Britain and the Commonwealth countries are members of the Court's jurisdiction on the understanding that they can quit on one day's notice. America's time limit is six months.

No Communist-ruled nation has accepted the jurisdiction of the Court at all, although some of its judges have been Soviet and Polish nominees.

During the first 15 years of its existence the World Court decided only 11 cases, disposed of five others on technical grounds and rendered 12 advisory opinions to the United Nations. Of these 11 cases only one, the mining of two British warships off the coast of Albania, was serious. The others varied from the trivial to the ridiculous, such as the case of a German in Guatemala who, for a handsome consideration, bought himself citizenship in the postage stamp size principality of Lichtenstein.

As the author observes, two things stand out in the Court's record during this period: "The first is the relative unimportance of the disputes which have been submitted to the Court. The other is the small number of disputes submitted during a period when disputes between nations seem to have been almost constant. These things are mentioned at this point only to dispel any illusion which may exist that the nations of the world have

accepted in large measure the principle of adjudication as a means of settling disputes involving their vital self-interests, or that the World Court has to date played any real part in international affairs."

Court's Role Could Grow
The question may arise why, if the World Court has been so ineffectual, it is necessary to retain the Connally Amendment. The answer is that the past is not necessarily a guide to the future. And the time has passed when the U.S. could reckon on an automatic majority for its viewpoint in the Assembly of the United Nations.

It is quite conceivable that a combination of the Soviet bloc and the "uncommitted nations" could produce anti-American votes on matters very vital to U.S. national interests: Tariffs, immigration, race relations, UN control of funds appropriated for foreign aid, the Panama Canal, the base at Guantanamo, to mention a few. Such a vote might be followed by an appeal to the World Court. In such a case the Connally Amendment would be a very useful trump in Uncle Sam's hand. At the present moment the struggle over the Connally Amendment is dormant. But the Democratic platform of 1960 calls for its repeal and the issue may flare up at any time.

It is a good thing to have such a convincing brief for the retention of the Amendment, on the ground that its repeal would involve, in the words of the title, "too grave a risk."

Too Grave a Risk. By Denison Kitchel. Morrow, 128 pages, \$3.75.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—With what military leader was the horse "Vic" associated?
A—General Custer. The blazed-faced sorrel was lost at the Battle of the Little Big Horn.

Q—What caused the death of the dinosaurs whose bones were found in Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado?
A—Paleontologists disagree but whatever the cause—a blizzard of volcanic ash—a flood, a plague—many of them died at once in this particular spot.

STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

In New York recently, I was introduced to a young man who had just resigned his position in a brokerage firm in order to become a writer. We chatted for a half-hour about his new life, and I was tempted to ask him: "What is it that you have to say?"

For it seemed perfectly plain to me that this affable, not unintelligent young man was singularly devoid of any ideas or views that cried out to be heard. He wants to say something, but he seems to have nothing of special importance to say.

There is a widespread mistaken notion that "writing" is a talent that exists in a void—a sense of words and phrases, a style, a gift of expression and arrangement. But this is only the hollow form of writing; it needs to be filled with substance.

Nine-tenths of all writers, including many of the established ones, have very little to say. Their world-view is either banal, unformed, or non-existent. They are a mass of feelings and inchoate ideas, but these have never been enough to give shape and point and direction to literary works.

Good writing—as distinct from mere "style"—is first of all sound thinking. A writer needs a pre-benign mind, one that can grasp

an idea and hold it in the round, firmly and forcibly, using it as a tool. I don't even mean that these ideas need necessarily be conscious ones—but they must be present, driving the engine and providing its motive power.

The young man in New York, like so many of his kind, feels that the urge to "express himself" is a valid enough reason. It is not. The writer does not express "himself"—he expresses his view of the world, refracted through his own unique personality. Unless he can objectively himself—which takes study, patience, and the right shape of mind to begin with—he would do better to express himself by taking up flower-arranging or finger-painting or some other therapeutic craft.

The subjectivism that is running wild in the modern world tends to make everyone think that all he requires is the urge and a few technical pointers in order to become a creative artist. Nothing could be further from the truth. Writing, like the other arts, is a vocation—and a vocation implies a call, a summons, to a certain way of life, of thinking and feeling. The church wisely rejects those probationers who, despite their feelings, do not truly have the call; how much anguish would be spared if these would-be writers had a bishop to turn to.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Women Pay Law Has Limitation Hedges

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Although everybody in the Kennedy administration from the President down and everybody in Congress is feeling pretty virtuous now for having passed an equal-pay-for-women amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act, there is considerable question as to how much good it will do.

There are no accurate figures on how many women workers will get a pay increase out of it. More won't than will.

Of the 68 million workers in the U.S. civilian labor force, 23 million are women. Of these 23 million women, however, only 7.5 million are now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act as to minimum wage, overtime and working hours.

These 7.5 million women are the only ones who stand to benefit in any way from the equal-pay-for-equal-work amendment.

Women workers in agriculture, hotels, motels, restaurants and laundries are excluded. So are all professional, managerial and administrative women workers, and all outside salesladies.

The equal-pay amendment, however, has so broadened the concept of what constitutes equal work for which equal pay must be given that it includes equal skill, effort, quality or quantity of work, experience, training, seniority or merit system now in effect and excludes almost every differential factor other than sex.

The new amendment doesn't mean that all women workers will have to be paid the same as all men workers on similar jobs across the board and across the country, as some opponents of the legislation feared. It will apply only to men and women doing exactly the same work under

the same conditions in the same plant. The catch is that so many restrictions were put in the amendment that it may turn out to have very limited effect.

The secretary of labor is given no regulatory authority. He is even prohibited from blacklisting for government contracts employers found guilty of violating the amendment. It is to be handled by the Wage and Hours Division of Department of Labor, now under Clarence T. Lundquist, who administers the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Department of Labor is specifically denied the authority to go on fishing expeditions through an employer's payroll records, looking for possible violations of the equal pay for equal work amendment. It cannot classify jobs.

Specified employer's records may be examined only after obtaining a federal court subpoena. Enforcement of the amendment will be only by federal court trial and decision, not by administrative order.

The amendment will not become effective until a year after it is signed by the President. For men and women workers covered by union labor agreements, the amendment will not become effective until the contract is renegotiated to comply with the new law or for two years, whichever date comes first.

The amendment is so limited, in fact, that Rep. Katharine St. George, R-N.Y., called it, "just one bite of the cherry."

"In other words," she said, "we are just nibbling away at a thing that could have been completely covered by an amendment to the Constitution, simply giving women equal rights and letting it go at that."

This is what the League of Women Voters wants.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Reaction Unfavorable To Rocky's Marriage

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Don't worry. Sit tight. This in essence is the message that Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has sent to key supporters from coast to coast. A trusted lieutenant, George Hinman, has phoned backers throughout the country to assure them that Rocky's marriage is not, as commonly assumed, a political liability.

Hinman, Republican National Committeeman for New York State, is convinced that adverse reaction to the marriage will shortly ebb. By fall, Rockefeller can open full-throttle his campaign for the GOP Presidential nomination.

The new Mrs. Rockefeller, says Hinman, is "political dynamite." She's another Jackie Kennedy, a real campaign asset. Despite the warm reception she received last week, party pros remain skeptical.

A major reason for this is Dr. George Gallup, who finds that Rockefeller, previously the leading contender for his party's nomination, has faltered badly since his marriage and now trails Barry Goldwater among GOP voters. No longer is he considered his party's strongest possible candidate, either, running behind Goldwater in trial heats with John Kennedy.

There is no doubt that Rocky has injured himself, at least temporarily, among Protestants and surprisingly enough, it is not only fundamentalists who are critical. Liberal theologians like Reinhold Niebuhr have rapped the governor. In an editorial entitled "The Neighbor's Wife," a leading Episcopal weekly, "The Living

Church," said it was doubtful whether Rockefeller "can any longer be considered as a candidate for the Presidency." Reaction on the part of Orthodox Jews, Roman Catholics and fundamentalist Protestants has been, as expected, adverse.

The governor found letters piled high at his Albany office when he returned with his bride from Venezuela. Almost without exception, they criticized his actions. Many writers said they could no longer support him for the nation's highest office.

What is most astonishing is that members of Congress report substantial mail on the Rockefeller marriage. Wrote Warren Weaver Jr. in the New York Times:

"If Congressional mail accurately mirrors public sentiment, Governor Rockefeller remarriage appears to have been a political disaster."

Weaver leaped through letters received by one Republican, a strong Rockefeller man, and observed: "Few of them are coming from cranks. They are carefully written, clearly expressed and sincere."

Pollster Sam Lubell discovered similar sentiment in New Hampshire. "On the whole," he wrote, "popular reaction to the marriage has been quite hostile."

Fully ten per cent of voters queried said they no longer could cast their votes for Rockefeller. Lubell did feel, however, that Rockefeller could take the GOP Presidential primary from Goldwater, but by a much smaller margin than earlier.

Note: With Rockefeller slipping, Michigan Governor George Romney is more and more discussed as a potential candidate. Romney, according to several stories, has the backing of Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon. Both deny the allegation. In fact, has written a personal note to Barry Goldwater, assuring him that the report concerning him is false.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Sure Romney's a good man, but could we as a nation take more vigah than we have now?"

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Friday, June 14, the 165th day of 1963 with 200 to follow. This is Flag Day.
The moon is in its last quarter. The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.
The evening star is Mars.
Those born today include Harriet Beecher Stowe, who wrote "Uncle Tom's Cabin," in 1811.
On this day in history:
In 1773, the United States Army was founded when Congress authorized to rifle companies recruited to serve the colonies.
In 1807 Great Britain honored Queen Victoria on the 58th anniversary of her reign.
In 1948, the Germans entered Paris during World War II.