

Editorial Page

With A Chary Hand

The late Samuel Gompers is generally referred to as the father of the organized labor movement in this country, and he fought to the last ditch for what he thought the unions had coming. He once had something to say about the Welfare State, though he didn't use that comparatively new phrase. In his view, "Doing for people what they can and ought to do for themselves is a dangerous experiment. In the last analysis, the welfare of the workers depends upon their own initiative. Whatever is done under the guise of philanthropy or social morality which in any way lessens initiative (is) the greatest crime that can be committed against the toilers. Let social busybodies and professional 'public morals experts' in their fads reflect upon the perils

they rashly invite under this pretense of social welfare."

The complexities inevitably accompanying scientific, social and economic change have necessarily altered the attitudes that government and labor bring to bear on controversial problems. These problems are tough economically and politically, involving wages, working conditions, protections against adversity, the shifting employment situation, tax policy, and the like. But this is no excuse for the "let the government fix it" attitude that has sorely infected so many of us.

We must give power to government with a chary and reluctant hand, and only when the need is inescapable. Otherwise we'll create a Welfare State whose proper synonym is "dictatorship."

Federal Paternalism

Every administration for a number of years has "nudged the businessman a little harder" remarked a man who started small and has grown big. Today, said Dillard Munford, who holds a chain of do-it-yourself stores, the free enterprise system is being undermined and sapped of its strength by "federal paternalism." It is coming from a federal bureaucracy "grown too big."

It is strange, said he, how everyone seems to understand the dire consequences of business failure, but the term profit is regarded with suspicion and in spite of past economic successes the system is under attack. The businessman, and the business community, he says, must come to life and become defensive. The time has arrived for the business world to "speak up for the way of life from which it has prospered."

This vogue of looking upon the businessman as an enemy because he's in business to make a profit started just prior to World War II when it became the practice to bring into

government those fellows who become known as "braintrusts." Idealists, they were well educated fellows who meant well, but unfortunately, derived their education and theories from textbooks in schools made possible by the funds from the commercial world, the very thing they attacked.

Business is hamstrung with government regulations, high taxes and a steady stream of innuendoes that the executive who makes it possible for an employee to earn a salary and pay taxes to support the anti-business theorists, is some sort of an outcast.

Mr. Munford is speaking out against this sort of thing. "We can no longer afford to sit around and be against something. Steps must be taken to deter the spread of 'statism,'" he said.

It's time to let members of Congress know the businessman has had enough. Washington knows, in spite of the nasty things said about business, that it is the commercial world that makes the tax wheels go round and round.



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Congressional Reform

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

On the theory that trial by jury is the purest expression of a democracy in action, H. L. Mencken used to say that legislative bodies ought to be empaneled by the sheriff, paid no more than a subsistence fee and discharged as soon as they finished their work.

With the summer growing longer and the Capitol Hill paralysis more rigid, the idea of a jury-type Congress seems much more than the facetious inspiration of a spoofing philosopher. Nobody has actually proposed it thus far, because Congressmen aren't apt to vote themselves out of jobs. Nevertheless, a spirit of discontent with existing institutions is in the air.

Led by Joe Clark, who, in his way, is as iconoclastic as Mencken ever was, a posse of 30 senators last month descended upon their body's Rules Committee with demands for a radical reorganization of the American Congress. John Pastore, a rapid but generally cogent talker, entered another resolution with 31 co-sponsors to outlaw discursiveness in the Senate and to enthrone germaneness in debate. Frank Church, with four colleagues, asked for a resolution to allow committees to meet without unanimous consent while the Senate is in session. Claiborne Pell and three others want to make ex-presidents non-elective members of the Senate.

These proposed changes suggest surface aspects of the Mencken plan, though not its central virtue. For example, one victim of the Clark reorganization would be the committee structure, which is now based on seniority and to some extent on a Senator's popularity with his mates. Pastore's plan to muzzle talkative colleagues, Church's to save time by having committees and the main body meet simultaneously, Pell's to include ex-presidents — these all have elements of the jury system. A jury is too new to have seniority, and too busy to talk too much. It moves briskly. Its members are non-elective, an element which the presence of ex-presidents would introduce.

But enactment of these reforms would not blast the blockade of unfinished business that now confronts both Houses of Congress. As long as members have a proprietary interest in holding public office, with all the honor, excitement and financial security that it entails for most of them, they are not going to move at their problems with objectivity and dispatch.

A national budget in the magnitude of \$100 billion contains dozens of items in Defense and Space, Veterans privileges and State subsidies for agriculture, shipping, area redevelopment and public works, which cannot fail to interest the politician who wants to win reelection. The same is true of the great philosophic questions, such as Civil Rights. Senators and Representatives on committees now hearing the Civil Rights bills can almost be seen to be counting the white and Negro votes, and the business or labor support, which they stand to gain or lose.

Congress is deadlocked because the sheer size of the take-home benefits is paralyzing and dazzling. Not every member, of course, is self-motivated. There are unselfish heroes in the strife, and they get the most frequent hurrah of this column. But the majority of the 535 members of the 88th Congress think at least twice (and that's what takes the time) before they act on purely public motives.

But it strikes me almost every summer, not entirely because of reverence to Mencken's memory, that there is a lot of merit in his scheme for choosing Congressional members as if they were jurors. Men and women involuntarily taken from their homes, planted in Washington, paid no more than board-and-keep, discharged upon completion of their duties, would button up this work and get it out of here in a jiffy.

BERRY'S WORLD



Addition to the Gallery of "War Mongers"



IN WASHINGTON . . .

The Lie-Detector Hoax

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

In all the commotion about civil rights, very little is said about the use of the lie detector—an instrument which puts you at the mercy of an "interpretation" of physical changes in your body when under questioning. The lie detector is so clearly in violation of the Bill of Rights that little is said about it. Yet the Central Intelligence Agency employs it on a mass basis. So do other government bodies. And business is becoming increasingly dependent on it.

Yet it can be stated flatly that the lie detector (or more accurately, the polygraph) is, from the viewpoint of scientific crime detection, nearly useless. No instrument which can be wrong at least one-third of the time can be trusted by those who take law and order seriously. FBI director J. Edgar Hoover has warned against reliance on the polygraph and derided the idea that it is anywhere near infallible. Police chiefs admit that its main value is psychological. That is, it often frightens criminals into making confessions.

So strong has the evidence against the polygraph become that Science Digest entitles a carefully researched article in its August issue "The Great Lie-Detector Hoax." The significance of the article can be gauged by the fact that a deputy secretary of defense, two service secretaries,

and two other high Pentagon officials were requested to take a polygraph test recently over the question of some leaked information. Only the protests of the press put a stop to this.

In discussing the topic, Bruce H. Frisch notes that not only FBI chief Hoover but Pope Pius XII objected to the polygraph. In West Germany, use of the instrument is not allowed and "in Britain, police have little interest or confidence in the machine." In the United States, some good results have been obtained by the "few good examiners." But Science Digest quotes an expert as saying that of the 400 polygraph practitioners today "80 per cent are either incompetent or outright frauds."

The polygraph is based, as I said, on bodily changes which occur when feelings of guilt exist. But frequently, in the complex motivations of human beings, a question about the offense being investigated may trigger a reaction because of guilt feelings held by the subject concerning other matters of no serious import. There are people, in fact, who react badly on the polygraph to questions about theft because at the age of 12 they took 25 cents from their mother's purse and have had that "guilt" lodged in their sub-conscious ever since.

Guilt, moreover, is not the only emotion that brings about the body changes recorded by the

polygraph. Anger will make the same marks on the chart, and so will imperceptible physical movement or muscular discomfort. For a polygraph reading to approach any degree of accuracy, the examiner must not only know how to question a suspect but must have a substantial knowledge of his past history. This then ceases to be a cut-and-dried reading of a chart. It is an "interpretation," and as Mr. Hoover says, "whenever the human element enters into an interpretation of anything, there is always variance." The American Psychiatric Association warns that a polygraph chart alone is useless and must be part of a mass of other psychological and sociological "evidence."

Yet a man accused of a crime is frequently put under tremendous pressure to take a lie-detector test—and if he refuses, this is usually considered an admission of guilt. There are people who are nervous or tense and whose reactions, even to innocuous questions, can "show" guilt on the chart. Science Digest is justifiably concerned because many people are unaware that they cannot be compelled to submit to lie detector tests. It also stresses that "government and business use the lie detector for security checks, pre-employment screening, to investigate specific losses, and for mass periodic fishing expeditions, which they hope will put the fear of discovery into their dishonest employees." This is certainly violative of due process, particularly when it leads to the loss of jobs.

I know of a case in which a woman was sent to the death house—and now serves a life term—because of a polygraph test which properly interpreted would have shown that she was lying to cover up for her lover. He sailed through the test with flying colors—and remains free. What's the moral? Think twice before you urge your state legislature to make polygraph evidence admissible in court.

STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Because the word for "myself" is a single letter in English, it is capitalized as "I." And because it is tall and thin and stands alone, it presents a psychological trap to the author who writes about himself.

This is not the case in other languages—the French "je," the German "ich," the Italian "io," and almost all others do not capitalize and isolate the subjective ego. It is a pure accident in the English tongue.

Thus, writing about oneself in English tends to arouse some irritation if the page is spattered with the obvious "I." It is so self-assertive, it leaps out of the sentence, it almost strikes the reader physically with its unique presence.

Because of this peculiarity, some writers with an overpowering sense of modesty have used the impersonal pronoun, "one." But this is weak, and sounds almost prissy in our time. It is not a man speaking, not a personality, but an attitude: who can imagine saying "One loves you," or "One would willingly die for one's country?"

The abrasive quality of the first person singular in English was remarked by Charles Horton Cooley a generation ago, when he observed:

"The chief objection to the frequent use of 'I' is that it is always

a vivid note, somewhat perturbing because it awakens a self in the reader, harsh if it fails to be harmonious. There is something contentious about in the sense of self; it is born of opposition; and when a man writes 'I' emphatically, he puts a chip on our shoulder, he starts a quarrel with us, unless he makes us feel at the same time that we are on his side."

Goethe, for example, wrote freely in the first person, yet even though he had a well-developed ego, his work does not sound self-centered in the German; if translated into English, his personal works (not, of course, poems like "Faust") would disconcert us with "I" sticking up in every paragraph to remind us of his singularity.

The English mistrust of egotism, even when it is genial and harmless, is regarded as amusing and rather pompous by people of other nationalities. The well-bred Englishman does not (or did not) speak about himself; yet only in his language is the "I" given such orthographic prominence.

In German, the writer capitalizes "you" ("Sie"), and in Spanish he does the same ("Usted"), while the pronoun referring to himself is in the discreet lowercase. English is a strong and supple language—but hardly a courteous or modest one.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Tuesday, July 23, the 204th day of 1963 with 161 to follow.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The morning stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history: In 1886, New York saloon keeper Steve Brodie claimed he had jumped off the Brooklyn Bridge into the East River.

In 1945, Henry Philippe Petrain, former French Chief of State, went on trial for treason in Paris.

In 1947, President Harry S. Truman made an unexpected visit to the Senate and sat in the seat he had occupied as a senator.

In 1961, a U.S. plane with 38 persons aboard was hijacked to Cuba.

A thought for the day—President Franklin D. Roosevelt said: "The truth is found when men are free to pursue it."



By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Influence of the U.S. Constitution and the power of the U.S. Declaration of Independence in the new nations of the world are little appreciated.

Eloquent testimony on this point has just been given by Tanganyika's President Julius K. Nyerere.

"We have taken our stand on what is one of the most inspiring documents of all time—the preamble to the American Constitution," he declared on his arrival here for a visit to the U.S. "It says, 'All men are created equal and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights . . .'"

Actually, this is a paraphrase from the Declaration of Independence, but the man made his point.

The president's short talk was principally a defense of the new Organization of African Unity declaration against racial policies of South Africa. So it was natural that the first question asked him was what United States policy should be toward that country.

He ducked, claiming an answer would be interference in American foreign affairs. But in reference to his remarks on the U.S. Constitution he proposed that, "The United States should support freedom movements wherever they are found."

He is a surprising little man. Forty years old, he is descended from tribal chiefs. But he was educated in a Catholic college in Uganda, did graduate work in economics and political science at University of Edinburgh. He gave up teaching for politics only a few years ago and received an honorary LL.D. from Duquesne University in Pittsburgh when he was here as Tanganyika's foreign minister two years ago.

He speaks precise English with a clipped British accent acquired when Tanganyika was a crown colony. He has a ready smile and a little Charlie Chaplin mus-

Africa Federation Hoped By Nyerere

tache that is deceptive. He has a quick wit and is representative of the new breed of African leaders at their best.

In a question-and-answer session after his talk at the National Press Club, Nyerere was asked, "If the United States States solves its own racial problems, will its position be more acceptable in the cold war?"

"Morality is morality," he replied quickly. "The framers of the American Declaration of Independence did not have the cold war in mind. I hope your color problem here is looked at from the moral standpoint and not from the viewpoint of the cold war."

"We would like to see a United States of Africa," he said in reply to another question. "You can't think of 'federation' without thinking of the United States of America."

Nyerere thinks he will see this federation in his lifetime. He sees nothing to prevent it.

Who would head such a federation? "We do not know," he says, "but the hopes of some will not be fulfilled."

Since Israel is now giving technical assistance to Tanganyika, Nyerere was asked if this undermined the idea of African unity?

"Some of our friends are not our friends," he replied cryptically. "But we do not allow even our friends to pick our enemies for us."

These last two replies were taken by some reporters to be veiled references to President Gamal Abdel Nasser of United Arab Republic and other ambitious African leaders.

If an East African Federation were to come into being, Nyerere was asked if he would be willing to play second string to Jomo Kenyatta, the 73-year-old Mau Mau leader recently sworn in as prime minister when Kenya received internal self-government from the British.

"After what I have been saying," said the president with a shy smile, "shouldn't the answer be 'yes'?"

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Under consideration in ruling circles of the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a proposal that party membership be extended to youngsters under 18 years of age.

It is only one plank in a proposed program designed to pump new blood into the party, according to J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"The party's aggressiveness in the youth area is so great," Hoover recently told Congressmen, "that it is now considering for membership individuals who meet only some of the qualifications heretofore required."

Prior exposure to Marxist-Leninist teachings, for instance, is no longer required. All that is needed is an "interest" in the party.

Communist speakers have fanned out across the country, addressing youth groups and student clagues in an attempt to recruit new members and to make Communism "respectable."

There have been few efforts to combat the massive invasion of U.S. schools by Communist orators. Only in Ohio has the state legislature acted to ban Communist speakers from state-supported schools. Such a bill was signed by Gov. James Rhodes last week.

G-man Hoover insists the Communist danger has not ebbed. He quotes party boss Gus Hall to the effect that 10,000 Americans are official members of the Communist Party while another 100,000 are "state-of-mind" members described as persons sympathetic to the party line and objectives. He says:

"The Communist Party, U.S.A., wields an influence and constitutes a security danger far out of proportion to its membership. It is organized to penetrate with its ideas and tactics almost every segment of our society. The party need not be nor does it want to be a large mass organization. It prefers to remain small developing mass strength through front organizations it controls and directs in its own interest."

Under Hoover's direction, the FBI now has under investigation some 165 known or suspected Communist-front or Communist-infiltrated organizations.

Some of these groups are Communist-created. In many instances, however, the party urges its members to join and infiltrate legitimate nonsubversive organizations and gain control.

Communists infiltrated the New York branch of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, gaining considerable influence be-

fore they were exposed by a Senate subcommittee. The national organization then purged the New York chapter of all known Reds.

Communist party members have joined Women Strike for Peace in droves. They have tried to infiltrate organizations working for civil rights, such as the NAACP and Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

FBI agents keep a close eye on the 761 Soviet-bloc "diplomats" stationed in this country and their 1,066 dependents, many of whom, Hoover says, are known to be intelligence agents.

During fiscal 1962, Hoover told a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations that Soviet officials made 14 intelligence collection and reconnaissance trips throughout the United States. They visited areas of strategic importance and closely studied industrial facilities and military installations collecting available maps, charts, photographs, and other detailed data of intelligence interest.

During that same period, 95 Communist officials attended 65 technical, scientific and military conferences in various parts of the country. They collected masses of available information and established initial contact with persons having potential for future intelligence recruitment.

Notwithstanding State Department restrictions on acquisition by Soviet citizens of aerial photographs, maps, and charts of a scale four miles to the inch or larger and detailed development plans of industrial cities, Soviet officials have continued to obtain such material wherever possible by means of trickery, deceit and false representation.

Director Hoover disclosed that a Soviet national employed by the UN secretariat had for two years posed as a student and purchased more than 200 maps from a New York concern. The maps covered the entire country at a scale of four miles to an inch. Other charts at the same scale covered Canada, Formosa and the Antarctic regions.

THEY SAY . . .

We must have ministers on the ski slopes of the Rockies, the swimming pools of Miami Beach, the "Strip" at Las Vegas and wherever Americans gather.

—Rev. D. Truman B. Douglass of United Church of Christ.