

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Aiding Our Enemies

Should we continue to make foreign aid commitments which strengthen our enemies—that is, the communist bloc—and add to their cold war strength? Charles Stevenson, who writes on this subject in the August issue of The Reader's Digest, thinks the answer should be No—a thought which, needless to say, is shared by many other observers and commentators.

An effort is now underway in Congress to substantially reduce foreign aid appropriations, though the President, the Secretary of State and other top administration people still say that the \$4.5 billion asked for, amounts to the irreducible sum if the program is to achieve its goals. The chances are that this effort will be partially, perhaps substantially, successful. However, as Mr. Stevenson sees it, "... Simply reducing appropriations won't cure what's wrong with an aid organization which is in more trouble than ever after going through ten different administrators, five major reorganizations and more than 100 billion tax dollars." He quotes Eugene Black, former president of the World Bank, as saying, "None of our objectives has been achieved. Soviet influence remains at high tide. Our dispensations of money have won us neither gratitude nor affection, but more often grumbling dissatisfaction." And Chairman Passman, of the House Appropriations Committee, holds that "The trouble is that too much of our foreign aid has deteriorated into a subsidy of communist takeover."

Oddly enough, and despite the campaign for vast present and future foreign aid appropriations, the foreign aid program has an enormous unexpended balance on the books—money previously appropriated which, apparently, the administrators couldn't find a way to spend. Senator Byrd figures this reached a total of well over \$21 billion in June of this year.

As for helping our enemies, Mr. Stevenson

cites chapter and verse down a lengthy list. He quotes from the report of a committee appointed by President Kennedy, and chair-manned by General Lucius Clay, to advise on reforms. It said: "The United States should not aid a foreign government in establishing government-owned industries which compete with existing private endeavors. We should not extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition and knowledge of economic organization and consequences."

This statement of principle has been violated time and time again. Big commitments have been made to India for what Mr. Stevenson terms "socialistic experiments." Other commitments go to Yugoslavia, which generally is found in the anti-Western, pro-Communist camp on major matters of policy. So it is with Poland which has sent aid, made possible by our aid, to Castro's Cuba and North Vietnam. The Polish shipments to the latter reportedly have included arms. So it goes with Brazil, the United Arab Republic, Ceylon, and a long list of other countries. One way or another, by direction or indirection, the communist world is steadily strengthened.

What is the solution? Mr. Stevenson praises the suggestion of Chairman Champion of New York's Chase Manhattan Bank, who would have us join with other friendly nations in establishing an independent banking-type organization to administer aid, staffed with professionals from the banking and private enterprise world. He concludes: "The means for getting such an operation under way already exists within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in which most Western nations and Japan participate. All that's needed is for Congress not to be content with cutting aid appropriations, but to order a phase-out of our current aid operations and establish a special joint Congressional committee which can at last start working toward a new order."



HOLMES ALEXANDER ...

Russians Buying Time?

By HOLMES ALEXANDER
Although the Nuclear Treaty officially would ban nothing except above-ground testing, the feeling runs on Capitol Hill that the Administration may extend the principle to ban all testing everywhere.

There are Senators who would vote for the treaty if they felt that it would positively give us uninhibited experiments underground. Important work can be carried out in caves on the whole spectrum of tactical weapons—on medium-yield strategic weapons, on abstract applications of anti-missile missiles and on the Neutron bomb.

True, nothing can take the place of environmental shots. To get an anti-missile weapon we need to see how two bodies in high-speed motion can be brought into rendezvous in space. The Neutron bomb, although admirably suited to underground testing, will remain theoretical until exploded above-ground. Nevertheless, a number of on-the-fence Senators would accept these limitations—if that were all. But this worrisome thought has been cautiously expressed:

"The soft-headed Administration advisers on weapons had already persuaded the President to curtail underground testing. These disarmers argued that even though underground explosions did not poison the air we breathe they did poison the atmosphere in the negotiating councils. Since these councils will continue to sit—and to seek absolute nuclear disarmament—will we, in fact, proceed with all-out testing under the ground?"

That is one largely unspoken and unresolved doubt about treaty ratification. Another is psychological. All three of the Atomic Age presidents have vowed to defend this country and the Western World with nuclear arms, if necessary. As late as last October, Mr. Kennedy made this sufficiently clear to Khrushchev in the Cuban confrontation. But does not our eagerness to meet Khrushchev's terms on a partial ban represent a weakening of our will to use the nuclear deterrent?

There is even talk that the Sino-Soviet quarrel, which seemingly caused Khrushchev to offer his terms to the Anglo-Saxons, is a gigantic hoax. Few Senators understand the dialectical deviations which Mao and Khrushchev are fusing about, but they remember

that the Russians are very adept at "buying time." They bought it by signing a non-aggression pact with Hitler. They bought it by pretending to go along with the nuclear moratorium which they ended in September 1961. Earl Voss points out in his excellent book "Nuclear Ambush" that the Japanese used time-buying tactics against us by dispatching "negotiators" to Washington in 1941



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

The most devastating critique that can be made against extremist movements is a very simple and yet deadly one: without exception, they lack a sense of humor.

Whatever the political, economic, or intellectual flaws in such doctrines as communism and fascism, the really telling charge against them is a kind of ferocious solemnity that is at bottom alien to the human spirit. No humor, no satire, no nonsense, can flourish in a country, or in a movement, that views life in black-and-white only.

A few weeks ago, for instance, the official Communist Party newspaper in Italy attacked the American comic strip, "Peanuts," for its depiction of characters ranging from the "suicidal" to the "stupid." One of the cartoon characters was even stigmatized as a "fascist."

And, of course, in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, no real humor was ever permitted. For genuine humor is the eternal enemy of all pomposity, all officialdom, all fanaticism, all the political creeds and doctrines and dogmas that strive to become, in one way or another, state religions.

We all know that artistic expression dries up in a totalitarian country; writers and painters and musicians, who are by nature rebels, cannot produce in response to official decrees. What is even more significant, however, is that the sense of humor atrophies in such an environment: people are afraid to be funny.

This is a worse enslavement

while synchronizing their strike at Pearl Harbor and throughout the West Pacific.

It is not too much to say that a number of soul-searching Senators are hoping that the scientific-military witnesses before the Armed Services Committee will give them technical reasons for opposing the treaty—reasons that will allow intuitive suspicions and misgivings to go unspoken.

STRICTLY PERSONAL

than the economic injustices that Marx inveighed against. The slavery of the intellect, of the spontaneous emotions, is more killing than any of the capitalist excesses of the 19th century. It is one of the wry paradoxes of Marxism that it made men "free" for more dullness and drabness and conformity than they had ever known before.

The most effective way to combat the extremists is with humor and satire and parody; and a democratic nation that begins to limit and censor its satirists has already fallen under the corrupting blight of totalitarian attitudes. Mocking self-criticism in a nation is a sign of health, not of sickness; the hand that salutes the flag must also be free to thumb its nose at those who wave the flag for venal or hypocritical reasons.

Freedom of speech must include the freedom to speak impertinently, or it means nothing; it must include the freedom to laugh at, the freedom to deflate the important, deride the orthodox, and dissect the "received wisdom" of the people. Otherwise, we lose the capacity, and the will, to correct our national stance when it slumps or sways.

The best method of testing the strength of a doctrine is by subjecting it to humor and irony and burlesque. The extremist movements invariably fail this test, for they are based on a grimly unyielding view of man's nature. Exposed to shafts of comedy, these doctrines turn nasty, brutish and violent. Which, of course, they always were in the beginning.

"Just Leave the Loot---We're Above It All!"



Letters To The Editor

One-Sided

We have been reading considerably, pro and con, regarding religious teachings in our public schools. Prayer is now unconstitutional, any mention of religion is offensive, it isn't proper for the baccalaureate services to be held in a church or for a minister to offer prayer at the beginning or the end of the service.

Intelligent people are objecting to these things because they say they are unconstitutional or that they have become personally offensive to them, and they object to their children being taught anything that might pertain to God.

I've often wondered why this controversy has been so one-sided. I, as a Christian parent, will certainly object to my child, when he becomes of school age, being taught by an atheist or a Communist, which I believe I'm very safe in saying that we have in some of our classrooms today. There are teachers in the schools today who ridicule the Bible and all its teachings, laugh to scorn any child who goes to church, and literally make a public example of any child who will stick up for what he or she believes is right, religiously. Every day our children are being told that the Bible is nothing but a fairy tale or just a silly old Greek fable; every day they are looked down on because they profess a Christian experience; every day they are told they came from a fish or an ape and that Khrushchev is doing, or has done, as much for the world as Christ ever did. Many boys and girls have entered high school or college with a strong faith in God and good decent principles and through atheistic and Communist teaching have come out of school with no faith at all.

They say that Christianity should only be taught in the home. I agree, but why can't those other views be taught in the home as well? Why do we have to be so one-sided about all this? It seems that everything decent has become unconstitutional and everything rotten is being praised to the sky.

I believe that we, as Christian parents, have as much to be concerned about as anyone else as to what is being taught in the classrooms. Why are just the views of the non-religious people recognized? Who are they, that they have become the voice of the people? Doesn't anyone else count? Don't we have a right to object about things that offend us? Or has it become unconstitutional to be a Christian?

If the religious views cannot be brought up or talked about in the classroom, why I ask, do our children have to sit and take it while all this other rot is being taught? No, why not clear the classrooms entirely and just go back to "Reading, 'Rit'n' and 'Rithmetic."

A belief in Communism or being an atheist will certainly do more harm to mankind than a mere, simple yet sincere belief in God. You can be sure of one fact: No Christian will ever advocate the overthrow of the United States government, or will ever have anything to do with any movement that is in any way subversive. No atheist can make this statement and remain truthful.

The Bible says that only a fool saith in his heart, there is no God.

Rev. Dale Loving,
Forest Grove.

Grateful

On Tuesday, Aug. 6, about 5:30 p.m. I had a flat tire on the Lake of the Woods highway. A man in a red pickup truck stopped to help me and would not take payment for his kind deed.

I'm sorry I didn't get his name. Perhaps he'll see this letter and know again how much I appreciated his courteous assistance. My visitors from New York State were impressed by his thoughtfulness, and I was too.

Carolyn Alotrico

Good Show

I wish to commend the wonderful people who represented the east of the Water Sports Festival.

It was truly wonderful! We all enjoyed it immensely, and now shall look forward to next year's show.

The beautiful and graceful girls and the handsome young men and the lovely music were much appreciated by the crowd.

Many thanks to the grand Red Cross group—we really liked your colorful and exciting show.

Mrs. Lorna Graves,
1434 Lakeview Street.

No Questions

We hope the person or persons who took the horseshoes from Ward Park will return them to the children's playground as they were given to the children. Some were also taken two years ago and never returned. It took us two years to collect the 14 shoes and now there are none left.

Maybe, who took them forgot to return them, or maybe they plan a horseshoe party. Just bring them back, anytime and no questions will be asked. Please.

Harry L. Ward,
Ward Park Caretaker.

Not Alone

I am deeply disturbed by the state of our nation today. Increased racial tensions, fiscal irresponsibility, a Communist Cuba, loss of states' rights—these are the accomplishments of the liberal New Frontier. I am sick of this kind of "progress," but we will get more of the same by continuing to vote for liberal candidates forced on us by our Democratic party and the liberal minority of the Republican party. We must have a conservative in the White House in 1964, or face national chaos and confusion.

The Democratic party is so thoroughly indoctrinated in liberalism that we must depend on the conservative majority of the Republican party to provide us with an honest choice of candidates—not a liberal versus a liberal, but a conservative versus a liberal. I see Barry Goldwater as the one man who can fight the New Frontier and win! Apparently I am not alone in this belief. I understand that over 60,000 petitions are being circulated by "Citizens for Goldwater," Valley Forge, Pa., urging the Republican convention to nominate the Senator for President. This group also provides all kinds of material and helps for organizing local Goldwater groups. I have already sent in my own request, and it occurred to me that many of your readers might wish to do so, too.

My conscience simply will not let me sit by and watch my

beloved country being torn to shreds by men who have tried to make a dirty word of patriotism and attempted to reduce the meaning of our Constitution to an absolute nothing.

I declare myself here and now as a Southern Democrat for Sen. Barry Goldwater, and I intend to see him through to victory!

Mrs. M. G. Price

Petitions

Some deal this rushing through by the legislature, the \$48 million income tax increase. Wonder if most people realize what this will mean to them, if the legislature has its way as well as some well known lobbyists of Salem?

What are the times coming to when deals like this are rushed through so the people can't perform their rights to vote?

Do the legislators feel we aren't intelligent enough to vote on tax issues? I'd like them and the world to know I can still make my X and vote.

Also, Mr. Editor, I'm sending for some of Mr. Howard's petitions to help get this on the ballot. As time is short, anyone wishing to sign them may do so at 2804 South Sixth Street.

Mrs. B. J. Squires,
2804 South Sixth Street.

Help

The Sanctuary, a refuge for homeless dogs on an old hill-farm, comes again with asking hand. I, who am the staff, take new courage as summer comes over the land. First, I would thank all who have helped in the years just past. I would like you to know how responsible I feel in the use of the things you have sent and how much comfort they have given.

We need food (of any sort), old blankets (or pieces), old sheets and towels. Just about anything can find a place here and will be used with care and appreciation.

Cold noses and warm hearts remember!

Louise Wood,
The Sanctuary,
Route 2, Wilbur Road,
Martinsville, Ind., 46151.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Now—may we show you some sincere socks to go with the sincere tie?"

EDSON IN WASHINGTON ...

Cold Chicken War Threatens Trade Act



By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent
WASHINGTON (NEA)—Ten months after passage of the Trade Expansion Act that was supposed to make the American export business boom, U.S. negotiations with the European Common Market on tariff reductions are in a bad way.

Negotiation of an East-West nonaggression pact with Russia is beginning to look simple by comparison with getting the European countries to reduce their tariffs on frozen poultry imports from the United States.

Three principal causes are given for this cold chicken war. First is the Common Market's refusal to admit Britain as a member.

The second factor is that the six countries in the European Economic Community—EEC—have never given Common Market authorities full power to negotiate for all of them. This gives every member a veto power over tariff reductions.

Finally, the European governments want to retain the European poultry market for their own small farmers, barring competition from American poultrymen.

All this was supposed to be worked out by early August. But France and West Germany in particular refused to allow tariff cuts on American poultry imports. This means that the issue will have to go before General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT negotiations. They are scheduled to open in Geneva in September.

Also scheduled for September is President Kennedy's submission to the U.S. Tariff Commission of the long list of articles on which this country will propose across-the-board tariff reductions of up to 50 per cent, under the new trade law.

The Tariff Commission is given six months in which to advise the President on economic effects of these cuts.

During this same period, a U.S. Trade Information Committee of seven government department representatives will hold hearings on the proposed cuts. Here any American business firm may file objections to any proposed changes in tariff rates.

Actual negotiation of these changes with the Common Market countries is now set for May 4, 1964. Most of the difficulty is expected in negotiating tariffs on agricultural products.

U.S. industrial goods trade with the six Common Market countries balanced roughly at \$3.5 billion each way in 1962. But last year the U.S. exported \$12 billion in agricultural products to the Common Market countries and imported only \$250 million worth from them. This gave the U.S. a favorable trade balance of nearly \$1 billion it wants to keep.

American poultry exports of \$20 million U.S. value and \$50 million at European wholesale levels in 1962 is a relatively small item, but it causes the most trouble. Over 90 per cent of these exports went to Germany, where tariffs have been raised from four to 16 cents a pound since 1953. The rate is now 10 cents a pound on value of the poultry itself, plus six cents feed grain differential.

European refusal to lower such tariffs may be the beginning of a trade war. This is the British reaction to U.S. trade czar Christian A. Herter's announcement of hearings to open Sept. 4 on retaliatory increases of U.S. tariffs.

If retaliatory increases are put into effect on both sides of the Atlantic, the whole purpose of the Trade Expansion Act will be defeated.

WASHINGTON REPORT ...



By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Natives of Kenya and Tanganyika, Guinea and Ghana, huddled around their radios not so long ago to get the lowdown on politics in far-off America. This, in effect, is what they heard:

—Sen. Thomas Dodd, a member of the Democratic Party from Connecticut, is a leader of the extreme right reactionary wing of the American political spectrum. He is spiritual heir to the late Sen. Joe McCarthy, whose great capacity for untruths destroyed many hundreds of careers and drove many people to suicide.

—Before his downfall, in 1954, McCarthy charged his own President, Dwight Eisenhower, with treason. Picking up McCarthy's mantle, Senator Dodd has distinguished himself by attacking everything progressive in American life. Having killed off all progressive Americans, Senator Dodd has turned his fire on progressive Africans, namely Kwame Nkrumah, President of Ghana.

The above account was sent into every corner of Africa by the powerful transmitters of Nkrumah's Radio Accra. The self-declared President-for-life, who last year received \$130 million in U.S. foreign aid, is angry because Dodd, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, released a report in which he called Nkrumah a dedicated Communist.

The frenzied attack of Radio Accra differs in tone from an attack by The New York Times. A Times editorial read:

"The irresponsibility of the

statement is obvious from the fact that even Senator Dodd only claims to have talked to one man who is a respected Ghanaian opposition leader in exile, Dr. Kofi Busia."

First of all, Senator Dodd did not "talk" to Dr. Busia. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee heard Dr. Busia's sworn testimony. Its investigators uncovered more than 100 documents indicating Nkrumah's Communist ties.

Among them: reports of British commissions of inquiry, detailing Nkrumah's early Communist activities; and a top-secret report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of West Africa identifying Nkrumah as a Communist.

Also included in Dodd's report were Nkrumah's own writings in which he revealed his philosophy as one of Marxism-Leninism. Included were detailed accounts of the subversive activities of Communist agents working out of Ghana.

"I share the belief of The New York Times," Senator Dodd wrote the paper, "that grave harm can be done by reckless or exaggerated charges against foreign governments or their leaders. I believe that my own record will show that I have not made any indiscriminate charges of communism against heads of foreign governments."

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Friday, Aug. 16, the 228th day of 1963 with 137 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening stars are Mars and Saturn.

On this day in history:

In 1781, the federal government prohibited union states from trading with the confederacy.

In 1896, gold was discovered in the Klondike.

In 1921, the Carnegie Steel Corporation established the eight-hour work day.

In 1945, Winston Churchill said that the atomic bomb had saved the lives of 1,250,000 British and American soldiers.

A thought for the day—playwright Henrik Ibsen said: "The spirit of truth and the spirit of freedom—they are the pillars of society."