

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Towns Eliminate Parking Meters

The fellow who has, through the years, resented the parking meter is beginning to get some sweet revenge. More towns are experimenting to see if removal of the meters will help downtown merchants.

The businessmen located in downtown areas say the meters are driving customers to shopping centers. They want 'em removed. That they are getting results in their demands is seen in the removal of meters in St. Petersburg. Now Phoenix City, Ala., has done away with collections for the summer and Valdosta, Ga., is going to conduct a three-months' trial by covering the gadgets.

In agreeing to cover up the meters, Valdosta city officials took action to discourage overtime parking. They raised the amount of the fine from \$1 to \$2.

There appears to be sound argument for the removal of the metered parking. There are ever-increasing numbers of shopping centers where parking is free. And easy. So the little woman drives the six blocks to the center rather than feed a nickel to the machine.

Now that merchants are beginning to get their way about easing machine parking requirements, we hope they'll refrain from driving their cars, as well as those of employees to a space directly in front of the store and occupying it all day. And we hope the cops on the beat will not be lenient on the merchants simply because they get a free cigar, a cup of coffee or a free lunch. If the meters are removed the merchants' cars should be tagged and tagged good and frequent.

The Negro's Real Interests

(The Christian Science Monitor)

Plans for a "march on Washington" appear to be taking more reasonable form than when they were first publicized. Negro leaders at a meeting in New York have emphasized that there is no plan for anything other than an orderly pilgrimage to the capital on the part of as many as may turn out on August 28.

Any group of people have a right to present their views to their senators and representatives or to call attention to grievances by peaceful demonstration. Were they to carry this to the point of sit-ins which impeded the work of Congress, the effect might be adverse rather than favorable. Good legislation is not made by mob pressure, and lawmakers properly resent suggestions of operating under intimidation.

Essentially the civil rights battle is a contest between minorities. The threat of a filibuster, which might be galvanized by an extreme bill of public accommodations, is of course a defensive device on the part of Southern whites. Yet senators who are on the fence about invoking cloture of debate may reasonably look forward to occasions when legitimate interests of other minorities might be imperiled.

One of the most serious apprehensions about the present situation is that a ding-dong fight about an extreme form of public accommodations bill might tie up legislation, especially in the upper house, to the extent that virtually nothing of pending programs would get enacted.

If, for example, the Senate Finance Committee should decide to hold very prolonged hearings on a tax reduction bill (assuming passage by the House), the present session

might run into 1964 without action on that important subject. And the well-being of Negroes would be one of the chief sufferers from the delay.

One of the objects of the march to Washington, according to spokesmen, is to call attention to the plight of the Negro worker, one of the worst sufferers from unemployment. Yet the nation's most active hope for reducing unemployment in general and among Negroes in particular is in the economic tax to be expected from a definitive cut in tax load on business, consumers, and investors.

Though important as a matter of dignity, the number of Negroes affected by discrimination in restaurants and hotels is relatively small. On the other hand, the number of those who might find new jobs or be recalled to work as a result of a widespread pickup in business activity could easily run into tens of thousands.

Probably all but the public accommodations section of the administration civil rights bill can be obtained with filibustering sufficient to override an incipient filibuster. This would include significant protections of the right to vote. It may even be that the application to hotels and restaurants can be so delimited as to avert a stalemate.

But if Negro leaders—and rank and file—think through the matter of what will most effectively serve their interest, they surely will come to some helpful conclusions. Among these, it may be submitted, is the proposition that their own long-run interest will be better served by a presentation that aids the orderly handling of legislation than by one that ends in a clashing of congressional gears.



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

A Call To Greatness

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

Can a Congress, like a man, have greatness thrust upon it? If so, the 86th, now in session, may go into history wearing entirely unexpected laurels.

For the thrusting of responsibility took place when, twice in mid-summer, the President asked for radical, epoch-making or breaking measures. The first was one of social upheaval in the name of racial equality, and the second was one of voluntary disarmament in circumstances more perilous than any war we ever fought. How Congress reacts in the weeks ahead to these challenges will prove its capacity for greatness.

Let us step back to say that the 86th was not born great. It came into being last November in the emotional turmoil of the Cuban confrontation. The melodramatic crisis undoubtedly diverted the voters' attention from the patent failure of the New Frontier's domestic and foreign policies. It called upon the electorate to support the President's belated and subsequently unsatisfactory ultimatum to Khrushchev.

Nor did the 86th, with its huge Democratic majorities, achieve greatness on its own initiative. Deep into August, its Majority and Minority leadership has failed the prime parliamentary purpose of legislating. Mansfield and McCormack, like Evie and Charlie, haven't found the handle that turns on the power-switch.

But who can say that the power isn't there? And what is Congressional greatness, anyhow? I take it that the First Congress,

which wrote the Bill of Rights that became the first 10 Amendments to the Constitution, stands at the top. In more recent times, when the worst problem we had was Labor, the 80th Congress legislated the Taft-Hartley Act over a presidential veto.

Neither Senator Taft nor Congressman Hartley was officially in the position now occupied by Mansfield, McCormack, Dickson or Halleck. Leadership came up from the floors, up from the committees. Similarly, when the Labor-Management Act was significantly updated a decade afterward, it bore the name of non-leadership men: Landrum and Griffin.

In the early 1930's, during the 72nd Congress, we had another spurt of greatness, surmounting a presidential veto, with the McCarran Act for Internal Security. Again, a mere committee chairman, Senator McCarran (Nev.) of Judiciary, and a front-row leader, performed the needed service.

My thesis emerges by now. The 86th Congress will find its greatness by accepting the responsibilities thrust upon it. This can be done by rewriting the Civil Rights Act and by revising the Nuclear Treaty. It will not do so by rubber-stamping these measures because the Administration says to do so. A House-Senate rewrite of the bill, and a Senate revision in the form of "reservations," will not be done by the men in the front seats. These things will have to be done, if they are done,

by non-leadership Congressmen and Senators who have the conviction, the knowledge and the force to make sure that the country gets what the hour of history demands on these two measures.

There are such men. I have heard them in committee and interviewed them in their offices, and put their names and ideas repeatedly, perhaps tediously, into this column over the past weeks. No need for another round of name-dropping. What matters now is to get these ideas clothed with Congressional action.

The 86th is not negative toward Civil Rights, as such, but it desires to better the lot of Negroes without clamping police state methods upon the whole population. It will take real legislative talent to accomplish what is desirable without swallowing what is undesirable. How? Perhaps, by a Constitutional Amendment. Perhaps, by a Marshall-type plan to improve the skills, education, income and citizenship of the underdeveloped Negro nation-within-a-nation.

And the treaty? The Senate is not going to reject it. But the Senate wants a treaty that will not freeze American disadvantages, not assume that Russian Communism has changed its spots, not legitimize Soviet conquests from East Europe to the Caribbean and not lead into a foolish disarmament spasm.

These assignments on Civil Rights and on the Nuclear Treaty are tough ones for the 86th. But greatness never comes easily.



THE GLOBAL VIEW . . .

Nehru's Two-Way Street

By LEON DENNEN

WASHINGTON (NEA) — American military and economic aid to India — "Yes, I want it." The Voice of America — "No, I don't want it."

This, in effect, sums up Prime Minister Nehru's latest policy of nonalignment.

India's "positive neutralist" has changed his mind about his recent agreement with the United States to set up a Voice of America radio transmitter in Calcutta. He now sees the agreement as an "infringement" of India's nonalignment policy.

Nehru actually said this to members of India's parliament.

The U.S. government, incidentally, earmarked the costly transmitter as another gift to the "people of India" — from the American taxpayers, of course. All the State Department asked in

return was the right to use it three hours a day to broadcast America's message to Southeast Asia.

There is fat irony in this new "diplomatic" mix-up. Nehru's second thoughts about the agreement coincided with an announcement by his foreign ministry that the U.S. also offered to provide India with "a set of radar installations and connected communication equipment." Did Nehru reject this offer because it would certainly jeopardize his "neutrality" even more than Voice of America broadcasts?

According to the Indian Embassy in Washington, "This offer has been accepted since radar coverage is the first requisite for effective air defense arrangements."

More than that, the United States also agreed to send quali-

fied personnel to train India's air force to master the use of this highly sophisticated equipment.

All this in addition to the massive economic and military aid the U.S. gave (and is giving) to India even while Krishna Menon backed Russia and Red China in the United Nations.

Thus, while Nehru has no reservations about accepting U.S. military aid, he fears that his neutrality might be questioned if he permits the Voice of America to broadcast the message of freedom and democracy from Indian soil.

The fact is that India, having been confronted with Red China's aggression, now views with even greater alarm than the U.S. the threat of Mao Tse-tung's expansionism.

For years Nehru turned a deaf ear to the American "imperialists" who warned him about Red treachery. Now, ironically, it is India's "neutralist" Prime Minister who is warning Washington about Mao's ambitions and how the West's interests coincide with India's.

However, in the view of Asian diplomats, there is much more to Nehru's new policy than simple self-defense. Pakistan, India's uneasy neighbor, is particularly disturbed about the massive military aid the U.S. is giving India.

Pakistan is a staunch ally of the West through the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO)—which Nehru never joined. Pakistan's President Ayub Khan even warned recently that this one-way buildup of Nehru's armed forces might force the weaker nations of Asia to look to Red China for protection.

But Ayub's warning seems to have cut little ice with President Kennedy's liberal advisers. Like Chester Bowles, the U.S. ambassador to India, they are convinced that Nehru is also a great liberal — "a major force for peace" — and can therefore do no wrong.

India's Prime Minister, in turn, is quoted as having said that U.S. officials, "particularly President Kennedy," fully understood and sympathized with India's so-called nonalignment.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Speaking of the old books found in summer houses, as I was the other day, reminded me that among the collection I ran across in my house were three or four volumes of the "Doctor Doolittle" books I used to read as a child.

I had long cherished the memories of these books, and it came as a shock to me a few years ago when I read in the newspaper that Hugh Lofting, their author, had just died at the comparatively early age of 54, or something like that.

When I read the books, in the middle 1920s, I conceived of the author as long dead, or at least as an old man with twinkling eyes and a fine Santa Claus beard. He seemed to me to combine the finest attributes of age and youth—the wisdom of the former and the spirit of the latter.

The "Doctor Doolittle" books remained in my mind long after the thousands of other children's books had vanished without a trace, because Lofting was one of the handful of authors who did manage to convey both understanding and merriment at the same time. He knew how to take serious things lightly, and light things seriously.

Nothing is easier to write than a child's book, and nothing is harder to write well. Each year thousands of such books come off the presses, in four colors, and most of them blur into one gray mass of indigestible coddles and archness and goody-goodness. My children despise such books wholeheartedly, and show good taste in doing so.

Most of these books are written by women (and by women with three names, which is even worse). And while women make admirable mothers and wives and sweethearts, they make terrible authors of children's books, as I have had occasion to remark before.

The reason, it seems to me, is that women mature in more ways than men do. Men remain children in certain areas (as every wife knows), and it is precisely this

STRICTLY PERSONAL

sprinkling of immaturity that enables them to achieve literary rapport with a child.

Women are strong on tales with a moral; they want to improve character, correct sloppy grammar, make sure that teeth are brushed and hands are clean and pajamas are properly buttoned. This is their conserving function of the world; this is how they hand down the tradition of rearing children.

But the best stories have no moral—or, at least, the moral is hidden and implicit. The best stories are a little soiled under the fingernails, and the buttons are done up every which way. If a woman had written "Alice in Wonderland," the White Rabbit would have washed Alice's face.

There are no Grimm Sisters, no female equivalent of Hans Christian Andersen, no Louisa Carroll. And if Hugh Lofting's sister had written the "Doctor Doolittle" books, she would have called him "Doctor Domore."

BERRY'S WORLD



"As your employer, Jenkins, I don't object to a little honest moonlighting—but THIS!"



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Long Fight Coming On Nuclear Treaty

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Opposition to U.S. Senate ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty with Britain and Russia is expected to be bitter and prolonged. Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which has legislative jurisdiction over ratification, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee may run a month or more.

After that will come several weeks of debate in the Senate. Ratification may not come before October.

The Kennedy administration, from the President on down, believes there will be no great problem in getting ratification by the required two-thirds of the Senate. But the aim is to get approval by 60 or 90 senators to show the world that the country is overwhelmingly in support of the treaty.

Key witnesses probably will be the Joint Chiefs of Staff and top atomic scientists who have played major roles in developing the American nuclear weapons arsenal.

They are not expected to be unanimous in their opinion. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, are likely to support the administration's point of view.

Army, Navy and Air Force chiefs may express dissent as they have in the past.

A majority of the atomic scientists are known to feel there is more danger to humanity from the fallout of continued atmospheric testing than there is risk in even an imperfect test ban treaty.

One notable exception to this view is Dr. Edward Teller, generally regarded as father of the hydrogen bomb development. He has written a letter to every member of Congress saying that under the proposed test ban:

"We could not control Russian atmospheric tests if these tests stay well below one kiloton (the equivalent of 1,000 tons of TNT). Use of clean explosives may permit even bigger Russian experimentation. Such small tests could be decisive in developing missile defense, a field of utmost importance in which the Russians may already have a considerable lead."

"There is little doubt that the Russians are ahead of us in big nuclear explosions," adds Teller. "A ban on atmospheric tests would perpetuate this situation."

"Only after the Russian tests and boasts of 1961 did we become fully aware of the fact that in these fields we are at a disadvantage and that the disadvantage could become fatal," concludes Teller. "We may now be involved in another move which will make the disadvantage permanent and which in the field of missile defense may give added opportunity to the Russians."

A principal critic of the test ban treaty in Congress and an advocate of Teller's views is Rep. Craig Hosmer, R-Calif. He is a wartime naval officer, later an Atomic Energy Commission attorney, now a Joint Atomic Energy Committee member.

Last May Rep. Hosmer proposed a test ban treaty of his own which would have allowed each side about a dozen fallout-free underground tests annually.

The treaty which Undersecretary of State Averell Harriman negotiated at Moscow goes far beyond what Hosmer proposed. It allows not just 12, but unlimited underground testing by the United States, Britain and Russia.

Production of nuclear materials is not stopped. Stockpiling of nuclear weapons is not stopped. The United States may resume atmospheric, underwater and outer-space testing at any time national security is threatened. Finally, the U.S. is given veto power over treaty amendments.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Test Ban Treaty Could Be Shocker

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

On a bitter cold December night this winter, hordes of Red Chinese and North Korean troops may pour across the 38th parallel.

Soldiers of the South Korean and U.S. Armies, greatly outnumbered, will retreat down the peninsula, as they did once before, 13 years ago.

In all-night sessions at the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs may decide it is necessary to use tactical nuclear weapons to halt the onrushing marauders. Then the shocker.

From the State Department may come word the military must wait 90 days before nuclear weapons can be used. The reason: A partial test ban ratified earlier by the U.S. Senate.

Preposterous? Not at all, according to legal experts who have studied carefully the treaty brought back from Moscow by Averell Harriman. That document outlaws not only nuclear tests but "any other nuclear explosions," as well. The only exceptions are underground explosions that release no fallout.

The Moscow treaty, now under Senate study, provides any signatory must give three months advance notice before it can withdraw and test or use nuclear weapons.

There are other loopholes. Suppose the Soviet Union violates the treaty by embarking upon a full-scale test program without giving three months advance notice. Legal experts say the United States must still wait three months before it can test. Otherwise the United States would be violating the treaty, which remains in effect, and is, the Constitution says, "the supreme law of the land."

The treaty may be abrogated, but this can be a lengthy and arduous task, requiring action by both Houses of Congress. Says Thomas J. Norton, in his definitive work, "The Constitution of the United States: Its Sources and Its Application": "Once a treaty is made, it requires both branches of Congress to abrogate it; that is, the President and the Senate cannot undo their work."

Note: Minnesota Sen. Hubert Humphrey, never known as much of an economist, used several thousand dollars of the taxpayer's dough the other day when he inserted in the Congressional Record 37 pages of editorial comment favoring the test ban.

Cost to the taxpayers at \$88 a page: \$3,256.

A New York Congressman, shocked to learn Uncle Sam is taking back still another Korean

War turncoat, has introduced remedial legislation. Republican Paul Fino has proposed automatic forfeiture of the citizenship of turncoats like Lowell D. Skinner, who returned last week.

"It is disgraceful," says Fino. "To think that Korean War turncoats who thought more of the enemy than the United States, should be permitted and allowed to return to this country and continue to enjoy all of the benefits and privileges of American citizenship."

"A dishonorable discharge, in my opinion, is not sufficient punishment for these turncoats. Only forfeiture of citizenship would adequately take care of these characters who preferred Communist China to the freedom of our country."

Skinner has sold his story to a TV network. In addition, he will receive \$1,700 in Army back pay.

Arab nomads will soon be smoking American cigarettes, courtesy of the U.S. Food for Peace program. From Aug. 13 to Dec. 31, American ships will carry 1,000 metric tons of domestic leaf tobacco and assorted tobacco products to Cairo. Cost to taxpayers: \$1.6 million.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Monday, Aug. 19, the 231st day of 1963 with 134 to follow.

The moon is at its new phase.

The morning stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening stars are Mars and Saturn.

Those born today include elder statesman Bernard Baruch, in 1870.

On this day in history:

In 1915, two Americans were killed when a German U-boat torpedoed the British liner Arabic.

In 1934, Germany voted that Adolf Hitler would be the official successor to President Von Hindenburg.

In 1955, the worst flood in northeastern United States killed 290 persons and destroyed or damaged 79,000 homes.

In 1960, U-2 pilot Francis Powers was convicted of espionage in the Soviet Union.

A thought for the day—American author Anne Morrow Lindbergh said: "One can never pay in gratitude; one can only pay 'in kind' somewhere else in life."