

Editorial Page

School Prayer Decision

It is wholly natural and understandable that the response to so profound a ruling as the Supreme Court's decision in the school prayer cases should reflect deep divisions within the country.

Many legal scholars say that the high court's prime function is to try to settle the great, divisive issues that otherwise might tear our society apart. The court does not create these divisions. It simply attempts to deal with them when they appear.

On its face, the relation between church and government is now and always has been a potentially disruptive question. Human feelings on the subject of religions are strong. No less strong are the words of the U.S. Constitution declaring that church and state shall be kept separate, and religious freedom shall be assured to all persons.

In the current controversy, complaint comes from citizens who say that freedom has been abridged by state or city laws which require the reading of the Bible and the Lord's Prayer by school pupils.

One of the complainants has no religion, the other is a Unitarian and does not accept all parts of the Bible.

The Supreme Court's decision that such religious practices do violate the Constitution has the endorsement of many, though far from all, religious organizations and leaders.

It should be noted also that the U.S. court is not a pioneer in this field. Several state supreme courts, interpreting their own state constitutions on the subject of religious freedom, have handed down similar readings.

Many devoutly religious persons are quite reasonably concerned over the impact these rulings may have on the religious life of the country. In its newest decision the U.S. court has tried—evidently with only partial success—to convince the nation that it is not assailing religion, but simply what it deems an improper link between religion and government.

A striking dissent comes from Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School. Anticipating the court's latest ruling, and commenting on its 1962 decision in the celebrated New York case, he says the court is construing the Constitution's language in far too rigid "absolutist" terms.

He argues that the founding fathers meant to bar establishment of a state-supported church, but not to expunge from the nation's life all signs and ceremonies of religious nature.

Griswold contends further that anyone who objects to school prayers, Bible reading or other such practices can preserve his freedom simply by declining to take part. He says the person who does this must accept the minority status this places him in—and yet has a right to expect the tolerance of others.

The high court says in reply that even when a law excuses those who do not wish to participate, it is still coercive and puts a stigma on the objectors.

In the cases just decided, it is also a fact that tolerance by the majority was sadly breached. The complainant in Baltimore has seen her son abused physically many times, her home and car often attacked, herself refused work. The Unitarian in Pennsylvania has been subject to violent, sometimes obscene written abuse.

That these things were done in the very name of religious faith perhaps illustrates perfectly the gravity of the problem the court has tried to solve.

The court cannot and should not attempt to reconcile religious differences. It does have a responsibility for keeping government neutral in the matter. Many religious leaders agree that the fostering of faith is the business of church and family—without help from public schools or any other government source.

We find ourselves in general agreement with this attitude.

TV's New Frontier

(Cleveland Plain Dealer)

Broadcasting magazine reports that Robert Taylor will play the part of a special assistant in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in his new television series.

Noting this, the Republican Congressional Committee's Newsletter has suggested, with tongue in cheek, that some of the more familiar TV shows might be adapted to the New Frontier, or vice versa. It thinks, for example, that "Young Dr. Celebrezze" would be a smash hit.

Other suggestions: For New Frontier

news managers, "I've Got a Secret;" for Soapy Williams, a starring role in "Bald Journey;" for Dean Rusk, mystery guest on "What's My Line?;" for Lyndon Johnson, "I Led Three Lives;" for the Kennedy family, "Father Knows Best;" for President Kennedy's economic advisers, "The Three Stooges;" and for Jimmy Hoffa, "The Untouchable." The newsletter fears it would be impossible to find authentic New Frontier characters to star in "To Tell the Truth." But it suggests the entire case could be included in a spectacular called "The Too Late Show."

The Mounting U.N. Crisis

By THOMAS J. HAMILTON

(In The New York Times)

The internal crisis confronting the United Nations has now reached the point where its effectiveness as a peace-keeping organization is seriously threatened. Although the Soviet attacks on the organization are an outgrowth of its dissatisfaction with the United Nations' intervention in the Congo, other cold war disputes are not a factor in the current difficulties.

Despite disagreements over methods, the United States, the Soviet Union and the neutralists were all in favor of the decision last week to send United Nations observers to Yemen. Thus the difficulties confronting the organization are a medley of intricate constitutional and financial problems. But this does not diminish their gravity.

The outcome may have a decisive bearing on the Soviet Union's attempt to reduce the organization to the status of a debating society, without the flexibility which enabled it to act so energetically in the Suez and Congo crises.

Two developments last week demonstrated that the Soviet Union is making headway in its campaign. (1) Observers were not sent to Yemen until, as the Soviet Union had demanded, the Security Council had given its authorization. Equally important, Moscow won out in its campaign for Security Council endorsement of the arrangement whereby the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia, the two contestants in Yemen, would split the cost of the observer operation.

(2) A surprising number of Latin-American, Asian and African delegates indicated their agreement with the Soviet claim that a member two years in arrears retained its vote in the General Assembly unless a two-thirds majority votes in favor of enforcing the pertinent provision of the Charter. Until now it had been taken for granted that the penalty for

non-payment would be imposed automatically when the Soviet Union became liable to the rule next year.

The Greater Threat

In the long run, the consequences of the Security Council resolution on Yemen are probably the greater threat to the United Nations. Following its unvarying custom, Moscow asked much more than it expected to get. It demanded a Council resolution detailing the arrangements for paying for the observers and providing for their withdrawal after two months—the maximum period for which the United Arab Republic has agreed to pay.

Never before in the history of the Security Council, whether it was sending out commissions, observers, peace-keeping forces or, as in the case of Korea, a combat army, has it concerned itself with the cost.

If the Soviet Union's proposed resolution had been adopted, Moscow would have obtained valuable support for the new doctrine devised to justify its refusal to pay the assessments for the Congo and Middle Eastern forces. This, as explained last week by Nikolai T. Fedorenko, is that only the Security Council has the right to send out observers or military forces of any kind, and that the money to pay for them can be provided solely by the Council or with its explicit authorization.

However, the resolution adopted by the Council, which was sponsored by Ghana and Morocco as a "compromise," gave the Russians almost everything they asked: By endorsing the financial arrangements the Council asserted its jurisdiction over all phases of the Yemen project.

It is the universal expectation that the Soviet Union will insist, again and again and again, that this is a precedent demonstrating that the Security Council accepted the Russian position. A number of delegates believe, therefore, that the United States and other

Western members of the Council should have rejected the "compromise" and taken the issue to the General Assembly, whose jurisdiction over such interventions has not been contested until now.

The Veto Available

In addition to its efforts to revive the finality of the Soviet veto, the Soviet Union is attempting to impose a "financial veto"—by the simple process of holding back the money necessary to keep the United Nations solvent. In this atmosphere the Soviet Union's veiled threats to boycott the General Assembly, or even leave the United Nations, if Moscow does not have its way on the financial question, has had a considerable effect. Whether Moscow is serious is the question.

Kreninologists have felt for years that the Soviet Union would never repeat its mistake in 1950, when its absence from the Security Council made possible the United Nations' defense of South Korea. Moreover, they have felt that the United Nations is so useful as a propaganda forum that the Soviet Union would never leave.

These calculations might be upset, however, if the United States and other Western powers go ahead with their plan to take away the Soviet Union's Assembly vote next year, and the majority supports them—although it is by no means certain that it will do so. Faced with such a humiliation, the Soviet Union might quit, and in that case a number of neutralist members would probably get out, too.

The outcome appears to depend on the response of the rank-and-file members. If they make it clear that the Charter will be enforced, regardless of who is affected, the Soviet Union can be expected to back down. But the attitude taken by a number of the small powers raises the question whether they will act with the necessary determination when the decision is taken next year on the Soviet arrears.

'Sorry, Fido, But We Can't Control His Appetite!'



Civil Rights Fight Looms

By DAVID LAWRENCE
(In The Oregon Journal)

WASHINGTON — President Kennedy addressed the nation last Tuesday night on the subject of wide-spread disturbances over racial questions. The same broadcasting facilities which were furnished to the President, at the request of the White House, were not given to a spokesman of the opposition viewpoint in Congress for his side of the controversy.

The country is fortunate, of course, in having newspapers available in which comments and rebuttal can be printed. Four newspapers in big cities in the North which this correspondent saw on Thursday did have brief reports to tell the public that Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and an outstanding leader of the Democratic party in the South, had read to 18 assembled senators a statement which they had approved.

Russell announced his opposition to the President's "civil rights" program, but more important than this was his charge that the President has, in a sense, encouraged street demonstrations

instead of repressing them. He declared:

"The President's speech appealed eloquently to the emotions but completely disregarded reason, human experience and true equality under the Constitution.

"The fact that every citizen has the same right to own and operate a swimming pool or dining hall constitutes equality. The use of federal power to force the owner of a dining hall or swimming pool to unwillingly accept those of a different race as guests creates a new and special right for Negroes in derogation of the property rights of all of our people to own and control the fruits of their labor and ingenuity.

"The outstanding distinction between a government of free men and a socialist or communistic state is the fact that free men can own and control property, whereas statism denies property rights.

"Our American system has always rejected the idea that one group of citizens may deprive another of legal rights in property by process of agitation, demonstrations, intimidation, law defiance and civil disobedience.

"The highest office of the land should symbolize respect for law, whether it be legally enacted ordinances of the meanest hamlet in the land or the written word of our national charter—the Constitution.

"I was, therefore, shocked to hear the President justify, if not encourage, the present wave of mass demonstrations, accompanied by the practices of sitting or lying in public streets and blocking traffic; forming human walls before the doors of legal businesses; and assaulting with deadly weapons officers of the law whose only offense was undertaking to maintain order and protect private property.

"The South has its shortcomings as well as other areas. But a calculated campaign waged by the metropolitan press, television and radio has magnified the unfortunate occurrences in the South while crimes of violence in other areas have been minimized. This has generated bitterness and hatred against the white people of the Southern states almost amounting to a national disease. It is also encouraging a condition bordering on anarchy in many communities. These terrible conditions are sure to further deteriorate with increasing disorder unless the President of the United States desists from using threats of mass violence to rush his social-equality legislation through the Congress.

"I believe in equality before the law for every American. In equal measure, I reject the idea that federal power may be invoked to compel the mingling of the races in social activities to achieve the nebulous aim of social equality.

"Every Negro citizen possesses every legal right that is possessed by any white citizen; but there is nothing in either the constitution or Judeo-Christian principles or common sense and reason which would compel one citizen to share his rights with one of another race at the same place and at the same time. Such compulsion would amount to a complete denial of the inalienable rights of the individual to choose or select his associates.

"The President's legislative proposals are clearly destructive of the American system and the constitutional rights of American citizens. I shall oppose them with every means and resource at my command. I do not believe a majority of the Congress will be frightened by thinly veiled threats of violence."



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Looking through the spring issue of the "Antioch Review," I ran across a reference in one article to "what name Ulysses assumed when he went among the women."

Upon reading this, I promptly inserted a sheet of paper in my typewriter and addressed a brisk admonitory note to the editor of the magazine, informing him that it was Achilles, rather than Ulysses, that the author meant. I mailed the letter off just as promptly.

Shortly afterwards, the unpleasant thought occurred to me that this was exactly the kind of reaction I most dislike in many of my own readers. They will write: "I have enjoyed your column for so many years, but in the issue of so-and-so you quoted Montaigne when you meant Pascal."

Certainly, errors should be called to one's attention—but did I ever take pen in hand to tell the editor of the "Antioch Review" how much I enjoyed the essay on positivistic philosophy, or existential fiction, or the short story I read with much pleasure? No, I did not. I patiently waited until I caught a hasty author and a careless editor in a minor error—and then I pounced with my superior knowledge, to make them feel that here was a reader who could not be lousy-tapping.

That we are motivated by negative rather than by positive forces is one of the most discouraging aspects of the human animal. We will not lift a pen to praise a writer who has gratified us for years, but the moment we disagree, or are rubbed the wrong way, or detect an error of fact (which may very well be typographical), we rush pell-mell to the desk and send off a snide little note, as I did to the magazine editor.

The pleasure of putting someone else down is one we are enormously reluctant to relinquish. Some personalities are so distorted, in fact, that they can

identify themselves only in terms of what they dislike and feel superior to; all history, at bottom, is a way of positing some group into the muck and exclaiming how dirty they are!

Appreciation, freely given, is one of the outstanding marks of a generous character. I am not talking about compliments, which are social in nature and exist on a quid pro quo basis—but about a voluntary expression of gratitude for pleasures we normally take for granted. Only when the pleasure stops for a moment, or reverses itself, are we prompted to react in a negative manner.

Whether it was Ulysses or Achilles or Ajax made absolutely no difference to the author's point. What made a difference was my alacrity in pointing the finger of blame, and my inertia in penning the praiseful note I should have written many months ago.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Have a heart, Charlie! If you build a patio, I'll have to build a patio."



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Distribution Key To World Food Problem

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent

WASHINGTON (NEA) — The 100-nation World Food Congress of 1,200 delegates winds up two weeks of talk in Washington with the adoption of a charter, recommendations for future action and a final report from United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization Director Gen. R. B. Sen. of India.

The food congress developed no sensational news that could compete for front-page space with American race relations problems, the Profumo scandal in Britain, nuclear test ban negotiations with the Russians, or all the other things happening in Europe.

But it did develop solid news which assures that hunger and malnutrition can be wiped off the face of the earth if human beings are sensible enough to use available resources.

There is enough arable land available to grow all the food needed by the six billion people (double the present population) who are expected to inhabit the earth in 2000 A.D.

There is a reserve of virgin land on which more food can be grown to feed the rapidly increasing populations of Latin America and Africa. In Asia, with its tremendous population, the problem is one of increasing productivity by intensive agriculture, such as Japan's, where there is little idle acreage.

No one reported to the food congress that the world would soon have to go on a diet of algae, which would have been first-page news. But it was recognized that a scientific breakthrough on photosynthesis — the chemical process by which plants convert sunlight into living matter — offers hope for food supplies in future centuries.

Probably the most important finding of the food congress was that the great requirement to insure that the world is well fed is more education for producers and consumers alike.

More than half the population of the underdeveloped countries is illiterate.

An illiterate farmer cannot be taught how to increase the pro-

duction of his land by scientific methods. An illiterate consumer cannot be taught that from the time a child is weaned until it reaches maturity, it needs a balanced diet with ample proteins.

There is a world shortage of schools of agriculture and home economics, a shortage of teachers for those schools, a shortage of farm technicians to train farmers in the field.

Speaker after speaker at the World Food Congress emphasized there can be no freedom from hunger till there is freedom from ignorance. The big problem is just that simple—and complicated.

Perhaps the second most important problem laid before the food congress for the immediate future is distribution of existing world food supplies and resources so that they will do the most good.

This means putting idle manpower to work cultivating underdeveloped acreage, as well as spreading the world's food surpluses among developing countries that do not now grow enough food to give their people an adequate diet.

The need for an international organization of countries that produce more food than they consume was stressed. The idea is to coordinate all aid programs for maximum benefit.

The use of surplus foods as partial wage payments to workers on capital improvement projects—such as power dams and irrigation projects in developing countries—was suggested as a curb to inflation in expanding economies.

It was recognized that there is a limit to the amount of money that can be invested profitably for bringing virgin land into production or increasing crop yields on land now under primitive, inefficient cultivation.

But representatives of developing countries pointed out that if one-fourth of the money now spent by the major powers on armaments could be diverted into increasing food production, there would be more than enough capital to wipe out the hidden hunger now afflicting from a third to a half of the world's population.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



Area Redevelopment Plan Lacks Support

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Not even Larry O'Brien could salvage one of the President's pet projects which met stunning House defeat last week.

O'Brien, chief White House expert on Congressional arm-twisting, worked closely with Majority Leader Carl Albert to round up votes for expansion of the Area Redevelopment Agency.

Until the very end, Messrs. O'Brien and Albert thought they had it sewed up. When the votes were tallied, however, 37 Democrats, including several from Northern districts, had deserted the leadership.

Liberal Republicans, led by Manhattan's John Lindsay, refused to go along with the administration. Connecticut's Abner Sibal, New York's Ogden Reid, Massachusetts' Brad Morse, were all thought favorable to the administration program.

None were, Lindsay, who had enthusiastically backed previous ARA bills, rose "suddenly" in opposition. The program, he said, has been "studidly and inefficiently administered. It is weighted down with cumbersome red tape that makes the customary bureaucratic snarl look like a bed of roses."

Republicans obediently agreed. Only 15 out of 167 voting supported the administration bill. ARA spokesmen boast that they have created 35,225 new jobs in their first two years of operation. Republicans took out their slide rules and discovered the jobs have cost taxpayers as much as \$27,000 apiece. Private industry, says the Library of Congress, needs only \$20,000 in capital investment for each job it creates.

Opponents discovered the following facts of ARA life: Agency officials dickered with foreign firms, asking them to set up branches in this country and compete with American outfits.

ARA loused a California firm \$25,000 to open a plywood mill, although local businessmen said there was not enough business to keep existing mills open.

A loan of \$410,000 was made to help finance a Wisconsin plant that would manufacture paper towels, tissues, and napkins. Existing firms in the area were operating at less than capacity.

ARA lous under consideration a loan of \$1.6 million to build a soy bean processing firm in Maryland. Local businessmen say ex-

isting plants can handle all available soy beans.

—ARA funds have gone to help build an Indiana plant to manufacture shoes. The plant, say responsible spokesmen of the United Shoe Workers, is competing with domestic, not foreign, manufacturers. According to Congresswoman Florence Dwyer, New Jersey Republican, the firm refuses to hire Negro workers.

—The ARA has made two grants, totaling more than \$40,000, to the Bureau of the Census. Congressman William Widnall, Republican of New Jersey, says with tongue in cheek: "I had no idea that the Bureau of the Census, which employs more than 30,000 workers, is an area of substantial unemployment."

—ARA made a substantial grant to Cayuga County, New York, to undertake a study to see if sugar beets could be grown in the area's rocky terrain. Farmers throughout the West and Midwest are ready to grow beets without any handouts from Uncle Sam.

A major reason that Republicans lined up solidly in opposition to the administration bill is the widespread feeling that ARA loans have been used as political weapons. In the 4½ months prior to the November, 1962 election, 100 ARA projects were approved and announced.

Of these, 78 were in Democratic districts. Of the 22 others, six went to Pennsylvania, where the President insisted that his administration could work better with a Democratic governor. Four were in Massachusetts, where Ted Kennedy promised he could do more for you-know-who.

Four went to districts that were involved in redistricting or where the incumbent had retired, throwing the race open. One represents a case where notification of the award went to the Democratic candidate running against the ranking GOP member on the House Banking and Currency Committee. Only seven out of one hundred went to districts represented by Republicans up for reelection.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q — Which was the first one cent coin to carry the motto "In God We Trust?"
A — The 1869 Lincoln cent.