

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Bumpy Road To Love

Let's concede that romance is wonderful. It is obviously popular, is undoubtedly here to stay, and nobody in his right mind is going to knock it.

But lovers, PLEASE—not behind the wheel of a moving car in today's traffic. There just has to be a better—and safer—place to neck and nuzzle!

Yet there is increasing evidence that the driver's seat is replacing the davenport, the park bench and even the movie balcony as a favorite sparking spot.

No one has any figures so far to show how many accidents have been caused because a driver was smooching instead of steering and wooling instead of watching. But you don't have to be a safety expert to know that high horsepower love can be lethal.

Let's forget any bad taste involved and consider the problem from the standpoint of safety alone.

Surely no one can seriously believe that a young lover—or even an older one—can keep his mind on traffic when he has at least

one arm around a cuddling cutie and is driving cheek to cheek.

If he can, he just ain't much of a lover! If he can't, he ought to get out of the driver's seat.

What to do about the problem? Legislation? Let's face it, you can't outlaw love. You would have to put a traffic officer in every car and keep him there as a chaperone. For unlike alcohol, romance doesn't show up on the breath in a balloon test or in a traffic spot-check.

Seatbelts? Do you think these lovebirds would use 'em—unless someone invents one that will buckle the lovers cozily together?

Public opinion and education? Probably the best hope. If only a fraction of these immature exhibitionists could be persuaded that they are inviting death and disaster for themselves and others, and looking cheap and silly as they do it, it would be a big step in the right direction.

Or we might pass a law that every driver and passenger must sit in an individual bucket seat. That might just do it!

The Rail Wreckers

(The New York Times)

The leaders of the rail unions persist in resembling the wreckers who in the early nineteenth century refused to accept the inevitability of the industrial revolution. Their position, however, is much more hypocritical and dangerous than the simple-minded, knowing resistance that sprang up with the introduction of the spinning jenny. The rail union leadership fully understands its power to disrupt the nation's economy through a strike; and it is counting on the threat of stoppage to maintain the present archaic and intolerable work rules.

To the last, the rail leaders are maintaining their opposition to any change, claiming that Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz is undermining collective bargaining and taking a step "toward totalitarianism" by his determination to prevent a strike. Their pose as the champions of democratic principles is an utter sham. The rail unions alone are responsible for undermining the collective bargaining process. They did so, moreover, with premeditation. From the first, they have refused to indulge in the give and take of collective bargaining, knowing that they could always resort to the strike or the threat of a strike that would cripple the economy.

As long as national security is not at stake, the right to strike should normally not be subject to automatic suspension, even in such an industry as the railroads, where the economic costs of a strike are incalculable. But the rail unions have lost their privilege to halt the nation's traffic by their consciously irresponsible refusal to bargain in good faith.

Mr. Wirtz has taken pains to point out that any legislation will be directed specifically to resolving the dispute over work rules, and not to labor as a whole. The democratic principles of collective bargaining and the right to strike can be as useful as ever in the new age of automation. But not if they are abused by the wreckers.

HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Taking The Long View

By HOLMES ALEXANDER
WASHINGTON, D.C.—If they convince me we can catch any Communist cheating, I'm for the treaty," said Sen. Stuart Symington (D., Mo.) in nailing his position on the East-West Nuclear Ban pact.

He added: "But I won't know until we get through the Stennis Subcommittee hearings on Preparedness. I want to learn more about detection in space."

Symington has, I would say, the widest acquaintance among the informed, influential Senators whose votes on treaty ratification are uncommitted and therefore crucial.

He belongs to what may be called the Hardway Set. He's a member of two of the three committees dealing with weaponry, Armed Services and Space (Atomic Energy is the third). Also, he's a member of Foreign Relations. In this combination, Symington encompasses the utmost of both practical and theoretical thinking as applied to the treaty.

More than that, Symington, born in 1901, is in the grandfather class, and this adds a dimension that is missing in his colleagues of the World War II generation. Symington's greatest admiration is for his friend, Sir Winston Churchill. He is constantly aware of how that grand old man foresaw both the intractability of the Communists and the inevitability of nuclear conflagration unless (together with the Communists) we can somehow control nuclear power.

This awareness of Churchill's prophetic sense goes a way toward explaining why Symington is one degree above the anti-Communist Hard Liners who would make no bargain whatever with the Reds. The Senator believes in bargaining with, but never trusting, the Reds. Therefore, our ability to detect Russian cheating, and our ability to snap almost instantly into rearmament of testing, are twin conditions to Symington's support of Mr. Kennedy's treaty.

If this seems complicated, so is the treaty-making, despite its apparent simplicity and limitation. And complicated, too, is Symington's thinking, being a combina-

tion of distrusting Russia, hoping to leave a free country and an uncontaminated earth for his grandchildren, and doing the right thing with the knowledge he possesses.

Because of so much compounded complication, Symington's position has been misunderstood. After the "Post-Dispatch" of St. Louis, his home town paper, had repeatedly called him "opposed to a nuclear test ban," the Senator fired off a curt letter-to-the-editor. He explained that he was against "unilateral disarmament" trusting the Russians' "good faith"—but he was not against a cheat-proof agreement. This will not satisfy the disarmers-at-any-price or the better-than-dead extremists. Symington may be hearing from them again in his reelection race of next year.

But he will not alter his position under pressure. Last spring he declined to become one of 30

odd co-sponsors of the Dodd-Humphrey resolution to ban nuclear testing in the atmosphere and water. Earlier in the year, he joined with Senators Russell and Jackson in warning President Kennedy against too many concessions to Khrushchev in the matter of underground testing. On these two criteria, the Missouri Senator did seem to resist testing because of its risks to national defense. Today, however, he feels that the President's treaty, which does not include underground tests, and which is being closely examined for cheat-possibilities, presents a very different kettle of fish.

"Somebody said to me," related Symington, "that Russia is our problem of the '60s, but that Red China is our problem in the '70s. I'd rather see Khrushchev moving our way than theirs. China scares me."

Thinking of the treaty, he was also looking far down the road.

BERRY'S WORLD



"C'mon, Charlie, if you had let that one go, it would have been out."

"Relax on That One. How About Trying Your Hand Over Here?"



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Farm Family Politics

By RALPH de TOLEDANO
In his weekly letter to constituents, Representative John Byrnes (R-Wis.) writes:

"One by one, the campaign issues of 1960 (economic gap with Russia, missile gap, etc.) have fallen by the wayside as events have proved them to be false. Perhaps the most persistent Democrat charge was that the family farm was on its way out under Eisenhower. (For example, 'The family farm is disappearing,' Kennedy, November, 1960.)

"Last week, this issue, too, bit the dust. On July 11, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman testified, 'Instead of wasting away, the family farm is a growing dynamic force in agricultural production.' And, he said, this strengthening of the family farm has been taking place since 1944.

"It should also be pointed out that, under Secretary Freeman, there are 369 fewer farms, a million less farmers, 19,000 more Department of Agriculture employees, and a massive \$7.7 billion outlay for farm programs."

Secretary Freeman's admission caused not very much of a stir

in politics-hardened Washington. But farm state legislators nodded bitterly and wondered how long the facts would be allowed to stand without tampering. Crocodile tears for the passing of the family farm have been standard equipment for Agriculture Secretaries under Presidents Truman and Kennedy. Every time a massive new handout (with chains attached) is proposed, the family farm is cited as the reason for agreeing to it.

The hardy Representative or Senator who did not wilt or tremble at any mention of the family farm was about as rare as a politician coming out against motherhood. Anguished cries over the plight of the vanishing family farmer were heard when the American Farm Bureau Federation opposed Mr. Freeman's ball-and-chain program. The farmers, mostly of the family type, voted against wheat program decisively—presumably satisfying their death wish.

The secretary's sense of duty toward the American farmer has carried him past the crisis in confidence of the wheat referen-

dum. But it has not brought to him the cold second thoughts of early morning on the trail of the cotton farmer. Mr. Freeman's concern obviously doesn't extend that far.

Yet this is something that should be uppermost in his mind. As Representative John J. Rhodes of Arizona notes with more than a little iron in his voice, Mr. Freeman inaugurated his career in the Cabinet by increasing the support price on upland cotton. He was warned that this would mean a sharp drop in exports and in domestic sales. But he would pay no mind to the experts.

The results: exports of upland cotton have dropped to less than four million bales a year, instead of the more comfortable seven billion bales. Simultaneously, the amount of cotton used domestically declined, with synthetic fibers taking over. In the foreign market, American cotton was priced too high to compete.

The point of the increase in price supports was to reduce acreages, and stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Fewer acres of cotton are being planted, but no matter how the Administration attempts to interfere with economic laws, the CCC's holdings in cotton continue to go up.

Because American cotton prices can't compete with foreign, three million bales were not sold. This not only hurt the domestic producer; it also hurt the rest of the country. These bales of cotton would have brought in almost half a billion dollars, thereby helping to ease the critical balance of payments deficit. Increased foreign trade is the only way, except for abolishing foreign aid, to reduce that deficit and to begin restoring confidence in the dollar.

Which leads to a simple question: If Secretary Freeman and his New Frontier posse are really interested in the welfare of the farmer, wouldn't they do better to look after such matters as the declining domestic and foreign markets for U.S. cotton than to weep copiously over the fictitious passing of the family farm? The question answers itself. But then, so does much political propaganda.

Command In Northeast

Since the nomination of Wendell L. Willkie in 1940 to run against FDR's third term candidacy, the command post of the Republican party has been in the northeast. Some of the Goldwater enthusiasm in the Midwest and mountain states unquestionably is an excitement over the possibility of shifting the party's center of gravity westward.

Goldwater fans claim they can elect their man without the states of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and West Virginia in the northeast. They are willing, also, to concede to President Kennedy in 1964 Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Oregon and Nevada. They call California doubtful.

Objective observers have called Goldwater more conservative than Taft. But this does not imply membership in the John Birch Society or anything like it. There evidently are some millions of Americans who want no part of that society or its leaders but who believe the senator from Arizona is the newly discovered prophet for a holy political war against over-centralized, big spending, deficit government.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Sunday, Aug. 11, the 233rd day of 1963 with 142 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last phase.

The morning stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening stars are Mars and Saturn.

On this day in history:

In 1909, the first radio S-O-S in history was sent by a disabled ship off Cape Hatteras, N.C.

In 1919, Andrew Carnegie, the industrialist and philanthropist, died.

In 1933, Nazi storm troops demonstrated against German Jews.

In 1961, the United States recovered its first payload from a space satellite.

A thought for the day — Abraham Lincoln said: "Truth is generally the best vindication against slander."

EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .



Ex-Eisenhower Aides Map GOP Guidelines

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—Twenty-three top Eisenhower administration officials and supporters will go to work soon on a project to develop new Republican papers on foreign and domestic policies.

These documents are intended to guide the GOP in the 1964 election and beyond, with such revisions as are necessary to keep them up-to-date.

The group will function as the Critical Issues Council. Its sponsor is the Republican Citizens Committee, which was organized at a tent meeting on Ike's farm in June, 1962.

General chairman of CIC will be Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the former President's brother and president of Johns Hopkins University. Organization of the council was completed at an announced meeting of 13 of its members in Washington Aug. 1.

The group will be organized into a half dozen or more task forces whose chairmen will be announced soon after Dr. Eisenhower's return from Europe. He is accompanying Ike on his trip to revisit the Normandy beachhead.

This is in preparation for a 20th anniversary D-Day landing telecast on June 6, 1964. That will be five weeks before the GOP national convention is scheduled to open in San Francisco.

Each critical issues task force will prepare one or more policy papers in the general fields of national defense, foreign affairs, science, economics, education, human relations and agriculture.

One principal purpose will be to build up independent and conservative Democratic support for the Republicans.

This effort will have no direct connection with either the present Republican leaders in Congress or the GOP National Committee.

Don C. Frey, executive director of the sponsoring Republican Citizens Committee, says it will maintain close liaison with both.

but the principal emphasis will be to make this strictly a private citizens' activity.

In this respect it will be completely unlike the 1960 Republican Committee on Program and Progress which operated under the chairmanship of Charles H. Percy of Chicago and which prepared a pocket book of 12 papers titled "Decisions for a Better America."

It had some impact on drafting the 1960 Republican platform. But the major decisions on that were really made in the famous pre-convention meetings between Vice President Richard M. Nixon and New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

Neither of these officials, nor any of the other 13 GOP presidential possibilities now crowding the political horizon, will have anything to say about the Critical Issues Council papers.

Anyone having any bright ideas to contribute to this Republican brains trust is asked to communicate with Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Critical Issues Council, 1625 K St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

His group includes five former cabinet members. They are Robert N. Anderson, Marion S. Folsom, Thomas S. Gates, Oveta Culp Hobby and James P. Mitchell.

For military experts he has Adm. Arleigh A. Burke and Gen. Lauris Norstad. His ex-members of Congress are Clare Boothe Luce and Dr. Walter Judd.

Eight former Eisenhower administration officials serving on CIC are Elliott V. Bell, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Albert L. Cole, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, Dr. Don Paarlberg, Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier and Adm. Lewis L. Strauss.

Republican Citizens directors serving with them will include Dr. Dean Malott, C. Wrede Petersmeyer, Samuel R. Pierce Jr., Charles S. Rhyne and Dr. Walter N. Thayer.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



Eggheads Drive For Liberal Trade Acts

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

A not-so-curious collection of dollar-hungry businessmen and ultra-liberal intellectuals continue to press for violent changes in U.S. policy toward Red China.

Both groups claim to be cheered by recent indications that the Administration wants a cultural window in the Bamboo Curtain. A minuscule group of American eggheads, longtime foes of Chiang Kai-shek, have formed the "Committee for a Review of Our China Policy."

They boast of a letter from Presidential assistant McGeorge Bundy citing the need for a constant review of our China Policy and deploring the fact that U.S. newsmen are barred from Red China.

Now the influential trade publication, Pacific Shipper, cites recent events to show the Administration is moving toward a more "realistic" policy. The publication is jubilant in saying:

"The political facade that stands in the way of trade and all formal relations with Red China—a formidable looking pile made out of papier-mache—at last shows signs of crumbling."

The publication cites "an apparently reliable report" that State Department officials have "no objections" to a Pacific Coast trade-promotion group conferring with the Red Chinese on grain and other commercial matters. Also:

"The National Security Council is said to have spoken up for cultural and commercial contacts with Communist China. Consequently, West Coast interests are planning on meeting in Hong Kong next November with Chinese spokesmen."

The publication, which claims to speak for West Coast shippers, wants trade, cultural exchange and normal diplomatic relations with Mao. Also, a "national policy in the Orient, formulated without benefit of anti-Communist hysteria or political expediency."

Sen. Milward Simpson, Wyoming Republican, is blunt. The Administration, he says, is violating the law. He cites federal statute after federal statute to show it is illegal for Administration employees to lobby for passage of favored legislation.

Title 18, Section 1913, of the Federal Code makes it a crime—punishable by one year in jail and a \$500 fine—to use federal monies to pay for "any advertisement, telegram, telephone call, letter or printed matter."

Sen. Milward Simpson, Wyoming Republican, is blunt. The Administration, he says, is violating the law. He cites federal statute after federal statute to show it is illegal for Administration employees to lobby for passage of favored legislation.

Title 18, Section 1913, of the Federal Code makes it a crime—punishable by one year in jail and a \$500 fine—to use federal monies to pay for "any advertisement, telegram, telephone call, letter or printed matter."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What are pistol or snapping shrimps?

A—Small shrimps that have a very large pistol claw equipped with a snapping device which is most efficient as a defensive or offensive weapon.

Q—What determines the pitch of the human voice?

A—The size of the larynx. Women's voices are usually pitched higher than men's because their vocal cords are shorter.