

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Take It Slow And Easy

Congress is doing some deep soul-searching on the nuclear test ban treaty.

The picture is not as bleak as some would paint it, nor is it as jovial and bright as the administration would paint it.

Claims of "victory for mankind" and "major breakthrough in the cold war" are not only premature, but downright foolish.

The facts are these: The United States first proposed an atomic test ban in June of 1946 at a time when only we had the atomic bomb. The Russians rejected this.

We renewed our atomic test ban offer from time to time, and, in October, 1958, a one-year "undeclared moratorium" on nuclear tests went into effect.

Thirty four months later in September, 1961, the Russians resumed testing in the atmosphere, particularly their 100-megaton giant atomic bombs. It was obvious they had been preparing for the test for some months prior to launching them.

It wasn't until April, 1962, or nearly five months later, that we resumed atmospheric testing.

As recent as earlier this month, Khrushchev said the Russians wanted a test ban but it must be linked to a non-aggression pact between the Reds and NATO.

In two weeks of negotiations, the test ban which bars testing in the air, outerspace or underwater was hammered out. Such speedy action after so long a delay causes us some uneasiness.

Last year we heard top atomic scientists warn of the dangers of another test ban, pointing out that such a ban enables the Russians to move up in the atomic race. Dr. Edward Teller, known as the father of the H-bomb, warned that the Russians might need only one more test ban period to perfect their anti-missile missile and that they would then have the defense against our retaliatory power and be in a position to launch a nuclear assault in a terrifying nuclear "Pearl Harbor."

We weigh this advice by atomic experts against the well-meaning intentions of politicians intent on improving their image.

In the weeks ahead, we shall hear a great deal of debate both pro and con on the test treaty. It may be that in the final vote the Senate may decide not to approve it.

The question is a pure and simple one, "Does it benefit the United States to accept such a nuclear test ban?"

There can be no other meritorious standard. We can talk about world safeguards against radiation, health hazards, cold war complications and the like, but it actually, for you and me, boils down to the calm question begging an answer, "Does it benefit the United States to accept this test ban?"

The proposal must be stripped of its political implications and placed up against the needs of the safety of this nation, it must be weighed against the past perfidious record of the Soviet Union on other treaties.

The un-censored opinions of our top military leaders must be secured, and these must be candid appraisals, not ones dictated by the civilian head of the defense department.

When all these facts are in, properly appraised and evaluated, then the Senate will come to a vote on the issue. We're content to accept their decision.

Frankly, while the proposed treaty raises a faint hope for some sort of nuclear sanity, there are many many loopholes in it and when it is all considered it boils down to a question of faith that the Soviets will do what they say they will.

This they will do ONLY if it is to their benefit. This fact is supported by their past record.

Their record also shows that they will honor the pact just so long as it benefits them and not one moment longer.

These uncontested facts must also be taken into account when one is considering whether or not to place his future nuclear security in the faith of Russia's words.

For nowhere have we read that Khrushchev has disavowed his announced intentions to bury us and force our grandchildren to live under Communism.

Security Threat

(New York Journal American)

The British reacted with shocked surprise to the disclosure of threats to security represented by the explosive Profumo scandal.

But a similar potential to America's security is posed by a ring of international call girls operating in and out of the United Nations.

The Journal-American, as a public service, has exposed how at least one of these party girls arranged to have a mysterious recording delivered behind the Iron Curtain... how these girls have unrestricted access to the delegates' lounge... how they are well-

comed by members of some foreign delegations having access to classified documents.

Even more sinister was the revelation that a former TV producer who fled from a Federal indictment charging him with procuring has now found refuge behind the Iron Curtain.

We are gratified that U.S. District Attorney Robert M. Morgenthau has shown his concern over this potential threat to the security of the nation by ordering a full investigation.

This country cannot afford to risk a repetition of the Christine Keeler case.



HOLMES ALEXANDER ...

Senate And The Treaty

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

On June 10, 1963, President Kennedy made his famous appeal to the Soviet Union for a partial nuclear test ban treaty and gave the pledge that the USA would not conduct further tests in the air or in the oceans unless Russia did so first.

But two days later, on June 12th, and again on June 13th, our listening devices picked up acoustic evidence of nuclear-type explosions within the Soviet Union. There was no accompanying fallout, therefore no conclusive proof that the explosions were caused by nuclear tests. But these acoustic signals matched three others which had been detected in July 1962, from the same territory. The Administration did not announce that any of these five occurrences were nuclear. The Atomic Energy Commission has preferred to believe (or have the country believe) that the signals were probably produced by electrical storms.

A prominent Senator, who has majored in nuclear detection - and verification for several years, completely disagreed with the Administration's trustful assumptions. They are, he feels, colored by the President's desire to coax Khrushchev into a treaty.

This Senator, who wishes to remain anonymous at this writing, is convinced, from logic and science, that the Russians were atmospherically testing as late as the middle of June, and that they have developed either a very refined low-yield bomb or a very "clean" bomb that drops little or no debris. In sum, the Russians have reached an advanced state of the art in disguising air-tests - and that's one reason why they are willing to discuss an unspecified treaty.

To this Senator's credit, he has not sensationalized these convictions. He still favors the Dodd-Humphrey Senate resolution which calls for a ban on tests that contaminate the air and water. He still favors the general tenor of the treaty which Ambassador Harriman has been negotiating in Moscow. Nevertheless, I think it is fair to report that this important statesman is disappointed in the Administration's soft-on-Reds attitude in failing to show more suspicion and alarm at five unidentified explosions in Russia during 1962-63. Here is a proviso which he tells me should be included in any Russo-British-American treaty to ban air-water testing:

"... that we shall consider a series of such signals, originating in their territory, to constitute proof that the test ban has been violated."

The Senator believes that we no longer need to find radioactive debris in order to know that testing has taken place. Our acoustic devices are now sensitive enough to be reliable - not for proof positive, but for proof sufficient.

He also is suspicious of the Khrushchev proposal that the treaty include space, as well as atmosphere and water, as areas where the treaty signers agree not to test. Modern techniques make it feasible to explode nuclear weapons millions of miles away from earth. But science has not yet provided the means of detecting or verifying such shots. To include space in the treaty would give Russia an area to test-and-cheat. He hopes that Khrushchev will be willing to leave space out of the treaty until science gives us more assurance in that area.

It would be wrong to take anything away from Mr. Kennedy's achievement in bringing some sort of partial treaty within the realm of possibility. But no pig-in-a-poke, please.



Maintaining Union Monopoly

By ARTHUR KROCK

In The New York Times
MIDDLETOWN, R. I., July 25 -

Every so often the American people wake up, like Lemuel Gulliver in Lilliput, to find themselves bound hand and foot. Their fetters are the Federal law and bipartisan politics that created and have maintained the monopoly power of the labor unions to paralyze the national economy.

This power is now being currently manifest by the railroad brotherhoods. The agreement by management to the appeal from Congress for another month in which to try to avert a shut-down on the roads by the brotherhoods is merely its latest demonstration. For, although railroad management has consented six times to postpone the date when work rules will no longer require payment for union jobs not needed for operation and has accepted the findings of two Presidential boards and also all Administration suggestions for easing the terms of dis-employment, a seventh agreement to postpone was a Hobson's choice for management because of the shackles of one-

way law and vote-seeking politics.

Labor Unions Favored

Under the terms of that law labor unions can legally do things, and on a nationwide scale, for which management would incur criminal penalties. They can: (1) shut down an entire industry on which, as in this instance, the strength and viability of the economy depend; (2) do this despite their refusal even to bargain on the issue with management, and in total disregard of the findings of investigators of these issues who were chosen by the President of the United States; and (3) terminate a basic transport facility of the nation as a protest against a responsible management decision whose legality was certified by the Supreme Court of the United States.

But politics is responsible for allowing the situation to drift to the point where the dignity of the American system of government has been impaired at the expense of the public interest and of the equal rights guaranteed by the Constitution. In his 1960 campaign Mr. Kennedy said and

repeated that "the President should have a wider arsenal of weapons so that (in a labor crisis) neither the union nor the company would be assured his intervention would benefit one side or the other."

But not until the railroad strike was only a week away did he go to Congress for this "arsenal," and then what he asked for was a weapon of unproved effectiveness and very limited range. Then railroad brotherhoods had only to indicate to Congress their continued preference for a wholly disarmed Government to prevent the prompt action the President unrealistically asked for, and produced the unfair but, in the circumstances, irresistible Congressional pressure on the railroads for still another postponement.

Defusing a Threat

This, however, is about all that has been accomplished so far by the political branches of the Federal Government to defuse an economic threat which has been steadily nearing the point of explosion for years. If Congress should turn the problem over to the Interstate Commerce Commission, on substantially the terms the President set forth, the railroads have now discovered in the fine print that they can be obliged to continue for four years, not two, a \$600,000,000 annual payroll for employees they do not need, to do jobs that no longer exist. Hence it will be up to a majority of the 11 Presidential appointees - seven by Eisenhower, three by Kennedy and one by both presidents - who compose the commission to determine the pace of the descent of the railroads into bankruptcy, or whether and at what point it is to be halted. Meanwhile there is no assurance that the brotherhoods will not renew their strike call when the latest period of postponement of the work rules has expired. They reserve the right and have the power thereby to do this if Congress has not legislated to their satisfaction.

Then Mr. Kennedy will be inescapably faced with the alternative of openly surrendering the Government to the union monopoly, or seeking that "wider arsenal of weapons" in the public interest that as a candidate he said he would as President ask Congress to supply.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Just as children are getting older or faster, grown-ups are staying younger longer. The age-categories of even the recent past scarcely apply to the present time.

I was thinking of this when reading about the dispute between an airline company and its stewardesses. The company wanted to drop its stewardesses at age 32; the union protested; and a compromise of sorts was worked out.

What interested me was not the labor aspect of the quarrel, but the outmoded assumption by the airline that 32 is somehow "old" for a stewardess. Actually, most women of 32 today look

(and presumably feel) 10 years younger.

A generation or so ago, a woman of 40 had nearly had it. She was settled into middle-age, and usually looked it. Today's women are incredibly young in appearance and vitality—that is, if they aren't trying too hard to look young. Nothing ages a woman faster than that.

Much the same, of course, is true of men. Men in their 40s and 50s are still young and vigorous, whereas their fathers and grandfathers were often sloping toward senescence in those decades.

It may have something to do with diet, with changing patterns of social life, with attitudes toward one's self. Somehow, past generations become prematurely stodgy; they not only wear heavier clothes and ate heavier meals, but also settled heavily into old age long before it was called for.

If you look at a picture of a woman of 40 at the turn of the century, or even two decades after that, and one of today, the difference is striking—not merely in the costumes, but in the expression, in the posture, in the whole psychic atmosphere.

Although it is true that American civilization today may put too much emphasis on "youth" as a virtue, it is equally true that our ancestors committed the opposite mistake—they grew old too fast, and often passed from youth to senility without ever grasping the fact that maturity is a time for delight, and not just for duty.

It is easy to be critical of our contemporary culture; yet to remain young in spirit (without remaining green in judgment) is surely a positive value that past generations neglected or scorned. To see a woman of 60 striding across the golf links, lithe and tamed, is to realize that 32, in our time, is barely the threshold of womanhood. No matter what the airline officials may think to the contrary.

EDSON IN WASHINGTON ...



Farm Bureau Chief After New Policies

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA)—Charles B. Shuman, American Farm Bureau president, ain't mad at anybody any more - not even Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Since the biggest farm organization was generally credited - or blamed - for defeat of the Kennedy administration wheat program in the May 21 referendum, it has been assumed that Shuman is still agin' the gov't because it has done nothing to get some substitute wheat legislation through Congress.

In Washington to testify before a House Agriculture subcommittee on the AFB proposals for an interim wheat, feed grain and cotton bill, Shuman was completely relaxed.

He didn't have any particular criticism of Freeman for taking his trip to Russia although some critics have accused him of running away to block new farm legislation.

"After all," observed Shuman, "Secretary Benson - (President Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson) - took his family and friends on a tour of Russia just before he left office. So why shouldn't Secretary Freeman go?"

Shuman gives Freeman credit for being very astute and a good administrator and he takes no stock in reports Freeman will resign or be fired.

"I'm more interested in seeing the Department of Agriculture change directions than change secretaries," says Shuman. But he sees no changes coming in Freeman or Kennedy administration farm policies.

Shuman gets around the country a good bit so he was asked how farmers generally feel about Freeman.

"About the same as they felt

about Mr. Benson," Shuman replied.

As for Republican presidential candidates now being mentioned, Shuman believes those with congressional experience in handling farm legislation would be best qualified. That would give the nod to Senators Barry Goldwater of Arizona and Thurston B. Morton of Kentucky.

Shuman gives Gov. Nelson Rockefeller credit for being knowledgeable on farm issues. New York State has a big dairy industry and Rockefeller has big ranches in Venezuela.

Shuman believes that "chaos will not result if new farm legislation is not passed by Congress this year."

He believes the average price of wheat next year won't be much lower if no new wheat bill is passed. Prices on feed quality wheat will be down, he admits, but some of the hard wheat prices will be up and farm income won't be far different from this year.

The Farm Bureau head believes the new wheat bill introduced by Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., and the cotton bill introduced by House Agriculture Committee chairman Harold D. Cooley, D-N.C., may stand in the road of the AFB program.

The Farm Bureau is opposed to these measures, Shuman believes that if they are defeated and if new farm legislation is not enacted this year, production will begin to come down voluntarily next year.

Contrary opinion is that if no new controls are imposed this year, production will zoom and prices will skid. Estimates on next year's farm income loss through defeat of wheat controls in the May referendum run as high as \$700 million.

Total cost of the AFB plan has been estimated at \$2 billion, including a soil bank scheme to take 100 million acres out of production.

WASHINGTON WINDOW ...

Kennedy Plays Politics With Racial Situation

By LYLE C. WILSON

United Press International
The resignation of Postmaster General J. Edward Day offers President Kennedy another opportunity to indulge his anxiety for a Negro in the cabinet. Kennedy's first choice for that cabinet post may have been a Negro.

During the 1960 presidential campaign, the Republicans played politics in stumblum fashion with the idea of a Negro cabinet member. There was no need for candidate Kennedy to match that maneuver precisely during his presidential campaign. The Democratic platform and his own shrewd plays for Negro votes were ample to offset Republican maneuvers.

Once elected, however, President Kennedy had Negro problems. He and his platform had promised - guaranteed - some instant civil rights. It immediately became obvious that the entire Kennedy legislative program probably would be scuttled if the new President proposed broad gauge civil rights legislation to the newly elected Congress. The decision was to put off the issue.

Negroes Were Pleased

Negroes were pleased by Kennedy's selection of Negroes for well-paid federal jobs. They were equally pleased by constant evidence of the President's concern for Negro problems. This was that the President-elect appeared on the porch of his Georgetown home in December, 1960, with Rep. William Dawson, a Chicago Democrat and a Negro. The President-elect told assembled

newsmen - and Dawson agreed - that the congressman had been offered and had refused the postmaster general's post.

Here was another evidence of Kennedy's interest and confidence in Negroes - but was it? The question arose: Was the offer to Dawson for real? The Chicago Daily News printed an editorial under the caption:

"We Can't Believe It. Dawson's record should keep him out of the cabinet."

The News pictured Dawson as the absolute political boss in Chicago of an empire of corruption, fraud and crime. It so, the nomination of Dawson would have invited severe scrutiny and, probably, rejection by the U.S. Senate. Kennedy scarcely could have been ignorant of Dawson's background nor insensitive to the attitude the Senate might take. There was suspicion, therefore, that the announcement that Dawson had been tendered and had rejected the job was a political device and that no real proposal had been made to Dawson.

Proposed New Department

Thereafter Kennedy proposed that Congress establish a new cabinet department of urban affairs. He said he would name a Negro to head the department. The Republicans almost unanimously cried "foul." They were joined by some Democrats from the South.

This was a political ploy, these dissenters maintained, to make it impossible for a non-Southern member of Congress to vote against setting up the new department lest he be accused of anti-Negro bias; of voting against a Negro in the cabinet. However that may have been, Congress did not authorize the new department. But President Kennedy undoubtedly took a substantial political profit among Negro voters.

Now comes a vacancy in the Kennedy cabinet, a cabinet job said to have once been offered to and rejected by a Negro.

If the President's anxiety for a Negro in the cabinet has been for real all along, here is a can't miss opportunity. Or, maybe, the President will decide to give another refusal to Chicago's Rep. Dawson.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q-Is it correct to call the last book of the New Testament "Revelations"?

A - No. In various English translations of the Bible it is called either "The Revelation" or "The Apocalypse."

Q-How long does a copyright last in the United States?
A - For 28 years; it can be renewed for 28 more.

BERRY'S WORLD



"I'll bet she looks fat in clothes!"