

Herald and News

Editorial Page

The Mandate For Peace

President Kennedy seems intent on restoring the notion of peace as an ideal, and at the same time trying to persuade millions everywhere that significant moves toward it are within practical range.

Peace would appear to need restoration as an ideal. To many it has seemed quite unattainable. To some it has been pictured as virtually undesirable, a status connoting only appeasement, surrender, slavery to communism.

The President declines to accept the idea that peace is beyond human reach. In his major speech at American University, he said: "Too many of us think it (peace) is impossible . . . but that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable — that mankind is doomed — that we are gripped by forces we cannot control."

"We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made—therefore they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings."

To Kennedy, peace is the "necessary rational end of rational men." But he does not think of it in consequence as only a distant dream. The practical peace he says is within our grasp is based "not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions."

In other words, he foresees no miracle of changing heart in the Kremlin or Peking.

The President argues simply that the "self-interest" compulsions toward peace must be as great for the Reds as for everyone else.

"Our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this planet," he said. "We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal."

Since this is so, Kennedy contends that the "new face of war," the horrible imperatives of nuclear holocaust, must be as evident to our adversaries as to us—and just as unacceptable.

"It is an ironical but accurate fact that . . . all we (the United States and Russia) have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first 24 hours."

The President's belief that Moscow understands this as fully as we is the foundation stone on which he would erect a new quest for the ideal of peace.

That search, he indicates, must inevitably produce slow, halting steps at best, with each necessarily ringed with safeguards. But those small strides can be important when multiplied.

Kennedy acknowledges that the discouragements from Moscow, up to this very moment, are many. Yet he insists that the logic of the world's dilemma dictates that we try again and again.

To yield hope, he says, is to accept the worst, a "strategy of annihilation," an annihilation that could embrace the globe.

Religion's Place In The Schools

(The Christian Science Monitor)

Neither God nor the Bible is excluded from American public schools by the decision of the Supreme Court in the school prayer cases. It is important that this point be understood. What the court has ruled is that no state of the Union nor any agency of it, such as a local school board, can constitutionally order a particular prayer or religious exercise as part of the public school program.

There still is ample room in the curriculum—ample opportunity and occasion—for the recognition of religion and morality as factors in American life. Some years ago a committee of educators headed by Dr. F. Ernest Johnson of Columbia University said in a report for the American Council on Education that "no person is fully educated who has not gained a knowledge of the faiths men live by."

So long as public schools are supported by people of varied faiths and convictions, it is not appropriate that these schools should "teach religion." They should not inculcate the doctrines of any sect nor even widely accepted dogma if these hurt the sensibilities of some. As communities become increasingly diverse, the sources of friction increase unless tolerance and understanding grow.

But it is possible and proper that the study of history, literature, and other subjects should include the many effects religion

has had, the enrichment and inspiration that have come from the Scriptures, and the place of ethics in the organization of the community. To these each pupil naturally will bring the approach of his own church and family background or lack of background.

Every removal of the suggestion of state religion from public instruction is a challenge to voluntary religion to supply through home and church what cannot be supplied through governmental forms—the essence and spirit of service and devotion, brimming within the individual.

It must be remembered that thousands of American children do not come from homes that have a church affiliation, have never seen the inside of a Sunday School or been introduced to the Bible. Nevertheless, religious influences, organized or otherwise, are as much a part of the environment in which they will live as are the shops in which they will work, the recreations they will seek, or the governments under which they will vote.

Hence there is a task before American educators—fortunately it already has been started—to develop teaching materials and practices that will handle even sensitive areas of religion with that detached objectivity sought in civics, economics, and sociology. This will not be easy; it will require public patience and cooperation; but it should insure that the products of the public schools will not be religiously illiterate.



WASHINGTON NOTEBOOK . . .

By WASHINGTON STAFF
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA) — Atty. Gen. Robert Kennedy, speaking before 300 college students ready to take a trip to Europe under the People-to-People Program, told this story which he says is an example of individual initiative.

One day last winter when he and his daughter Kerry were playing in the yard behind their home, he slipped and fell in the snow, cutting his face and head. He applied snow to stop the bleeding, till daughter Kerry ran up and said to him:

"Daddy, don't do that."
"Why," asked Bobby.
"Cause Kerry's reply:
"Cause you'll use up all the snow."

Mr. Lee Sherry, chairman of the California Republican Women's



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS
Doing the "right things" for children too soon is as bad as doing them too late, or not at all. This is a hard lesson for parents to learn—especially for those who are ambitious, intelligent and well-educated, and therefore capable of harming their children in many expensive ways.

Arthur Schnabel, whom I quoted the other day, also remarked in the same transcript: "I received a letter yesterday, stating, 'I know, Mr. Schnabel, that you are not interested in young pianists, but I would appreciate it if you would hear my son. He started piano lessons at the age of 3.' Well, I am afraid he has been ruined."

So also have been ruined those little girls who are given "ballet" lessons before their minds, their spirits or their feet are equipped for them. And pushing a shy and reluctant boy into competitive athletic events can have exactly the opposite effect from what the father intends—that is, it can make the boy effeminate rather than virile.

I speak from experience, at least in one area; a minor one, but still significant, in that it shows that even a thoughtful parent, aware of a child's limitations, is nevertheless often too eager to push. It was only by the third child that I learned differently.

This was in the buying of toys. I would invariably bring home toys that were "too old" for the child — too complicated, calling for more dexterity and a longer interest-span than the child then possessed.

A great deal of money was wasted upon toys that were played with for a few moments, and then discarded with no interest, or quickly broken. When I analyzed my constant stupidity in this area, it seemed clear to me that I was expressing my own needs, not those of the child.

I was trying to push him to grow up faster, to become stronger and more skillful before he was ready to or needed to. I wanted to be "proud" of him—a most dangerous word in the par-

en's Northern Division, has come up with her version of the best nursery story of the year, which she calls "The Elephants Couldn't Bear It." The story is about three little bears, Johnny, Bobby and Teddy, who take all the honey from the people and eventually are driven from their den (The White House) by outraged red-white-and-blue elephants.

A Washington newsman who does not wish President Kennedy and his brothers any ill luck nevertheless is waiting for that day when all three of them have a rather poor go of it.

Whether or not he gets to write the story, he wants to recommend this headline to his editor:

"The Grim World of the Brothers Wonderful."

STRICTLY PERSONAL

ents' lexicon—which means that I wanted him to develop at a faster rate than nature intended him to.

Some gifts of elaborate, expensive and complicated toys, of course, are simply a parent's way of substituting (quite unconsciously) material things for genuine love and understanding. But, this apart, most gifts of this kind represent a parent's impatience with the child's leisurely development, and say, in effect, "Hurry and get bigger so that you can do more things that I may brag about."

Recognizing, and accepting, a child's own tempo of growth is difficult for parents who have set high goals for themselves and their offspring. The somewhat neglectful, or slothful parent, perhaps does not do as much damage to the child as the parent who buys a piano for a 3-year-old.

When McGeorge Bundy, one of President Kennedy's top aides, spoke to the Women's National Democratic Club, he found himself under good-natured verbal fire from the wife of an administrative colleague.

He was introduced by attractive Elizabeth Rostow, wife of Walt Rostow, chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council. Noting that a biographical sketch of Bundy refers to him as a "general factotum," Mrs. Rostow said:

"I looked that up. A factotum is defined as a busybody, and a servant who manages all of his master's affairs."

The same sketch, she added, states that Bundy is "politically a Republican." She suggested that left unanswered this question:

"In his innermost a-political soul, what is he?"

Rising to speak, Bundy said to Mrs. Rostow:

"There's a girl we've got to keep out of our files!"

He added that his Republicanism is "something Republicans never remember and Democrats always forgive."

Sen. Norris Cotton, R-N.H., has come up with this verse from "Space Child's Mother Goose Rhymes," which he says describes the present Kennedy administration to a tee:

"This is chaotic confusion and bluff
That hangs on the turn of a plausible phrase
That thickens the erudite verbal haze
That lies in the theory
Jack built."

Washington, like other cities, is playing "Swifities," which consists of making quotations in the stilted style of the old Tom Swift boys' books.

Example: "I don't care to drink," he said dryly.

The other evening somebody got off this one:

"Remarriage won't affect my political plans at all," said Rockefeller happily.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Goldwater To Miss Washington Rally

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — As of now, you can put down Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona as a man who would rather be grand marshal of a rodeo in Prescott, Ariz., on July 4 than to be present as guest of honor at the "Draft Goldwater for President Independence Day Rally" in Washington's National Guard Armory.

Cynics may ask, "Who wouldn't?" The senator's advisers may argue, "This just shows how politically smart he really is."

Such comments are beside the point. Goldwater can plead "previous engagement" to go campaigning in his home state.

But in staying away from the Washington rally the senator is sticking to his announced determination not to become a GOP presidential candidate. Not just yet, at any rate.

A Goldwater rally without Goldwater may be like cold mashed potatoes without meat or hot gravy for his hungry fans. But Republican Sen. John G. Tower of Texas, Reps. John Ashbrook of Ohio and Paul Fannin of Arizona have been booked to make up for that as orators for the Draft Goldwater rally at 8 p.m. on the Fourth. A band concert at 7 and an all-star supporting cast of professional actors headed by Elmer Zimbalist Jr., will whoop things up before and between speeches.

They can be counted on to ring the rafters and give Old Glory such a waving as it hasn't had since William Jennings Bryan held forth on the Chautauqua circuit years ago.

The rally will compete with the usual fireworks display on Washington Monument grounds — barring a rainstorm, in which case the crowds may seek shelter in the Armory.

Most Washington residents who can get out of town over the Fourth do so. But the National Draft Goldwater Committee under Texas GOP State Chairman Peter

O'Donnell Jr., in charge of arrangements, is taking care of that. Trainloads and plane loads of Goldwater enthusiasts, he says, are preparing to descend on Washington and fill the Armory to overflowing.

Meanwhile, the object of all this affection will be nearly 2,000 miles away. He will be photographed, probably on a horse and waving a big hat. This makes a more exciting picture than with his mouth open delivering a speech, which is an everyday occurrence.

In Prescott he will be campaigning for re-election as senator from Arizona, which is the only political office he is now openly seeking. A year from now things may be different, July 4, 1964, will be just nine days before the Republican National Convention is scheduled to open in San Francisco.

If Goldwater isn't an avowed candidate for the GOP presidential nomination by then, he should be.

Political observers in Washington and elsewhere are beginning to believe that a race next year between President Kennedy and Senator Goldwater would be one of the healthiest things that could happen in America.

It would settle for some time to come, maybe, the issue of conservatism versus liberalism. It would let the American people decide whether they want the United States run by the policies Kennedy stands for, or the opposite policies that Goldwater stands for.

It has become increasingly apparent in recent weeks that Goldwater is the only Republican presidential possibility who can rally support from the thousand or more right-wing splinter groups.

They don't go for New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and they might not go for Michigan Gov. George Romney. None of the other favorite son Republicans mentioned for the presidential nomination has enough support at this writing to be worth bothering about.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



Science Projects Lacking In Merit

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Communists and Black Muslims are both working to "save Mae Mallory."

Mrs. Mallory is a militant black nationalist sought by North Carolina authorities on charges of kidnapping. She was arrested by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Cleveland, Ohio, on Oct. 12, 1961. Charged with "unlawful flight to avoid prosecution for kidnapping," she was ordered extradited by Gov. Mike Disalle.

Attorneys for Mrs. Mallory, who had earlier been convicted of fraud in New York State, went to the courts to abrogate the extradition order. Their request was denied by the Ohio Supreme Court. An appeal will soon be ruled upon by the U.S. Court of Appeals.

To mobilize support for Mrs. Mallory—and to raise \$15,000 for her bond—friends formed the Monroe Defense Committee. An official government report says the group has accepted aid from various organizations, "some of which are subversive in character."

Communist spokesmen around the globe have rushed to Mrs. Mallory's defense. Spearheading the campaign to save Mae Mallory is Robert Franklin Williams, who is also sought by North Carolina authorities on charges of kidnapping.

Williams now operates out of Cuba, where he fled to avoid arrest. His broadcasts over Radio Havana have carried "the truth about Mae Mallory" to all corners of the hemisphere.

He tells listeners that Mrs. Mae Mallory can expect a fair trial in the "fascist United States"—not unless she has "half a million tanks. I mean military tanks. And three or four hydrogen bombs." He boasts that he has contacted propagandists in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, asking them "to make appeals for Mrs. Mallory."

In this country, rallies for Mrs. Mallory have been held from coast to coast. The articulate Malcolm X, second in command in Elijah Muhammad's Black Muslim movement, has addressed Harlem rallies to demand "justice for Mae Mallory."

The same plea has been voiced by Benjamin Davis, one of the country's leading Negro Communists. He was convicted under the Smith Act and served a prison term for conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government.

Extraordinary pressure has been put on Ohio Gov. James Rhodes, who defeated Disalle last fall. Rhodes has received letters

and petitions from as far away as Los Angeles demanding that he free Mrs. Mallory.

The Monroe Defense Committee has been blunt: "Many voted Governor Rhodes into office with the expectation that he would grant Mrs. Mallory the protection of the state."

The fact of the matter is that Mrs. Mallory was not an issue in Rhodes' campaign. He has indicated that her extradition is a matter for the courts to rule upon.

U.S. taxpayers have shelled out \$85,400 for a study entitled "Behavior and Ecology of the Wandering Albatross." They have paid through the nose (\$20,000) to learn all there is to know about "Social Behavior in Ants."

These tidbits were uncovered by Ohio Congressman "Pete" Able, who made a personal investigation of the National Science Foundation. Other tax-paid research projects bear these earth-shattering titles:

Social Behavior in Termites, \$16,900; Communication Signals in Birds, \$17,500; Modification of Alcohol Preference in Rats, \$16,800; Mammal Fauna of the Highlands of Ethiopia, \$36,800; Revision of the Classification of Earthworms, \$13,700.

Says Representative Able: "In view of the fact that the financial resources of the national government are not unlimited, Congress must make a greater effort to differentiate meritorious research projects from those of doubtful value."

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Monday, July 1, the 182nd day of 1963 with 183 to follow.

The moon is approaching its full phase.

The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1898, Lt. Col. Theodore Roosevelt and his "Rough Riders" captured San Juan Hill in Cuba in the Spanish-American War.

In 1932, the Democratic convention, meeting in Chicago, nominated Gov. Franklin Delano Roosevelt for president.

A thought for the day—English philosopher, John Locke, said: "The only defense against the world is a thorough knowledge of it."

HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Two Teams Of Conscience



By HOLMES ALEXANDER

WASHINGTON, D.C. — Navy Capt. William Robert Anderson (Ret.), 42, commander of the Nautilus when it sailed under the polar ice, is a compact, dark-haired, earnest man with a mission. He left the Navy in 1962, he tells me, because he felt that the country he'd served so well in war and peace had reached a state of readiness which could probably deter its militant enemies. He felt also that the battle henceforth would be joined in non-combat activities.

He expressed these sentiments to Robert Kennedy shortly after the 1960 election and, having some tenure with the Youth Programs of Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge, Anderson found himself tapped to head the President's study group on the National Service Corps. He is its presumptive director at \$20,000 a year.

The National Service Corps, if Congress votes it into being, would become the domestic version of the Peace Corps. It would send an advance guard of 1,000 corpsmen, costing us \$5 million the first year, to work among an estimated 30 million distressed Americans who are rural and urban slum dwellers, mentally ill or retarded, habitually delinquent or destitute.

Much of the work would be done on Indian reservations, in the southern highlands, in Negro communities, and among migratory workers. The purpose would be to catalyze our social awareness

of the hidden misery beneath the surface of American affluence. The methods would be those of the overseas Peace Corps, whose volunteers live and work, with proven success, among backward people—a combination of social uplift, medical care and vocational training.

As might be expected, the enabling legislation (S. 1321) is caught in a political badminton match on Capitol Hill, being batted unmercifully between two teams of conscience. To call each team by its chosen name, you could say that this is a contest of social conscience vs. conscience of the conservative — the latter is Senator Goldwater's happy phrase.

Those of the social conscience creed, the perennial do-gooders with public monies, hardly need an introduction in our times. But the apostles of the conservative conscience, so constantly denigrated and misrepresented, can always use a few kind words of identification.

Their conscience is a naysayer (like the Ten Commandments and Bill of Rights) to all that is morally wrong. They rightly conceive it to be wrong when government is not frugal, not minimal and not decentralized. They find all these faults, and more, in the proposed corps. Yet, for reasons that take some explaining, the conservatives—led by Goldwater—are not beyond relenting on the corps, if the legislation can be purged of its worst features.

The chief reason for reasonable-ness here is that the conservative conscience has one element which is entirely left out of the opposite faction — the element of tolerance. No liberal can give an inch, but the conservative is only a bigot when he is being a caricature of himself. His conscience is automatic without being absolute. There is a trip-switch in his mind which will, when the occasion is right, make an exception, much as a head of state sometimes, for the right reason, commutes the death sentence of a criminal.

To give the conservatives a chance to support the corps, the administration should be willing to sanitize it, somewhat as follows: cut the salaries of the director and his staff into halves, provide that corpsmen can operate in a state only by invitation of the legislature, freeze the enrollment at 2,000 members for 10 years and, possibly, place these volunteers in a special branch of military service rather than spawn another civilian glamour shoppe. There is good precedent (the Army Corps of Engineers), for using peacetime soldiers on public projects.

No disagreement exists in any quarter as to the existence of distressful conditions and distressed persons in the best of countries. A National Service Corps, designed under the advisement of both kinds of conscience mentioned here, would be, in all truth—a godsend.