

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Mark Of The Communist

What is a Communist?

We ought to ask again, because this label is being pinned on some people in this country more than at any time since the McCarthy era of the 1950s.

Controversy over civil rights, economics, politics, welfare programs, almost anything, can easily end up with somebody shouting at somebody else:

"What are you, a Communist or something?"

To answer the question: What is a Communist?

You can begin, of course, by citing avowed members of the Communist party.

You may presume there are a considerable number of secret members, not to mention actual professional spies working for the Soviet Union. By the very nature of their purposes, they are not likely to wear red light bulbs over their heads.

You can add identifiable persons who, while avoiding party membership, nevertheless unmistakably serve the party's goals — as dictated by Moscow.

Beyond these levels, identification becomes tricky and presumption dangerous.

For example, the Reds often try to adopt as their own a flock of foreign and domestic proposals which may accord roughly with programs advanced by legitimate political parties in the free democracies.

As practiced under Moscow's guidance, this device is a conscious fraud. Its aim is to

gain for communism an identity with certain causes the Kremlin believes to be either popular or provocative in the free countries.

People in freelands who let the Reds get away with this nonsense are just playing Moscow's game.

It could lead us to such absurdities as having to oppose highway safety and better libraries because the Communists may say they favor them.

You don't prove a man is a Communist because he says he favors six or eight or ten American-born programs the Communist Party also pretends it wants for the country.

Programs in the Communist world are mere stratagems.

It is more fundamental to remember that a Communist is a person of totalitarian mentality. Whatever his programs of the moment, he is a man who:

- Brooks no opposition from any quarter, whether school, church, business community, other political party or what not.
- Wants not simply to defeat his rivals but to crush and eliminate them. Rule or ruin is the game.
- In support of these purposes, seeks to control both the thought and the action so that only his ideas, policies and programs exist.
- Would bend every power element in society—every agency of the government and the economy to this overriding goal.

Let this distinctively marked shoe fit where it will.



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Marches Have Little Effect

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congress became very infuriated when a group of menacing citizens marched upon it, presented a list of grievances and demanded almost instant redress.

Instead of knuckling under to the threats, the lawmakers passed a blistering resolution against the rights-marchers — and went out of session. A leading author, lawyer and statesman — a thorough-going egghead—later wrote of the principle which the episode involved. The principle, as he saw it, was that the wronged marchers did not have as much right in the matter as Congress did. Arguing his point in the columns of a New York newspaper, this highbrow liberal declared:

"The indispensable necessity of complete authority at the seat of government carries its own evidence with it. . . . Without it, not only the public authority

might be insulted and its proceedings interrupted with impunity, but (the disorders) might bring on the national councils an imputation of awe or influence, equally dishonorable to the Government and dissatisfactory to the other members of the (Union)."

All this may read like a preliminary reference to next month's projected march on Washington by 100,000 or more Negroes in demand of their civil rights. Actually, the episode occurred in June, 1783, when a mob of unpaid soldiers burst upon the Continental Congress, then sitting in Philadelphia, and demanded an answer to their petition "in 20 minutes." Congress asked protection of the Pennsylvania authorities, didn't get it, and recessed in order to reassemble in another state.

Writing his Federalist Paper, No. 43, five years afterwards,

James Madison plugged for a federal city where the central government would be entirely independent of any state and thereby free to protect its dignity and safety.

The 88th Congress, especially the Senate with its Southern filibusters, is very nervous about what may happen at the end of August. There have always been demonstrators here. Many old-timers still remember the Bonus Marchers of the '20's, the Reds that surged around the late Congressman Marcanonio in the '40's, the Minute Women of America who overran the marble corridors in the days of the Bricker Amendment and the various pacifist groups in recent times.

But none of these had the magnitude and the potential disruptiveness of the threatened August onslaught. Behind the pious pleading by Martin Luther King for "non-violent" action (which can be pretty disruptive) is the insolent warning by James Baldwin and others of "the fire next time." The President has been rebuffed in his suggestion that the Negroes hold off on demonstrations while Congress is considering Civil Rights legislation. Ironically, it may fall upon Attorney General Kennedy, spearhead of the Civil Rights drive, to control the marchers or punish any offenders. It will surely fall upon Vice President Johnson and Speaker McCormack, presiding officers of Senate and House, to keep order there.



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

The phrase "neglected child" conjures up a picture of slums and broken families, of poverty and drunkenness and cruelty, in the familiar pattern of the social worker's case-history.

I think another kind of neglect is even more widespread, and just as deleterious in its effects. I am thinking of the ordinarily intelligent middle-class child who is rarely, if ever, treated like a person by his parents, but only as a child.

A few weeks ago I was chatting with an 8-year-old girl of the most appalling ignorance. She didn't know her birthdate, what her father did for a living, how old her teenage brother was (she guessed "37"), or the most commonplace facts that any 8-year-old should be aware of.

This was not a stupid child, but a profoundly neglected one, in the social and psychological senses. It was quite evident from our conversation (and I hasten to add that she was not shy, simply negligent) that her home life is utterly devoid of dialog in any real way. This child was intellectually underprivileged, and may remain crippled by it for a lifetime.

As much as food and drink, love and companionship, a child needs some stimulation at home that can be got nowhere else in the early years. A child requires

information, enlightenment, serious discourse at its own age level. More than this, a child desperately needs puns and word-games, riddles and jokes, puzzles and poems.

These latter, contrary to popular thought, are not mere luxuries; they are the basic fabric out of which the adult personality is loomed. The parents of this 8-year-old girl will dutifully send her to college, even if they can't afford it, but will give her a "good education"—but by then it will be too late. Education, as Justice Holmes said, begins in the womb, before the child is even born.

Like so many millions of others, she has little curiosity, no interest in words or the ideas they convey, no sense of the richness and diversity and wonder of the universe. The parents, perhaps, suppose that somehow she will get all this at school—which is a monstrous fallacy almost wrecking our entire educational system.

Parents, of course, should not push or lead too fast, or expect too much too soon. But for every one set of parents who do this, a thousand do nothing: they are content if the child has surface good manners, is "obedient," and keeps out of the way. They would be angry and horrified to be told that their home contains a well-fed, scrubbed "neglected child."

That won't be easy, as your reporter can testify from a personal experience. Nor, as I can further testify, is disorder likely to produce remedial legislation. I was a member of the Maryland House of Delegates in the 1930s, when our chamber was invaded by Hanger Marchers. I described it as follows in Harper's Magazine, September, 1933:

"The leaders . . . advanced boldly to the rostrum and, without preface, one of them began reading a petition. The Speaker flailed on the desk with his mallet . . . now there rose a buzz of indignation which culminated in a lusty 'Throw 'em out.' I vaulted over my desk and found myself engulfed in a free-for-all. . . . State troopers and a posse of deputies charged into the corridor wielding blackjacks and firearms. . . . Heads were broken, blood was shed. . . ."

"That afternoon the House clerk read their petition. It demanded in part: State unemployment insurance, a donation of the militia funds to the poor and needy, a repeal of the Jim Crow Laws. . . . Refer to the Ways and Means Committee," chanted the Speaker. And that was the last we ever heard of it."



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Oppenheimer Case Blurry

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

When the present Atomic Energy Commission awarded the Fermi medal and \$50,000 in tax-free cash to Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, a little gasp could be heard among those who take the security of these United States seriously. Far more shocking to U.S. security agencies were the leaks from high Administration sources that Dr. Oppenheimer's "Q" clearance—opening the nation's most guarded secrets to him—would be restored. (It was taken from him after one of the most exhaustive, and sympathetic, hearings known to Washington.)

An immediate outcry was expected in both House and Senate. But there was only an ominous silence. Congressional leaders with whom I spoke gave no

very convincing explanation for their failure to protest the Fermi award and the possibility of bringing Dr. Oppenheimer back into the government in a sensitive position. The most they would say was that he had no stomach for again turning the spotlight on his past and would therefore not return to the Washington wars.

Having spent hours and days looking into Dr. Oppenheimer's record—and having written about it extensively in "The Greatest Plot in History"—I could not share these views. I knew that Dr. Oppenheimer had a passionate champion in Presidential aide Arthur Schlesinger Jr. Since Dr. Oppenheimer sought to brazen out several investigations, I could see no reason why he would suddenly turn shy. Obviously, great pressure was being exerted by the White House to prevent Congressional criticism of the award.

Finally, however, a Congressman has taken the bit in his teeth. In a Fourth of July release to the press, Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.) warns of efforts to give Dr. Oppenheimer an appointment that does not require Senate confirmation. And he points out that it might be just a little embarrassing for the President to honor Dr. Oppenheimer, as other Fermi award winners have been, by a ceremony at the White House.

Does this mean, he asks, that some kind of clearance is in the works? If so, he says, "It would constitute a most grievous miscalculation to assume any attempt to place him back in a position of governmental responsibility would be tolerated by even a small minority of American people."

Mr. Hosmer may be an optimist. For how many people remember today what the Gray Board, a panel of distinguished citizens, said of Dr. Oppenheimer? Or more important, what the Atomic Energy Commission, which reviewed the Gray Board findings, added on its own. Let me quote the AEC:

"The record shows that Dr. Oppenheimer has consistently

placed himself outside the rules which govern others. He has falsified in matters wherein he was charged with grave responsibilities in the national interest. . . . The work of the Military Intelligence, the FBI, and the AEC—all, at one time or another, have felt the effect of his falsehoods, evasions, and misrepresentations. Dr. Oppenheimer's willful disregard for the obligations of security is evidenced by his obstruction of inquiries of security officials."

But far more pertinent, since Dr. Oppenheimer's supporters have always questioned the integrity of those who condemn their hero, are his own words. Under oath before the Gray Board, he admitted that when questioned by security officers attempting to uncover a Communist spy ring at Los Alamos and other wartime atomic installations, he told them—and I quote—"a cock and bull story."

Dr. Oppenheimer has placed his defenders in a terrible position. A comparison of his recorded words to security people in 1943 and his sworn Gray Board testimony in 1954 shows that he either violated the law in the first instance by obstructing an espionage investigation, or committed perjury in the second. A further study of his own words shows that he favored full speed ahead in work on the hydrogen bomb when it was designed for use against the Japanese, but then found "moral" grounds for propagandizing against it when its potential target might be the Soviet Union.

The foregoing is not my evaluation. I have examined and published the text of his positions in 1944 and 1949 in my book. They allow of no other summary.

It may be that Dr. Oppenheimer deserves the medal and the \$50,000 for his work at Los Alamos. But certainly, as Representative Hosmer urges, the President should make it clear that the award does "not condone the recipient's actions which lost him his security clearance," and that no relaxation of security standards is contemplated by the AEC and/or the White House.

BERRY'S WORLD



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Federal Government Interference Greater

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — The best slogan which the Republicans have come up with yet to sweep them back into the White House in 1964 is: Make America Safe for Mrs. Murphy.

Such a theme might even split the Irish vote—in America, that is—away from the Kennedys.

This Mrs. Murphy, of course, is an imaginary character in no way related to the Mrs. Margaretta (Happy) Murphy who in real life married Gov. Nelson Rockefeller after both divorced their former mates.

There would be a double-take on the slogan if Rocky got the GOP nomination.

It was Sen. George Aiken of Vermont—as good a rock-ribbed Republican as ever was—who dreamed up the modern mythical Mrs. Murphy as a symbol. He introduced her during debate on minimum wage law regulations. Small shopkeepers — "like Mrs. Murphy"—who ran what used to be known as "Mom and Pop" stores should be exempted from all these government laws affecting wages and hours, said Senator Aiken.

Mrs. Murphy got back into the limelight as hearings began on the civil rights proposal to ban discrimination in all business places catering to the public. This time she was introduced by the GOP National Committee chairman, Rep. William E. Miller of New York, as a widow woman who owned her own home in a resort area and rented her spare rooms to tourists.

Would she be required to offer her rooms on an integrated basis?

Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy, lead-off witness for the administration's civil rights program, thought that one over carefully and then said she would not be covered.

House Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler, D-N.Y., presiding over the hearing added that Mrs. Murphy was

insignificant and not worth bothering about.

Representative Miller was still unconvinced, with justification. Just how much freedom and independence individuals will have to do what they please in the future as America becomes more and more crowded with people is a growing problem.

Government is stepping in to regulate more and more phases of what used to be considered private life and private business. Big Brother is watching you, Little Brother too, and the government'll get you if you don't watch out.

Business complains about this and all the keeping of records it entails. Then business comes to Washington and in the name of supporting a "Fair Trade Law" backs a bill that would require Mrs. Murphy to sell brand name goods at factory fixed prices, in complete contradiction of a free market.

The new regulations which Internal Revenue Service has just issued on reporting business travel and entertainment expenses as income tax deductions offer another example. They affect the Mr. Murphys more than the Mrs. Murphys. They hit not only big shot executive types but also a lot of smaller fry who are salesmen and operators of their own businesses.

Internal Revenue Service has now tried to interpret a tough law intended to crack down on expense-account chiselers so as to give the Murphys with legitimate expenses a fair break.

But in reporting these expenses, the Murphys practically have to keep a diary of everything they do and how much it cost, as evidence of their deductions. If Mrs. Murphy goes along with Mr. Murphy on a business trip and her expenses for travel and entertainment can be legitimately charged off, records of that must be kept, too.

The good old days when the Mrs. Murphys who ran Mom and Pop establishments just as they pleased are going, going, and almost gone forever.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Reassurance Needed By Captive Nations

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

With the opening of Captive Nations Week but a few days away the President would do well to heed those magnificent words of his 1960 campaign:

"We must never—at any Summit, in any Treaty declaration, in our words or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe."

There have been occasions, too many occasions, when John Fitzgerald Kennedy has acted as if those words were nothing more than campaign oratory.

There was July 13, 1962, for instance, when the President issued a press release marking Captive Nations Week, a proclamation that was noteworthy for its refusal to condemn Soviet rule over Eastern Europe.

There are some advisers who have urged the Chief Executive to forget Captive Nations Week in 1963 or to issue a proclamation so weak and innocuous that it will not "offend" Nikita Khrushchev.

This type of logic is expressed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who had adamantly refused to give his blessings to a resolution introduced by Rep. Dan Flood, Pennsylvania Democrat, that would create a House Committee on Captive Nations.

Creation of such a group, Rusk argues, could only antagonize the partly Mr. K. He says: "It would likely be a source of contention and might be taken as a pretext for action by the Soviet Union which would interfere with the resolution of the present crisis concerning Berlin."

It was Rusk, too, who helped "modify" U.S. policy toward Hungary. He instructed our UN Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, to cease all opposition to seating the fraudulent delegation that claims to represent the Hungarian people.

He had Stevenson approve the replacement of Sir Leslie Munro, an eloquent anti-Communist, by Secretary-General U Thant as Special UN Representative on Hungary.

Thant promptly let it be known that the Hungarian issue was as dead as far as he was concerned. He then canceled the special broadcasts to Hungary that were often the only non-Communist words the Hungarians ever heard.

He paid a personal visit in Budapest to Janos Kadar, the Khrushchev lackey who mopped up after Soviet tanks had crushed the Hungarian Revolution in 1956. Sen. Peter Dominick of Colorado, one of the most impressive

young Republicans in Congress, has proposed that the United States take the initiative against International Communism. He says of Eastern Europe:

"The minds, hearts, cultures and beliefs of the people in the Captive Nations are still dreaming of their human rights to freedom—of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Many are still risking their very lives to escape from the horror chambers imposed upon their minds and spirits. We should stimulate their feeling of independence — their drive for restoration of government based on self-determination."

Dominick asks the President to cut off all foreign aid to the puppet regimes of Eastern Europe and to prohibit the export of strategic materials to those who vow to bury us.

He suggests creation of a Freedom Academy that would instruct our diplomatic representatives in the realities of Cold Warfare. He demands a massive propaganda campaign that would throw the Soviets on the defensive.

Dominick wants Ambassador Stevenson to demand a sweeping investigation into Soviet colonialism, and to throw the spotlight of righteous indignation on Eastern Europe. He asks:

"Are we to accept the position that the people in the Captive Nations are doomed to living deaths under Communism?"

An answer is anxiously awaited from the President.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Tuesday, July 9, the 198th day of 1963 with 175 to follow.

The moon is approaching the last quarter.

The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening is Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1776, George Washington had the Declaration of Independence read to his troops.

In 1850, President Zachary Taylor died of typhoid in the White House after serving only one year and four months of his term.

In 1943, the United States, Canada and England invaded Sicily.

A thought for the day—Oliver Wendell Holmes, the American jurist, said: "Sin has many tools, but a lie is the handle which fits them all."