

Editorial Page

Rocky Gambles On New Posture

No political forecaster is daring to say whether or not New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has a really strong chance of recouping his springtime losses in the fight for the 1964 GOP presidential nomination. But the governor himself is not waiting for the tides to change.

In recent weeks he has taken a militant stand for powerful civil rights legislation and for expressions on this score from the governors who assembled in July in Miami Beach for their annual convocation.

Fundamentally, this represents no shift for Rockefeller. But in much of his political utterance from mid-1962 until the time of his remarriage in May, he seemed to play down his advocacy of civil rights action as he appealed for conservative Republican support.

Evidently he has decided that the conservative surge to the candidacy of Arizona's Sen. Barry Goldwater largely undercuts his own earlier efforts in the conservative ranks.

He is acting like a man who has not thereby yielded his presidential hopes but who has concluded they now may lie only in a course ranging from middle of the road to progressivism.

He is betting there are still enough powerful Republicans, especially in the big industrial states who, in the final test, will seek such a candidate as he rather than the avowedly conservative Goldwater. Their argument would be, as so often before, that only a mid-

dle roader could attract enough Democratic and independent votes to win the fall election.

Perhaps the big conservative push for Goldwater left Rockefeller no choice but to move leftward. Certainly the right has been quite thoroughly pre-empted by the Arizona.

However that may be, it is clear from published indications that the governor is happier in his present posture. It is his original one in politics, and he seems most at home with it.

In his earlier attempts to woo Republican conservatives, he managed to make very few happy. A good many were prepared to accept him as the nominee when they believed that prospect inevitable, but they were not real Rockefeller fans. And the wooing cost him some of his moderate to liberal backing.

Today he is fairly close to being a free agent. He can fight with the knowledge that most of the worst probably is behind him — the impact of his remarriage, the liquor scandals, his budget troubles.

In the next several months he should learn whether all this is truly behind him — or riding with him as a dead weight wherever he goes.

If the latter is true, then his big political bet that the center-left is the place to be for 1964 could be a wasted wager. But if his image is somehow restored, then his gamble will be watched as one of this decade's most fascinating political maneuvers.

Castro's Mission To Moscow

(Des Moines, Iowa, Register)

Cuban Premier Fidel Castro has now made in Russia the point that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev has been making since the crisis with the United States last October. This point is that Khrushchev saved Castro's Marxist-Leninist regime from the night of the United States, and would do it again. Khrushchev is still more anxious to get this point over to Communists, including his critics in Russia and China.

For Khrushchev's purpose, it was not enough to say this himself, while Castro in Havana muttered in his beard about the indignity of Khrushchev taking the missiles out without consulting him. Now Castro has publicly and personally made Khrushchev's

point for him in Russia itself.

This would make it harder than ever for Khrushchev to back down on his promise to come to Castro's aid if Castro is threatened once more by military moves staged or assisted by the United States.

Those who urge military moves against Castro rely upon Khrushchev's backing down.

President Kennedy has to consider the possibility (1) that Khrushchev might go through with his threat, and (2) that he might strike back elsewhere, in places where Communism has local superiority of power. This explains the moderation of Kennedy's demands, even during the crisis last October, and the limited nature of the measures he is taking against the Castro regime now.



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Man In The House

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

Congressman Gerald Ford of Michigan, mid-continent in geography and mid-conservative in politics, gets frequent mention for the Republican national ticket of 1964. His national image is a little too dim at the moment for presidential likelihood, but he conceivably could run in second place for Barry Goldwater, Nelson Rockefeller, Tom Kuchel or Gen. Lucius Clay. He would do credit to any ticket.

Just turned 50, a balding, one-time blond football star and boxing coach, Gerry Ford, in the role of a national candidate, would represent a trend that began in 1960. Three years ago, both parties left the old presidential supply sources, which for years had been the governorships and military shrines, and reached into the Senate. Kennedy was preferred to Stevenson, Nixon to Rockefeller. The Democrats did the incredible by fielding two senators, Kennedy and Johnson, despite the fracture of precedent.

Today, with the Senate gone heavily liberal, most of the close party battles are fought in the House, where the Republicans keep gaining membership, and gaining quality, despite losing governorships, senators and their only president since the Great Depression.

Ford came to Washington from Grand Rapids in 1949, when Harry Truman was scuttling Republican majorities in both chambers and in the Gallup polls. A Yale Law School graduate and a Navy veteran, Ford took the slow way upward by inconspicuous work on the Appropriations subcommittee or defense spending, the obscure number of Democrat George Mahon whom he greatly admired.

Ford was nearly always with the GOP leadership in votes, but not entirely in lock step with the plodding of the Old Guardsmen. He was part of the youth movement in 1959, which overthrew Joe Martin and installed Charlie Halleck as the Republican leader. Then, this year, Ford himself rode the surge for a New Breed of party leadership. He unhorsed the elderly Hoeven of Iowa, a Halleck lieutenant, and became chairman

of the hitherto moribund Republican Conference.

Since then the conference has been a garrison post from which Ford - appointed subcommittee have made daring raids on a number of rather complacent Democratic positions.

The Hosmer (Calif.) subcommittee has hit the Administration some telling blows on the matter of detecting nuclear blasts. Schwengel of Iowa leads a subcommittee which has awakened slumbering attention to the scarcity of minority staff workers. A new subcommittee under Gubser of California is readying a study of Democratic assumptions on space spending. An Ad Hoc subcommittee, headed by Poff of Virginia, is reporting on ways to improve the work of the conference itself.

By marshalling these and other youngish House members, Ford has become something very admired on both sides, and in

both parties, of Capitol Hill—a politician's politician. His rise is not dissimilar to the ascendancy a few years ago of Sen. Lyndon Johnson, although without LBJ's flamboyant and publicity-conscious style.

Ford's economic conservatism would balance a Rockefeller ticket, and bolster a Goldwater ticket. His ideology, while activist and nationalist, is not doctrinaire. He can see some reason in bending a principle to make it fit an historical opportunity — such as invading Cuba at a ripe moment, adding Yugoslavia to help split the Communist bloc, curbing civil rights (in which he deeply believes) at the point where they intrude upon property rights.

A go-slow, but go-forward product of the postwar House, Ford is one of many Republicans who are willing to march, but not to stampede, toward the betterment of his country and party.

BERRY'S WORLD



"We're sending her to Paris to study French!"

Scandal In The Barnyard

By JOHN GOULD

(In The Christian Science Monitor)

LISBON FALLS, Maine—The annual report on my crazy ducks is about to be rendered, and it is a bit more didactic than usual. It seems we have had a scandal in the barnyard, but you'll have to take my word for it. The evidence has been destroyed. This story isn't all funny, unless you say sort-of, and even then it's stretching the rules and regulations of this department. But nature winds a devious and curious route, with instruction plentiful.

As paid-up members from other years know, these ducks are mallards, and they serve only to beautify and adorn my little farm pond beyond the barn, toward the woods. Their number weaves up and down with the seasons, but we always have some, and this spring we came through with only a pair. I hope old-timers in the bird business will nod, and others will go to their books and look up the mallard.

I have always thought the mallard drake to be the prettiest bird I know of in nature—the wood duck is much the same, but not so well balanced in stature. The mallard drabs out some in his fall plumage, but at nesting time he is gorgeous. And, unlike the other barnyard ducks, the mallard really is a wild bird. Nobody ever had much success bringing other kinds of wild waterfowl into the family, but a mallard will stay, make a pet, and live from a hopper.

So, we had this pair last winter, and after the pond thawed I roused them out of their little house, cleaned out the litter and got it ready for next fall, and left them to their duties. They usually nest right away, the lady going into four weeks of meditation that will produce about eight ducklings, and the gentleman sitting out in the middle of the pond looking as if he didn't know what was going on. During nesting the mallards revert to their wildness. They won't come and feed from my hand, and they do a lot of sneaking around. They also become noisy if a pussy-cat goes by or something otherwise disturbs them. Then one day the madam appears with her clutch of new ducks, each looking like an oversized bumblebee, and she trots them up for my inspection and demands rations.

Well, that's the way it happened. She brought off 11 ducklings, more than the usual, and I was greatly astonished. Because, six of the ducklings were clear, unmistakable mallards with the yellow streak across their eyes, and five of the ducklings were not. Five of the ducklings were all black on the heads, which is the touchstone of quite another race of waterfowl—and the reason for this discrepancy should be evident to any well informed citizen. It so happened that Steve Powell, custodian of the Swan Island game refuge of

the Maine Department of inland Fisheries and Game, a game warden and nature biologist, and the best authority we have on migratory birds, stopped in that afternoon on another errand, and he confirmed my suspicions. "There's only one way for that to happen," he said.

A Black Duck, the prevailing game bird of this flyway, came winging north, and paused on our pond. Blacks don't often move in this close to dwellings, and I certainly never knew he was here. But he paused long enough to manage this split personality in my domesticated brood, and then went his way. But the story is not over, yet.

Up in our woodlot a pair of Cooper's Hawks has nested now for some years. You should go to the book again if you don't know them. They are a handsome bird, magnificent in flight, and big. They can be identified in flight by the white lines under the wings, and as everybody knows—or should know—the hawks are both good and bad. What they will do to a flock of poultry is a sad thing, and sometimes a farmer has little choice except to go after them. But they have their good points, too.

It has been many years since we've had hawk trouble, partly because the duck pond also encourages redwings, and the redwing will go after a hawk. So will the kingbird, and we have kingbirds all around us. And as for the ducks, in particular, they have built-in protective measures, and know how to scatter in the weeds. Their vision upwards is so good that I have seen them scatter for a jet fighter plane going over so high you can't hear it.

But now the Cooper's Hawk came for the ducks. Instead of 11, one morning there were nine. It went to eight, and finally to six. The old lady quacked plaintively for me to do something, and I rigged some tin pie plates on poles and strung some old shirts on bushes. One day I dusted the tailfeathers of the hawk with some No. 6 from the old woodchuck gun—not likely to bring him down at that distance, but possibly persuasive. It's not the most drastic avenue, but in this instance it proved adequate. The raiding had stopped, and I imagine Mother Duck will successfully rear the remaining six ducklings, who now have some size, to beautify and adorn as aforesaid.

But, the five ducklings the hawk took were the five Blacks. My remaining ducklings are pure and unquestionable mallards, the obvious offspring of my salaried drake. He sits on the pond surveying his family with inscrutable diffidence, seeming to know neither car nor cork, preening himself as if all was well and he knew precisely why. That we had a scandal in the barnyard is something you must take my word for. There is no evidence otherwise.

WASHINGTON WINDOW . . .

Living Beyond Our Means Creates World Problems

By LYLE C. WILSON

United Press International

In the simple terms of what really goes on, the Federal Reserve Board's increase in its discount rate is in recognition of the unhappy fact that the United States is living beyond its income abroad as well as at home.

The immediate purpose of the rate increase is to make it more profitable to keep certain money on deposit and drawing interest in the United States than abroad; or, at least, not less profitable to have the money here than elsewhere.

If it works that way, the United States balance of payments position will be improved. The U.S. balance of payments position is the end result of the all international dealings between the United States and its people and foreign nations and their people. For some years now we have spent or given away abroad a lot more than foreigners have spent in the United States. This deficit in the international balance of payments is made up by payment in U.S. dollars.

Accumulated Dollars
Foreign individuals and governments happily accumulated those dollars immediately after the war. The U.S. dollars was so sturdy and so much sought that much of the free world used accumulated dollars as backing for its own currency. The dollar, literally, was as good as gold. Better, maybe, because it was handier in the pocket.

The U.S. gold dollar also had some gold backing, up to 25 percent. About \$12 billion of the gold hoard accumulated by the United States was and is required to provide that 25 percent gold backing of the U.S. dollar. Foreign owners of U.S. dollars got a much better deal than that. Each of their dollars was backed by gold 100 percent.

That came about because the Roosevelt administration committed the United States in 1934 to sell to foreigners gold at \$35 an ounce. That commitment still holds. So a foreigner with U.S.

dollars has been able to demand in exchange U.S. gold to the value of his dollars. The Citizens Foreign Aid Committee calculates that on Dec. 31, 1952, the U.S. gold reserve was \$23.2 billion and the gold reserve of all other free world countries was \$13 billion. The U.S. gold hoard today is down to \$15.8 billion whereas the gold holdings of other free world nations had increased by Dec. 31, 1961, to \$23.6 billion.

Some Still Hold Dollars
The committee calculated that from Dec. 31, 1952, to Dec. 31, 1961, the U.S. balance of payments deficit was about \$19.6 billion. Our overseas spending in those years was that much more than we received from overseas. Obviously, many foreigners no longer regard the U.S. dollar as good as gold. But some still do hold dollars and that creates another problem.

The American Institute for Economic Research at Great Barrington, Vt., calculated in August, 1962, that those outstanding foreign dollar claims already exceeded the capacity of the United States to make good in gold. If the foreigners demanded their gold we could not pay up. This would create a catastrophic chaos in the free world where the dollar is a vital part of the international economy.

Chairman Harry F. Byrd of the Senate Finance Committee explained this situation in a speech the other day and added: "I regard this as our most serious fiscal and financial problem."

Byrd was being consistent. He abhors living beyond means whether at home or abroad.

THEY SAY . . .
I am not against the United States, but a lot of people believe that if you live in this hemisphere you must get down on your knees and bow to capitalism. —Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana.



WASHINGTON NOTEBOOK . . .

A Riotous Education?

By THE WASHINGTON STAFF
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—In Hyannis, Mass., near the Kennedy summer home on Cape Cod, this sign is in the lobby of a main street movie theater: "Fruit Drink, 25 Cents. Delicious. Cold! Vigah!"

Harlan Cleveland, assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs, has a trick relief map of Antarctica in his office. Take off a transparent plastic cover and it shows what the place would look like if all the ice melted. There would be only a few mountain peaks showing above the water.

"Please understand," emphasizes Mr. Cleveland, "there isn't any U.S. or U.N. aid program under consideration to melt all this ice."

But Antarctica is one of his responsibilities, since this southernmost continent is under joint Antarctic Treaty administration of a number of countries, including the United States and Soviet Russia. It's the one place on earth where the Russians cooperate with everybody in perfect harmony.

"Wherever the population is all penguins," Mr. Cleveland explains, "we can get international cooperation. If the population is people, it's more difficult."

At the lunch honoring the successful American climbers of Mt. Everest, National Press Club



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

There are some problems that have no solutions. Being by nature and background an almost incurably optimistic people, we Americans do not like to admit this may be the case, and we struggle against it furiously.

Consider the running argument over the subject of divorce: Is it better for the children if hostile parents stay together, or if they separate? There is absolutely no answer to this question.

Those who oppose breaking up marriages can point to a wealth of evidence indicating that the children of broken homes are often in trouble, psychologically, socially and academically. There is no doubt that a child with only one parent is severely handicapped in growing up.

Those who take the opposite view point out that it is healthier for a child to grow up with one parent than in a bitter and wrangling atmosphere, in which the child often becomes an emotional pawn between the parents and suffers lifelong scars.

Neither side can ever convince the other, because there is no solution for a bad marriage: staying together is terrible for the children, and so is breaking up. There is only a choice of evils.

Very well, says the optimist, but there must be a lesser evil: we can surely make some rational estimate of what is less bad

President Bryson Rash noted that the expedition tried to locate some mementos claimed to have been left at the summit by a Communist Chinese team.

Since the Americans failed to turn up any trace of the Communist expedition, Rash concluded:

"Either the Chinese didn't climb the mountain, or Khrushchev sent Mikoyan up there to get rid of the evidence."

The Defense Department has discovered that women are right after all when they use hairpins to fix things.

Secretary McNamara estimates that the department now is saving \$1,330 a year by using ordinary women's hair wave clips at two cents each in place of more complicated gadgets at \$1.35 each formerly used to prevent soldering heat from damaging transistors during manufacture.

Handling fan mail from irate citizens at home is one of the newer problems of U.S. ambassadors stationed abroad. If Americans don't like the way things are going in some foreign trouble spot country, they write the U.S. ambassador to ask what's wrong and why he doesn't run things better.

Some of the letter writers aren't too sure of their geography. Ambassador Frederick E. Nolting Jr., back in Washington for consultations recently, says he gets letters addressed to Saigon, Indo-

nesia, or Saigon, Laos. But eventually he gets them at his station in Saigon, Viet Nam.

U.S. Ambassador John Martin, home on leave from his post in Dominican Republic, told the story of a bright young Dominican girl studying English in a class taught by his daughter.

The seniorita was an apt pupil and said she wished to perfect her English so she could go to college in the United States some day. Asked about how she intended to get enough money for this, the girl replied, "Oh, I get paid for taking part in demonstrations staged by the Communists."

For small marches, it was learned, they pay the crowd \$150. For riots where they want cars overturned and burned, the pay is \$500.

Sen. Norris Cotton, R-N.H., says of the Area Redevelopment program: "Tax-paid projects steered to the party faithful have always been called 'pork.'"

"Plain-spoken old John Garner of Texas used to boast, 'Every time a Yankee gets a pound of pork, I take a barrel for Texas.' Texas is one of the states that has been getting the lion's share from Area Redevelopment."

"I bet old John is chuckling as he sits on his porch down in Uvalde."

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has taken note of newspaper editorials advising him that he would get further with Congress if he were more discreet and tactful in his attitude. He told newsmen at his last press conference he had decided to take this advice.

Therefore, he said, answering a query, he would not comment on recent statements by Rep. Earl Wilson, R-Ind., who has been conducting a one-man campaign against Pentagon spending.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Friday, July 26, the 207th day of 1963 with 158 to follow.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The morning stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening stars are Mars and Saturn.

Those born today include playwright George Bernard Shaw, in 1856.

On this day in history: In 1925, American political leader William Jennings Bryan died of a stroke in Dayton, Tenn.

In 1941, Gen. Douglas MacArthur became commander of the U.S. forces in the Philippines.

In 1952, King Farouk of Egypt boarded his royal yacht and sailed into exile.

In 1959, Cuban premier Fidel Castro agreed to return to the premiership.

A thought for the day—British playwright George Bernard Shaw said: "The more things a man is ashamed of, the more responsible he is."