

Editorial Page

Civil Rights Effort Stepped Up

President Kennedy's broad civil rights proposals represent just about the heaviest down payment any modern-day president has ever made on his party's civil rights platform plans.

The Democrats' 1960 platform was a sweeping affair in this field. And the President's new message, together with earlier proposals and actions, leaves almost no part of that party document untouched.

The platform called for:

* Stronger Negro voting rights, including elimination of literacy tests and poll taxes as voting requirements.

* Speed-up of school desegregation, with every affected school district submitting at least first-step compliance plans by 1963. Aid to those districts facing special transition problems.

* Power to the United States attorney general to begin federal court suits to bar denial of any civil rights.

* A new fair employment practices commission to secure equal opportunity in employment.

* A permanent civil rights commission with broader authority than the existing one created in 1957 on a temporary basis.

* Improved employment opportunities for Negroes throughout the federal service and on all government contracts.

* An end to discrimination in federal or federally assisted housing.

Before the President's big, new program went up to Congress, he already had acted through executive order on housing and equal employment in the federal establishment.

Earlier this year he had proposed a re-

newed, stronger, though not permanent civil rights commission, and an easing (but not elimination) of literacy tests for voting, not to mention aid to school districts in process of desegregating.

FEPC "equal opportunity" legislation has been in the congressional works for some time, and has in fact just cleared its first House committee hurdle.

The current message gets into new ground, however, in urging authority to the attorney general to start suits in school segregation and public accommodation (lunch counters, etc.) cases. Right now, such suits are begun only by the complaining individuals.

The platform is more sweeping, suggesting the attorney general have power to start suits in any kind of civil rights action. For that matter, so was the quite similar proposal of former President Eisenhower — which was stricken from the 1957 civil rights bill.

Nor has Kennedy here urged the kind of first-step compliance timetable for school desegregation which the platform demanded.

But in two respects, at least, his message goes beyond the platform. There was no call, as there is now, for a federal law specifically barring discrimination in restaurants, stores, hotels, theaters. This idea is not only new, but untested in the courts.

Most of the things that are new in the President's message would give the attorney general added specific and broadly discretionary power.

They may or may not be enacted. If they should be, they would make the Justice Department perhaps the busiest, and certainly one of the costliest agencies in the federal establishment.

Bleak Truth From Cambodia

(Detroit Free Press)

News, as bad as it is logical, has come from Prince Norodom Sihanouk, ruler of Cambodia. He flatly predicts the fall of two neighboring countries to the Communists. The outspoken prince, who makes no secret of his sympathy for the West, is concerned because of his borders with Laos and South Viet Nam.

Few could quarrel with his observations about the fact that only the pro-Communist Pathet Lao is Laos' only united group.

And his assessment of the South Viet Nam situation can hardly be improved on: "I have always said it was necessary to do two things in South Viet Nam. First, replace

President Diem, who is not supported by the people. Second, establish a neutral government representing all political tendencies. But now I think it is too late for that.

"The Americans can keep things going as they are now in Viet Nam for many years. But in the end, America will get tired of the endless war and withdraw, leaving the field open for the Viet Cong. Americans have put themselves in the same position as the French during the Indochina war, and they cannot win."

His gloomy prediction was unsullied by any demand for a policy change or increased handouts. Its pessimism was pure.



Reverence And Self-Control

By JAMES RESTON

(In The New York Times)

WASHINGTON, June 16—Every time the Supreme Court restricts religious ceremony in the public schools, this country suffers a twinge of conflict between its heart and mind.

Intellectually, it seems to understand the force of the court's decision that government must be neutral in religious matters. But intuitively many people, unbelievers as well as believers, feel a sense of regret, as if something noble were passing out of our national life.

Fortunately, the court, in ruling out prayers and Bible reading in the public school this week, paid attention to both points. It explained, not only what it was doing, but unlike the New York Regents case (Engle vs. Vitale), it took pains to explain that it was not attacking the religious basis of our national life.

"The place of religion in our society," said Associate Justice Clark for the majority, "is an exalted one, achieved through a long tradition of reliance on the home, the church, and the inviolable citadel of the individual heart and mind."

"We have come to recognize through bitter experience that it is not within the power of govern-

ment to invade that citadel, whether its purpose or effect be to aid or oppose, to advance or retard."

There was some concern in the country before the court emphasized the limitations on its action. If it could make public school prayers unconstitutional, why couldn't it strip all religion from our public procedures, end the prayers in the Congress, eliminate the chapels and military chaplains in the armed services, and even rule out public observances of Christmas?

Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, charged the court with an "absolutist" approach and expressed his doubts as follows:

"In a country which has a great tradition of tolerance, is it not important that minorities, who have benefited so greatly from that tolerance, should be tolerant too, as long as they are not compelled to take affirmative action themselves . . . ?

"Is it not a travesty," he asked, "that we have brought ourselves, through an essentially thought-denying absolutist approach, to the point where such things as chaplains in our prisons, or chaplains in our military academies can be seriously and solemnly raised as threats to the religious free-

dom, which is guaranteed by the First Amendment . . . ?"

This week, the court clearly sought to answer these fears. It pointed to the fact that the Supreme Court itself opened each session by invoking the grace of God, and seemed to approve the religious ceremonies that attend other government functions.

This does not wholly meet Dean Griswold's objection, but it helps remove the feeling of many citizens that the country was not only turning its back on its religious past but was going to hell with the blessing of the Supreme Court of the United States.

It was probably a good thing, then, for the court to emphasize the religious background of the nation, while limiting religious practices in the schools. For despite all the aggressive skeptics in this country today, the ideals of personal duty and conduct still reach back to religious beginnings. And the more the headlines deal with the turmoil between the races, the nations, the sexes and the generations, the more people wonder about ruling out religious practices on the order of the highest court in the land.

History still suggests that free government has prospered best among religious peoples, and men have often speculated about what would happen to America if she ever lost her ancient faiths.

"One is startled by the thought," Lord Bryce wrote in The American Commonwealth 80 years ago, "of what might befall this huge yet delicate fabric of laws and commerce, and social institutions were the foundations it has rested on to crumble away. . . . It is an old saying that monarchies live by honor and republics by virtue. The more democratic republics become, the more the masses grow conscious of their own power, the more do they need to live, not only by patriotism, but by reverence and self-control, and the more essential to their well-being are those sources whence reverence and self-control flow."

The Supreme Court is not attacking this principle. It is not trying to weaken religious practice but arguing that taking compulsory religion out of the public schools will strengthen it.

For the moment this increases controversy, but once it is clear that the court is strictly limiting its restrictions on compulsory religious ceremony, a more thoughtful evaluation of the issue is likely to begin.

STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

The teenage boy was asked what his ambition was, and he replied, only half facetiously, "I want to live forever."

One of the first things we can note in a child is his inability to comprehend death, except on a purely verbal level. The child may accept the fact that other people die, but he cannot believe that he will ever die. This "sense of immortality" often persists into and beyond adolescence; some, indeed, never lose it.

It may be said to be the emotional acceptance of one's certain mortality that marks off the adult from the child. It also happens to be the principal psychological feature of human beings, as distinct from all other animals. Only man knows he will die, and this fact shapes much of his life, or mis-shapes it.

Immortality, on this plane of existence, would really be a horrible fate for any individual, no matter how appealing the idea seems to the young, who have not lived long enough to appreciate the necessary cycle of birth, growth, decay, and death. To think about living here forever, to think about it seriously, reveals how appealing it would be; its attraction is wholly superficial, a vestige of infantile desires.

The finite human mind cannot grasp what "forever" is, so let us imagine living even only 200 or 300 years, as the only ageless person on earth. No one we know would be alive; we would be a person out of time, and out of community, a true stranger on the earth. Our predominant feeling would be one of exhaustion, spiritually and emotionally. We would cry for death as a most welcome relief from this intolerable burden.

Or, to carry the philosophic fantasy in another direction: suppose that everyone alive were conferred immortality. Could anything more ghastly be imagined? With no deaths, there could be no births, for there would be no room. We would drive one another crazy by the second century

of life—the search for change, for novelty, would become maniacal; and a profound depression and inertia; akin to suicide, would settle on us.

Adam and Eve were presumably created for immortality, but this was before they had any knowledge of good or evil. Their just punishment was exile from Eden, not death—death was a gracious gift to prevent them from going mad; for to live forever with the knowledge of our infirmities and mistakes would be a worse hell than Dante conjured up.

Young people want to live forever because "time" as a concept has no meaning when we are young—to them, people of 40 are just as old, as "half-dead," as people of 80. It is only as we ripen into adulthood (if we do) that time becomes a friend, and not an enemy.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Christine Keeler Ltd., may we ruin you?"



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Civil Rights Message Tremendous Job

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — President Kennedy's civil rights message is in effect a second State of the Union message sent to Capitol Hill in June instead of January.

Using the current race relations disturbances as a peg, the President has hung onto it all the major domestic reforms he has recommended before. He includes tax reduction, the need to promote greater and more rapid economic growth, aid to education, his youth programs, more vocational training and even the Area Redevelopment Act, which the House recently killed, but which the Senate is trying valiantly to bring back to life.

The President now wraps all these old requests in a message of more than 20 major legislative recommendations, with some new demands for sweeping new executive powers. He tells Congress to stay in session till it gets all the parts put together in a single omnibus bill, this year.

The rationalization for this approach is fairly obvious.

Most of the 20 million Negroes in the United States are at the bottom of the economic heap. They have the lowest paid jobs, the lowest average income, the worst housing, the lowest educational level, the highest unemployment, the highest percentage on relief.

Until this one-ninth of the population is better educated and put to work at higher skills there can be no full employment, no general prosperity, no economic growth sufficient to absorb all the new workers entering the labor force every year.

"Delinquency, vandalism, gang warfare, disease, slums and the high cost of public welfare and crime are all directly related to whites and Negroes alike," says the President. He adds that, "Recent labor difficulties in Philadelphia may well be only the beginning if more jobs are not found in northern cities."

Here, the President indirectly brings into the civil rights message his juvenile delinquency program, medical care under Social Security, urban renewal, public housing, the anti-crime drive and improvement of labor-management relations. The President

even requests a company-by-company, plant-by-plant and union-by-union report on equal employment opportunity agreements covering 20 million workers.

The President is marshaling all the executive powers of his office to further his objectives. He has told his secretaries of labor and health, education and welfare to deal directly with local communities on work relief for unemployed fathers and aid to dependent children, wherever state co-operation lags.

He has earmarked \$400 million which he had previously cut from his January budget requests for new aids to education. He has instructed the Departments of Commerce, Labor and Health to see if they cannot give more aid to depressed areas and the long-term unemployed.

In short, he makes civil rights an economic problem, not a social problem to handle on an emotional or a moral basis.

"Our concern with civil rights must not cause any diversion or dilution of our efforts for economic progress," the President declares. "For without such progress the Negro's hopes will remain unfulfilled."

Finally, the President is setting up by executive order — until Congress gets around to establishing it by law — a new Federal Community Relations Service. Its function will be to try to restore peace to communities threatened or torn by racial tensions.

This race relations conciliation service will be empowered to act on invitation of local communities or on its own motion. The latter option is an experiment intended to minimize violence, and it may work that way. But interference by the federal government in what has always been considered the domain of local authority may also mean the beginning of the end of states' rights forever.

The powers which the President's civil rights message asks Congress to bestow on the United States attorney general is another long step in that direction.

Congress will be taking a long, hard look at this whole bill of particulars. It's going to be a long, hot summer in Washington, lasting till Thanksgiving before it's all over — if not Christmas.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



Stolen Votes Factors In General Elections

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

In Chester, Pa., one man votes 45 times in two elections. In Philadelphia another enters the voting booth to cast his ballot 327 times in a single day.

In Colorado County, Tex., thousands of ballots marked for a Republican candidate are thrown out. In Cook County, Ill., a Special State's Attorney discovers that his own Democratic Party is guilty of election fraud.

Angered by the disfranchisement of voters across the country, Congressman Bill Cramer, Florida Republican, has proposed remedial legislation. He has thrown into the hopper a bill (HR 7115) that would extend the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to include all vote fraud cases. Presently the Commission can investigate only minority group complaints.

Cramer introduced similar legislation in 1961. To the consternation of Rep. Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Cramer's Amendment was approved by members of his committee and attached to a bill extending the commission's life another two years.

Ironic was the fact that many of the Democrats voting in Executive Session against the Cramer Amendment were loud public advocates of civil rights. Chairman Celler, Holtzman of New York, Rodino of New Jersey, Toll of Pennsylvania.

Celler had the situation well in hand, however. The bill, complete with Cramer's amendment, died in a quiet death in the Administration-controlled House Rules Committee. The wily Brooklyn Democrat then attached to an appropriations bill another amendment extending the commission's life.

Cramer argued that the amendment was not germane. The venerable "Judge" Smith, chairman of the Rules Committee, called Cramer's scheme an "outrageous abuse of the parliamentary process." Speaker Rayburn upheld Cramer and the Civil Rights Commission was extended — without the power to investigate vote fraud.

Now on the spot is Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Cramer plans to ask him to support his bill.

The Florida Congressman wrote Kennedy two years ago but did not receive an answer. He received instead a letter from the then Deputy Attorney General, Byron White, stating the Justice Department's position: The Cramer amendment was "unwarranted." While now sits on the Supreme Court, Cramer hopes this time to get a personal reply from the Attorney General.

Note: The techniques of vote fraud have become more sophisticated since 1928 when Don Mellett, editor and publisher of the Canton (Ohio) Daily News, was shot to death after his expose of ballot box stuffing.

Nevertheless, one recent estimate put at one million the number of votes stolen in any Presidential election. Time-tested methods (chain balloting, graveyard voting, false canvasses) are still used.

A Democratic precinct captain and two benchmen were recently sent to jail in Chicago for methodically altering paper ballots after the polls closed. In full view of polling officials and a uniformed policeman they had erased X's from the Republican column and placed them in the Democratic column.

There are other, more subtle techniques. Voters in at least one-third of the nation still use paper ballots. The law is usually precise as to how the ballot must be marked. A candidate's or party's name must be clearly X'd in the appropriate square; any erasure, tear or additional marking will disqualify the ballot. Often a special pencil must be used.

All of which makes it possible for a quick-fingered vote thief to invalidate opposition ballots. While invalidating the ballots, he may tear some of them with a sharp-edged ring; or may conceal a piece of lead in a banded finger and mark up the ballot as he smooths it out. In a twinkling, he has disfranchised a voter.

Voting machines are safer but not foolproof. While voting-machine companies deny the charge, at least one citizens' group claims that a nail or small piece of wood can be wedged under a voting lever to keep it from registering.

IN WASHINGTON . . .

Tax Discrimination



By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Mindful that Senator Barry Goldwater would sweep the South if he runs for President in 1964, the Democrats are attempting to make the GOP pay as heavily as possible for this electoral gain. (Even President Kennedy privately concedes that Mr. Goldwater would be the toughest man to beat.)

The Democratic strategy, therefore, is to associate by continuous propaganda the Republican drive in the South and a racist position. If they succeed in doing this, it will keep the Negro vote in line for them. That this runs directly counter to the facts is hardly the question. What people believe is more important in politics than what really is.

I know of no responsible political reporter who doesn't agree that Republican strength in the South is built on economic factors and on the states rights issue. Not just a Republican, but only a Constitutional Conservative Republican can carry the South. The race issue inflames the low-income groups that are in job competition with the Negroes. But Republican strength is among the great middle class which has long ceased to argue the segregationist position.

Any analysis of Republican gains in the 1962 election shows that the party's candidates ran far below their statewide averages in the most heavily segregationist areas, that they ran above these averages in areas which have taken an undogmatic view of the race issue.

But there is even better proof of this in the strength shown by Senator Goldwater. For as he remarked in a recent interview, "I campaigned all over the South for Nixon in 1960 and everywhere I went I told them that I was opposed to segregation and discrimination." But he also stood up for conservative economic policies and states rights.

Senator Goldwater continues to speak in the South. He continues to repeat that he opposes discrimination. But he is more popular today south of the Mason-Dixon line than ever before. His words, when he appears there, are widely reported, so it is not ignorance that protects him.

If the Democrats can paint him, and all conservatives, as racists — and they have a great propaganda machine working at it day and night — then it will certainly do some harm in the North.

At present, many Negroes believe that the Kennedy Administration is shadow-boxing. Attorney General Bobby Kennedy's genius for rubbing people the wrong way lost him the support of such people as James Baldwin, a popular Negro writer who has emerged as a spokesman for the extremists. It will may be that a virulent campaign against the GOP is the only way of preventing a general Negro sit-down on election day. But it may also boomerang if Negro aggressiveness gives rise to counter-aggressiveness among whites.

In the past, we were told that the Democrats won because of an inflammation of the pocket-book nerve among the voters. If this is true, then the race issue will be far less important in 1964 than the tax issue. The House Ways and Means Committee — or the Democratic majority therein — has begun to give its approval to "reforms" which leave the low-bracket and the high-bracket taxpayer relatively alone. But they strike directly at the middle-income group. If Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) continues to go along with the Administration on these measures, he will be sowing dragon's teeth for himself and the President in 1964.

Just this week, the Mills committee tentatively approved a change in the tax laws which, if enacted, will prevent those who itemize their deductions to sub-

tract taxes on gasoline, auto tags, cigarettes, liquors, and a long list of other items. It will increase Federal revenues by \$500 million dollars and most of that money will come from the pockets of the abused middle class which has no lobby to protect it on Capitol Hill.

This kind of legislation will do much more for the Republican Party. The high-income taxpayer has ways to lower his taxes. The low-income taxpayer has it all taken out in withholding and does not itemize his deductions. The middle-income groups, both north and south, must rely on such clauses to save them from prohibitively high taxes. Next April, when they make out their returns, they will not bless Mr. Kennedy for singling them out as the targets for discriminatory taxation.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Tuesday, June 25, the 177th day of 1963 with 189 to follow.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1863, the former Confederate states of North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama and Louisiana were readmitted to the Union.

In 1876, Sitting Bull led the Sioux Indians in the battle of the Little Big Horn that wiped out Gen. George Custer and his men in an action that later became known as "Custer's Last Stand."

A thought for the day—European philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche wrote: "Distrust all in whom the impulse to punish is powerful."