

Herald and News

Editorial Page

We Should Be Told

President Kennedy seemingly won a diplomatic victory in the Cold War when he quarantined Cuba last October and forced the Russians to remove their offensive missiles.

Red China's Mao Tse-tung, Nikita Khrushchev's bitter foe in the Communist world, denounced Moscow's Cuban retreat as a "Soviet Munich." There is little doubt that in a world where "face" is important the Soviet premier suffered a loss in prestige.

Yet in six months, while United States diplomacy was paralyzed by partisan quarrels, Khrushchev was able to snatch victory out of defeat. He even had the effrontery to announce that he had accepted Castro's invitation to visit Moscow's Cuban satellite 90 miles from Florida.

As seen by specialists on communism, Khrushchev was able to turn defeat into victory because the Russians never conceded that it was the U.S. quarantine that forced them to remove their missiles from Cuba.

Moscow's Pravda and Izvestia write to this day that the Soviet premier's "sacrifice to peace" was due solely to President Kennedy's alleged pledge not to invade Cuba and to prevent anti-Communist Cubans from overthrowing Castro's dictatorship.

This has also been repeated with deadly monotony by Moscow's global propaganda organ Novoye Vremia (New Time) ever since the United States failed to press Khrushchev for the agreed, on-site inspection of missile bases. Such inspection was the main condition for lifting the quarantine, President Kennedy said last fall.

The State Department was obviously reluctant to engage in a public debate with the Red press. Thus, the United States never denied officially that a pledge to bar force against the Castro regime was the price paid Khrushchev for removing his missiles from Cuba.

However, it was the Soviet premier himself — and not anonymous Red journalists

— who recently warned that Russia will aid Cuba if the United States failed "to carry out" the agreement Khrushchev says he reached with President Kennedy in October.

The Soviet Premier spoke at Moscow's mammoth rally for Fidel Castro. Here, as reported by Pravda, is what he said:

"A breach of obligations by the United States could not be regarded otherwise than as perfidy."

"If the United States does not strictly observe the agreement reached and aggravates the situation, the world might find itself in an even more dangerous situation than during last year's Caribbean crisis."

Truth, of course, is not a tenet of Marxist-Leninist double talk. Nor is Khrushchev known for his veracity. But he is the leader of one of the world's most powerful nations. His words about an agreement with President Kennedy, spoken in public, were clear. They can no longer be ignored or dismissed with vague denials by the United States.

Should Moscow's statements stand unchallenged, the belief that President Kennedy pledged to bar force against Castro under any conditions will bolster Red prestige in Latin America. It will play havoc with the Alliance for Progress. It will sow confusion in the United States.

No phase of the Kennedy administration's policy baffles the ordinary American more than the policy on Cuba, as this writer has found on trips around the United States.

Surely Americans are entitled to know if there are pledges of the kind Khrushchev is talking about. It is not enough to say that the foreign policy of a free nation is the business of the government. Policies pursued by democracies are credible and can be effective only if the whole people share the conviction that their aims are right.

Are the Reds indulging as usual in reckless propaganda? If so, no time should be lost by the State Department in contradicting officially and without ambiguity Khrushchev's claims.

John Boyle's Role

(Mail - Tribune, Medford)

The role played in the development of southern Oregon by John C. Boyle can hardly be exaggerated. The list of honors he has won in his profession is a long one. He was, in real truth, a pioneer in the electric utility business.

These things are known to his colleagues and co-workers.

But to the citizen who has never had a chance to get acquainted with this dignified,

kindly, white-haired and determined man, Boyle's accomplishments can be summarized by saying that he and his engineers are responsible for the burgeoning industry in southern Oregon, and for the fact that when the switch is flicked, the light goes on.

We wish Mr. Boyle many long and productive years in his new role as consultant and elder statesman in his field.



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Restore Domestic Peace

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, a respected classmate and clubmate of mine at Princeton, lives in New Canaan (Conn.), and Philadelphia, but he came to suburban Baltimore over the long July 4 weekend where he was perhaps the most prominent leader of the integrationist commando raid against Gwynn Oak amusement park in suburban Baltimore.

Although Gene played varsity football for Old Nassau, his greatest scrimmage must have been this one, which he helped to precipitate in the Free State. The holiday air was filled with rocks and tomatoes, insults and blood, as the jaded police jailed over 200 persons in protection of a law which permits a property owner to post his land for no trespass.

Dr. Blake, like the ante-bellum Abolitionists, is a zealous man of conscience and deserves respect for that reason. But out in Chicago over the same weekend the Communist Ben Davis, formerly a New York City councilman, was among several Reds whose presence during the NAACP convention was noted by the FBI. While the motives of Dr. Blake, the NAACP and the Communist Party are divergent, their actions in the civic disturbances throughout the nation in this turbulent summer pose a common problem. How much longer can the local police forces contain such demonstrations within the limits

of mere roughhouse and token arrest?

The President himself, in addressing the mayors at Hawaii, expressed apprehension at what explosion might come from the mixture of hot weather, hot tempers and hot blood. With the Negro insurrectionists quarreling among themselves, we are near the historical point, described by Thomas Carlyle, when a revolution begins to devour its children. After that, if the revolutionary formula runs in this country as it has elsewhere — the Reign of Terror.

Newspaper readers and editors must be excusably irked these days at the unremitting downpour of racial stories which drench their sheets. I have felt apologetic about adding anything to a disagreeable subject, but it is with us and upon us, a far more immediate menace than nuclear fallout, the National Debt or the unemployment rate. The taken-for-granted job of keeping law and order is an elemental business of all government. Overwhelm the local police, swamp the jails with inmates, fail in the protection of life and property, and civilization totters.

These commando raids, hitting cities in North and South, are no longer to be judged as having a good purpose or a bad one. By their results, present and pending, they are so clearly against the national interest that the President and the Congress have no more conspicuous duty than

to act—and act now. Whatever the outcome of the Civil Rights legislation, currently before committees in both houses of Congress, there is a prior need to restore domestic peace.

Mr. Kennedy, with his great personal popularity and his prestige of office, could do much with the kind of speech he is capable of making. As to Congress, I have found only one bill which seems to address itself to the crisis. This is a measure (H.R. 7329) by Congressman Tuck, a former governor of Virginia. It is lucidly entitled: "To amend the criminal laws of the U.S. to prohibit any persons from crossing state lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any state."

The Tuck bill would apply equally to clergymen and Communists, Freedom Marchers and avowed lawbreakers at state borders, head off demonstrations that are beyond the control of local police, put the federal government (whose position in all this is much too equivocal) on record and on the alert against itinerant inciters of riot, whether they are well-intentioned or not.

Congress is now fully committed to examining the sweeping equalization reforms placed before it by the Administration and demanded by the Negro insurgents and their white sympathizers. There was never a better time, or a better reason, for the American people to insist that their leaders call an end to this hubbub.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Cuba Buildup Continues

By RALPH DE TOLEDANO

According to the best and most reliable intelligence information available on Cuba, the Soviets have begun to move in replacement for the missiles they took out last November. Eyewitness reports state that great objects, encased in zinc and carrying a red stripe along the center, are being brought in as they were in the summer of 1962. Soviet crews handling these objects work with extreme caution as they load them into truck-trailers. The objects, obviously missiles, are then shipped to five Soviet bases where the launching sites were previously set up.

So far, neither the State Department, nor the Pentagon, nor the White House cares to discuss these "objects." As in the past, they are discounted because the information comes from Cuban exile groups. This was the attitude in 1962. Though the Stennis Committee sharply criticized the Administration for ignoring reports of this kind—and for downgrading or ridiculing exile intelligence—the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency continue to brush aside what is being waved under their collective noses.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Not long ago, I was talking with a teacher in Chicago, who has stubbornly remained in a school that lies deep within the slums. He was telling me about the attitude of most of the pupils.

"When people talk about slum living," he said, "they think about poverty and crowded housing and shabby clothes. But poverty as such is not the real problem in the slums — because rural poverty, for instance, doesn't breed the kind of reactions you find in city slums."

"Then what is the real problem?" I asked.

"It's fear," he replied. "Children grow up, from the earliest age, with fear and mistrust. The reason they feel it necessary to be 'tough' is their fear of attack; the only way they can defend themselves is by becoming like their potential attackers."

"They also grow up extremely mistrustful," he went on. "They see only the worst side of the police. They learn all about the fix and crooked politicians by the time they're 10. They acquire a deep cynicism about law and justice and the social ideals we profess in our textbooks. The qualities they learn to admire are force, shrewdness, and flashiness. How else could they survive in the jungle of the city slum?"

"Would more jobs, or better jobs, or higher income, help the problem very much?" I inquired.

"Not in themselves," he shook his head. "The slum is a subculture, and few are able to climb out of it by their own efforts. If they get extra income, they use it to solidify their posi-

tion in the slum, not to leave it. The alleged values of the larger community strike them as phony."

"In my opinion," he continued, "the real threat to our democratic institutions and processes comes from this increasing subculture, as our metropolitan complexes grow and rural communities decline. And if the so-called 'good people' keep on deserting the cities for the suburbs, then the apparatus of city government will be increasingly controlled by the standards and values and felt needs of this subculture."

At the present time, the Administration plans to hold off on any change in the Cuban status until Congress goes home. Then, should the move be unpopular, there will be no procession of Senators and Representatives to Secretary Rusk's office. In any case, it is believed that they can always be routed by the question: "Are you ready to accept a nuclear holocaust?" This kind of political thinking, however, may ignore the reaction of the American people.

A Soviet missile build-up, the incontrovertible evidence that no Soviet troops have been removed from the island (despite President Kennedy's assurances that they had been), and the new State Department "accommodation" effort are a chilling combination. What makes it even worse is the knowledge, based on sad experience, that if the Secretary of State announces resumption of diplomatic ties, there will be very little outcry from the two-to-one Democratic majorities in the Congress.

At the present time, the Administration plans to hold off on any change in the Cuban status until Congress goes home. Then, should the move be unpopular, there will be no procession of Senators and Representatives to Secretary Rusk's office. In any case, it is believed that they can always be routed by the question: "Are you ready to accept a nuclear holocaust?" This kind of political thinking, however, may ignore the reaction of the American people.

At the present time, the Administration plans to hold off on any change in the Cuban status until Congress goes home. Then, should the move be unpopular, there will be no procession of Senators and Representatives to Secretary Rusk's office. In any case, it is believed that they can always be routed by the question: "Are you ready to accept a nuclear holocaust?" This kind of political thinking, however, may ignore the reaction of the American people.

BERRY'S WORLD



"I've threatened 'compulsory arbitration,' and still it won't work!"



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

GOP Three Way Split Jeopardizes Chances

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — The standard Republican line now is that the Democratic party is so hopelessly split that it is completely ineffective.

This was the theme of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership manifesto.

Using President Kennedy's statement that Democrats in Congress would need Republican help to pass comprehensive civil rights legislation this year, Senate minority leader Everett M. Dirksen intoned the idea that this was a confession of Democratic administrative disunity.

This raises the question of just how united the Republican party may be a year before its national convention.

As a curtain raiser, speaking at the San Francisco convention of Young Republicans, GOP Sen. Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania urged that elements of the party "not beat each other to bits." It seems to have been a futile appeal.

Full reports on this convention, brought back to Washington by participants, indicate it was a pretty rough affair. There was wide-open feuding between progressive and conservative factions. And it was only by the narrowest of margins that the organization escaped a takeover by the far right-wingers.

What this fight indicates is that the GOP may be just as badly split as the Democrats. There is abundant evidence that the ultraconservatives make up a much larger percentage of the Republican party than in the Democratic party.

On civil rights legislation in particular, the Republican party—even if it were so completely victorious in 1964 as to sweep the White House and Congress—would have to depend far more on Democratic support to put through an effective rights program than the other way around.

The Fourth of July Goldwater-for-President rally in Washington was notable in that there were no Negro Republicans inside the Armory. The only Negroes around were in a delegation of Black Muslims demonstrating outside the hall—not in support of Goldwater, it might be added.

Actually, the Republican party today seems to be split three ways—not just two. There are GOP conservatives and progressives who correspond to the reactionaries and the liberals in the Democratic party. In addition, there is the new Republican National Citizens Committee.

This modern and moderate element of the GOP is centered around ex-President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his principles. But at the present time it has neither a candidate, a platform nor much of a following.

The 50 to 100 well-heeled Republicans who head up and, in fact, are the GOP Citizens Committee today, have as one of their principal objectives definite inroads on the Democratic strongholds in the North and West. The Republicans simply have to woo Democratic voters in the metropolitan areas to get a majority.

Perhaps the only way the Republicans can get a meaningful program for 1964 is to reverse the traditional American political procedure which is to adopt a platform, then nominate a candidate to stand on it and like it.

When the Republicans convene for their national convention in San Francisco next July they might try picking their candidate first, then let him dictate the platform.

If that candidate should be Sen. Barry Goldwater, the platform would read one way. If the candidate were Gov. Nelson Rockefeller or almost anyone else, it probably would be completely different.

That's how the Republican party stands as of today.

FCC Proposals Stir Racing Fan Protests

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

The controversial Newton Minow may be gone but his memory lingers on.

The storm-centered chairman of the Federal Communications Commission has deserted the "vast wasteland" of radio and television for a lucrative Chicago law practice.

But commission members continue in a dogged campaign to regulate the listening and viewing fare of John Q. Public. Latest FCC proposal is one that would prohibit radio and TV stations from broadcasting almost any news about thoroughbred racing.

The plan is based on the premise that any information about horse racing is of interest to "persons engaged in illegal off-track betting."

Radio and TV stations would consequently be forbidden to broadcast virtually all racing news: track conditions, post times, scratches and jockey assignments.

The FCC rules would prohibit, with rare exceptions, the sending out over the nation's airwaves of any horse race anywhere in the land. Stations could no longer give race results unless every race had been run and the track closed for at least one hour. This would be several hours after newspapers hit the streets with race results carried on their front pages.

The FCC proposals are ludicrous, according to those familiar with organized crime and high-time gambling operations. Far more money is wagered on baseball and football, even golf, than on horse racing. Will the commission soon rule that Americans can no longer watch on their 21-inch screens as Mickey Mantle romps the outfield, or the Green Bay Packers move toward another pro-football championship, or Arnold Palmer wins the U.S. Open?

The FCC regulations may well be unconstitutional. The National Association of Broadcasters has advised the commission:

"The fact that there may be illegal wagering on an otherwise legal activity does not give rise to a right to place a prior restraint . . . on the programs built around that activity. The natural result of such a policy would be similar restrictions on virtually every sporting event."

Maryland Gov. J. Millard Tawes, a lawyer, has sent word to the FCC that the proposed rules "exceed commission authority and raise serious constitutional issues."

The Fourth of July Goldwater-for-President rally in Washington was notable in that there were no Negro Republicans inside the Armory. The only Negroes around were in a delegation of Black Muslims demonstrating outside the hall—not in support of Goldwater, it might be added.

Actually, the Republican party today seems to be split three ways—not just two. There are GOP conservatives and progressives who correspond to the reactionaries and the liberals in the Democratic party. In addition, there is the new Republican National Citizens Committee.

This modern and moderate element of the GOP is centered around ex-President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his principles. But at the present time it has neither a candidate, a platform nor much of a following.

The 50 to 100 well-heeled Republicans who head up and, in fact, are the GOP Citizens Committee today, have as one of their principal objectives definite inroads on the Democratic strongholds in the North and West. The Republicans simply have to woo Democratic voters in the metropolitan areas to get a majority.

Perhaps the only way the Republicans can get a meaningful program for 1964 is to reverse the traditional American political procedure which is to adopt a platform, then nominate a candidate to stand on it and like it.

When the Republicans convene for their national convention in San Francisco next July they might try picking their candidate first, then let him dictate the platform.

If that candidate should be Sen. Barry Goldwater, the platform would read one way. If the candidate were Gov. Nelson Rockefeller or almost anyone else, it probably would be completely different.

That's how the Republican party stands as of today.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

FCC Proposals Stir Racing Fan Protests

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

The controversial Newton Minow may be gone but his memory lingers on.

The storm-centered chairman of the Federal Communications Commission has deserted the "vast wasteland" of radio and television for a lucrative Chicago law practice.

But commission members continue in a dogged campaign to regulate the listening and viewing fare of John Q. Public. Latest FCC proposal is one that would prohibit radio and TV stations from broadcasting almost any news about thoroughbred racing.

The plan is based on the premise that any information about horse racing is of interest to "persons engaged in illegal off-track betting."

Radio and TV stations would consequently be forbidden to broadcast virtually all racing news: track conditions, post times, scratches and jockey assignments.

The FCC rules would prohibit, with rare exceptions, the sending out over the nation's airwaves of any horse race anywhere in the land. Stations could no longer give race results unless every race had been run and the track closed for at least one hour. This would be several hours after newspapers hit the streets with race results carried on their front pages.

The FCC proposals are ludicrous, according to those familiar with organized crime and high-time gambling operations. Far more money is wagered on baseball and football, even golf, than on horse racing. Will the commission soon rule that Americans can no longer watch on their 21-inch screens as Mickey Mantle romps the outfield, or the Green Bay Packers move toward another pro-football championship, or Arnold Palmer wins the U.S. Open?

The FCC regulations may well be unconstitutional. The National Association of Broadcasters has advised the commission:

"The fact that there may be illegal wagering on an otherwise legal activity does not give rise to a right to place a prior restraint . . . on the programs built around that activity. The natural result of such a policy would be similar restrictions on virtually every sporting event."

Maryland Gov. J. Millard Tawes, a lawyer, has sent word to the FCC that the proposed rules "exceed commission authority and raise serious constitutional issues."

The Fourth of July Goldwater-for-President rally in Washington was notable in that there were no Negro Republicans inside the Armory. The only Negroes around were in a delegation of Black Muslims demonstrating outside the hall—not in support of Goldwater, it might be added.

Actually, the Republican party today seems to be split three ways—not just two. There are GOP conservatives and progressives who correspond to the reactionaries and the liberals in the Democratic party. In addition, there is the new Republican National Citizens Committee.

This modern and moderate element of the GOP is centered around ex-President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his principles. But at the present time it has neither a candidate, a platform nor much of a following.

The 50 to 100 well-heeled Republicans who head up and, in fact, are the GOP Citizens Committee today, have as one of their principal objectives definite inroads on the Democratic strongholds in the North and West. The Republicans simply have to woo Democratic voters in the metropolitan areas to get a majority.

Perhaps the only way the Republicans can get a meaningful program for 1964 is to reverse the traditional American political procedure which is to adopt a platform, then nominate a candidate to stand on it and like it.

When the Republicans convene for their national convention in San Francisco next July they might try picking their candidate first, then let him dictate the platform.

If that candidate should be Sen. Barry Goldwater, the platform would read one way. If the candidate were Gov. Nelson Rockefeller or almost anyone else, it probably would be completely different.

That's how the Republican party stands as of today.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

FCC Proposals Stir Racing Fan Protests

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

The controversial Newton Minow may be gone but his memory lingers on.

The storm-centered chairman of the Federal Communications Commission has deserted the "vast wasteland" of radio and television for a lucrative Chicago law practice.

But commission members continue in a dogged campaign to regulate the listening and viewing fare of John Q. Public. Latest FCC proposal is one that would prohibit radio and TV stations from broadcasting almost any news about thoroughbred racing.

The plan is based on the premise that any information about horse racing is of interest to "persons engaged in illegal off-track betting."

Radio and TV stations would consequently be forbidden to broadcast virtually all racing news: track conditions, post times, scratches and jockey assignments.

The FCC rules would prohibit, with rare exceptions, the sending out over the nation's airwaves of any horse race anywhere in the land. Stations could no longer give race results unless every race had been run and the track closed for at least one hour. This would be several hours after newspapers hit the streets with race results carried on their front pages.

The FCC proposals are ludicrous, according to those familiar with organized crime and high-time gambling operations. Far more money is wagered on baseball and football, even golf, than on horse racing. Will the commission soon rule that Americans can no longer watch on their 21-inch screens as Mickey Mantle romps the outfield, or the Green Bay Packers move toward another pro-football championship, or Arnold Palmer wins the U.S. Open?

The FCC regulations may well be unconstitutional. The National Association of Broadcasters has advised the commission:

"The fact that there may be illegal wagering on an otherwise legal activity does not give rise to a right to place a prior restraint . . . on the programs built around that activity. The natural result of such a policy would be similar restrictions on virtually every sporting event."

Maryland Gov. J. Millard Tawes, a lawyer, has sent word to the FCC that the proposed rules "exceed commission authority and raise serious constitutional issues."

The Fourth of July Goldwater-for-President rally in Washington was notable in that there were no Negro Republicans inside the Armory. The only Negroes around were in a delegation of Black Muslims demonstrating outside the hall—not in support of Goldwater, it might be added.

Actually, the Republican party today seems to be split three ways—not just two. There are GOP conservatives and progressives who correspond to the reactionaries and the liberals in the Democratic party. In addition, there is the new Republican National Citizens Committee.

This modern and moderate element of the GOP is centered around ex-President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his principles. But at the present time it has neither a candidate, a platform nor much of a following.

The 50 to 100 well-heeled Republicans who head up and, in fact, are the GOP Citizens Committee today, have as one of their principal objectives definite inroads on the Democratic strongholds in the North and West. The Republicans simply have to woo Democratic voters in the metropolitan areas to get a majority.

Perhaps the only way the Republicans can get a meaningful program for 1964 is to reverse the traditional American political procedure which is to adopt a platform, then nominate a candidate to stand on it and like it.

When the Republicans convene for their national convention in San Francisco next July they might try picking their candidate first, then let him dictate the platform.

If that candidate should be Sen. Barry Goldwater, the platform would read one way. If the candidate were Gov. Nelson Rockefeller or almost anyone else, it probably would be completely different.

That's how the Republican party stands as of today.