

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Learn Now, Pay Later

As all parents with college-bound children know, the cost of higher education is reaching for the sky and shows no signs of leveling off.

A recent study by the University of Michigan reveals that the average annual bill for an American college student is \$1,550. In a few years we may look back and wonder if things were ever that inexpensive.

But right now, this sum of money (it is only an average; costs can be much higher at individual schools) looms as an insurmountable obstacle for far too many otherwise qualified high school graduates who are now going through a "summer of discontent" before reconciling themselves to the fact that college, through no fault of their own, is not for them.

Fortunately, there is another trend offsetting the gloom of this one: Sources of financial aid for students (over and above the traditional scholarships and part-time jobs) are increasing in number, size and availability.

Today, the financially hard-pressed student CAN get help in paying for his college education—not just the superior student, but the run-of-the-mill student whose grades are satisfactory.

Last year at Tulane University, for instance, 2,200 students—nearly half the full-

time enrollment—received financial aid from various sources totaling \$2 million.

The university itself makes loans running some \$400,000 yearly, on liberal terms. Other important sources include:

The National Defense Student Loan Program, under which needy students may borrow up to \$1,000 for one academic year and up to \$5,000 for the entire course of their higher education. They may take as long as 10 years to repay the loan, at 3 per cent annual interest, beginning a year after they graduate. In addition, those who go into teaching can get writeoffs of up to 50 per cent of the loan.

Private educational financing organizations also are playing a growing part. Under some plans, the family repays tuition loans in monthly installments.

Still another source is commercial banks. Loans can be negotiated on a long-term basis with interest usually lower than on other types of loans. An advantage here is that a family need not be "needy" but merely have a good credit record.

Thus, while college costs have increased tremendously, ways to meet those costs also have increased—thanks to national and local governments, public and private groups, profit and nonprofit organizations.

All are resolved that in America, no qualified young person be denied access to the best education he is capable of mastering.

Peace — Is It So Wonderful?

Even though we know the Russians too well to drop our guard, it must be admitted that it is a pleasant change from the Cold War to be on the receiving end of Russian effusions of friendship.

Relations between our two countries could not have been more cordial than they have the past few weeks. Our envoys to Moscow and those from Britain could not have been more warmly treated.

The signing of the nuclear test ban treaty, limited and imperfect as it is, makes worthwhile the seemingly fruitless years of argument that went before.

Assuming that the Soviets may intend to abide by the treaty, there is still the nagging suspicion that this sudden sweet reasonableness may not be quite genuine, that there is some ulterior reason which may, in the end, work to our harm.

The obvious answer is that Khrushchev is mending his fences facing the West because of deteriorating relations with the East—Red China. Knowledgeable observers seem to agree that the Russian about-face is genuine, that it does bode well for the future of mankind, and that we should take advantage of it.

Surely the vehemence with which the

Red Chinese have denounced the treaty—and Khrushchev and the Russian Communist party for signing it—indicates that the nuclear ban is hardly just part of a larger Soviet plot, any more than Gen. De Gaulle's maverick behavior is part of over-all Western strategy.

Whatever the truth may be, Americans are accepting the treaty with restrained relief. Opinion polls are almost unanimous in painting a picture of the man in the street who is wary and not exactly overjoyed, but is nevertheless hopeful that some good will come of it.

Americans' attitudes might be summed up as: "It's better than nothing." Or to paraphrase Churchill: "Ban ban is better than war."

Senate scrutiny of the treaty, we hope, will be thorough—although the cries of the Senate eggheads lead us to believe it will be anything but thorough.

"Peace" is wonderful—but we retain the skepticism that leads us to believe that the Russians will get the best of the bargain. We have little faith in Harriman and the other "peace at all costs" delegates that head our state department policy makers.



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Privilege And Humbug

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

There is one advantage to being usually in the minority opinion, as is the Republican party and your columnist. The conscientious dissenter has the exquisite privilege of truth-telling without the temptation to go pandering after popularity. On Capitol Hill the other day, Senator Everett Dirksen did himself proud by indulging in this privilege, while a large group of House Republicans did themselves dirt by casting it away.

Dirksen in the Senate's handsome conference room faced a 100-member, well-dressed, well-mannered delegation from the NAACP. As minority leader, he was there with other Republican senators because the GOP has always solicited Negro votes in the Northern cities and needs them next year as seldom before. But when Dirksen was chided in front of this audience for his opposition to the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights bill, he admirably refused to grovel for himself or his party. Instead, he said:

"You may not be satisfied with my approach, but I don't go around particularly trying to please everybody. I will adhere to

my conviction, and pursue it according to my rights."

Coming from a political leader, in the particular circumstances that now beset the Republicans, Dirksen's retort rang with echoes from Barbara Fritchie's "Shoot if you must this old gray head," and from Nathan Hale's "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country." It was nifty, it was honorable, it was right.

But at almost the same hour, Dirksen's colleagues in the House of Representatives were enacting a scene of bickering and hypocrisy on the same subject of racial politics. Before the House was the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to which there was a final opposition of only 21 votes.

Almost every member, that is, favored adding \$450 million during the next four years to the meagre \$57 million now being spent by the federal government to match state funds for vocational training. Yet, with honorable exceptions, the Republicans could not resist the temptation to put themselves falsely on record as pro-Negro and to baffle the well-known North-South rift in the Democratic party.

Accordingly the Republicans, al-

most, en masse, supported an amendment—named for Adam Clayton Powell—to provide that the funds be expended without regard to race, color, or creed. The provision, as everybody knew, was needless. The President has said he intends to spend the money that way, law or no law. But the Republican strategy, a weary-some trick by this time, was to attach the anti-discrimination amendment to the bill, curry a bogus favor with the Negroes, and hope that Southern Senators in what the House calls "the other body" would filibuster it into defeat.

In the latter case, of course, nobody would get the use of the much-needed, almost unopposed increase in Vocational Education. The amendment wasted nearly three hours in useless debate and was defeated 217 to 181.

It was an exercise in humbug, an exhibit of perversion in racial politics. The House Republicans ought to have formed a queue and kicked one another out of the chamber. They had, in contrast to Everett Dirksen, passed up the privilege of taking an honest position without pandering for anybody's approval. It's a privilege, if you're asking me, of inestimable worth.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Getting Goldwater

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

It seems like only a few weeks since Governor Nelson Rockefeller was lambasting the "radical right" and implying that Senator Barry Goldwater was both its idol and its ideologue. That didn't work in knocking the Senator out of the Republican Presidential stakes.

Few people among the GOP's rank-and-file accepted the Rockefeller charge, and it was clear that an attempt at making the Goldwater position and John Birchism synonymous would get nowhere.

The next push came from other sources. To believe them, Barry Goldwater was a racist with an anti-Negro record. Pickets were sent out to a number of choice locations—including the Senator's home state of Arizona—to spread the word. Most people yawned.

Therefore, a new line is now being displayed. It is, perhaps, more vicious than the others because no defense exists against it. It goes like this:

Senator Goldwater is not a member of the "radical right." He is not a racist. But he can't carry the South, a necessary condition to victory, because the



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

"Crops are grown in the country," said an ancient Roman writer, "and words in the city." Language does not spring from the soil, but from the stones of urban communities; and most languages have an inbuilt bias against the rustic.

Consider the word "villain." Today it means simply an evil man, a wrong-doer. But originally a villain was a serf or peasant, who was attached to the "villa," or farm.

Because the arbiters of language in those days regarded the farmers as churlish, rude, and bestial, the word "villain" came to be applied to anyone having those characteristics.

"Boor" has the same snobbish history. At first it meant any cultivator of the soil; subsequently it came to mean any person who was coarse and unmannerly. The same is exactly true for "churlish." Ancient monasteries, as well as schools, were responsible for the class-consciousness of language. It is not widely known, for instance, that "pagan" was first a villager, as opposed to a townsman. It was not thought that the villagers could be good Christians, and only late in its life did the word come to mean a heathen.

"Clow" is also a word originally designated for a rural person. A "knav" was once simply a servant—then it came to mean any rascal who could not be trusted. And when we say that a person is "uncivil," we are really saying that he is not city-bred, that he lacks the cultivated manners of an urban dweller.

It is one of the ironies of modern society—at least, since the Industrial Revolution—that the village has been growing more uncivil. As the city increased in size, it reached and passed its optimum point of "civility."

Shakespeare, in his "A Midsummer Night's Dream," refers to the "rude mechanics"—the rural

"radical right" and the racists hate him. He doesn't stand a chance—and at this point you can hear the speaker tut-tut sadly—because he has a Jewish grandfather. It's a shame that people should be so bigoted, the viewer-with-sadness says, but after all that's a fact of life.

It may be that anti-Semitism will defeat Senator Goldwater. When John F. Kennedy was running for the Presidency, he made his Catholicism help rather than hurt by making an issue of it. His campaign workers, in their word-of-mouth propaganda, more than implied that those who opposed Mr. Kennedy were anti-Catholic and beyond the pale.

But Senator Goldwater does not intend to use this strategy. Those working for him know that he does not want them to so much as mention the religious issue.

Even if the bigots are silenced, however, there are others who normally would show disgust at this method of winning elections but who are not above it. For some time, members of the Washington press corps have been aware that a well-liked Texas Congressman has made oblique use of the Jewish issue by carefully reminding constituents in his

newsletter of the religion of Goldwater's grandfather. The mention is made in the context of pointing out the equal opportunities offered by America.

Those correspondents who are most ecstatically and violently anti-conservative chortled at what they thought was a neat thrust. Others felt somewhat queasy about it. In the last days, however, a columnist close to President Kennedy (and who writes for a pro-Rockefeller newspaper) has mentioned the Congressional reference to Goldwater's grandfather.

It can be expected that anti-Semitism will play a growing part in the efforts of respectable political leaders to torpedo the Goldwater candidacy. I am sure that some of them will, with pious tears, deplore the campaign and disavow it. The very disavowal can be expected to do some damage.

But I suspect that it will do little harm in the South. Northern liberals tend to have a feverish and outlandish concept of the region below the Mason-Dixon line. If I am any judge, however, there is less anti-Semitism in the South than in any other part of the United States. It exists for the most part in the back country, not in the cities and the suburban areas on which Barry Goldwater must depend for support.

The American Nazi Party, George Lincoln Rockwell's rag-tag and bobtail group of tinhorn fascists, picketed the July 4 "Draft Goldwater" rally in Washington. There are other groups of similar ill-repute and unimportance which scatter seeds of hatred across the land. These groups, with their noxious publications, have had an increasingly diminishing impact on Americans—if only because the appeal is so hysterical and in such bad taste.

True, political analysts have seen a startling rise in Negro anti-Semitism over the last years. But since no Republican can be expected to get more than 3 per cent of the Negro vote (according to opinion surveys) and Senator Goldwater counts on an insignificant 2 per cent, this will not affect the course of history.

As of today, it is not the bigots who stand between Senator Goldwater and the Republican nomination—or the Presidency—but the liberals.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Yes . . . but does it have power asbrays?"



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

West Won't Gain In China, Soviet War

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent

Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

(Second of two columns)

on Russia-Red China split.)

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Warn-

ing flags already are being run

up against hope that the United

States somehow will make big

gains from the cold war be-

tween Soviet Russia and Red Chi-

na.

"This isn't a permanent split,"

cautions (former Rep. Walter H.

Judd, R-Minn., who still rates as

one of the few remaining "old

China hands" around Washington.

This is just a rift between a

couple of Communist theoretic-

ians, Dr. Judd insists. It will be

decided by the accepted princi-

ples of Marxist practice.

"When it is all over, some-

body will have to walk the

plank," says Judd. "It may be

Mao or it may be Khrushchev.

"Whoever it is, the Communist

Party will still remain exactly

what it always has been. For

under the theory of 'democratic

centralism,' the party can never

be wrong. Only individual mem-

bers can be wrong."

Sizing up the two top antago-

nists in this rift, Judd points out

that many Communist cells around

the world have never accepted

Khrushchev's policy of de-Staliniz-

ation. Mao may have more sup-

port than he is credited with.

What Khrushchev is doing, there-

fore, in his test ban treaty and

his proposals for a nonaggression

pact with the West is to protect

his rear while he wages ideologi-

cal war on his eastern front.

"This is my great fear," warns

Judd. "Remember that less than

a year ago, Khrushchev could

have destroyed the United States

from Cuba. There can be no peace

till communism itself fails.

"We can never relax until

Khrushchev takes steps that will

show he is genuinely interested in

permanent world peace."

Four acts that would show this

intent are listed as:

—End colonization in eastern

Europe as Russia now wants Per-

tugal to end its colonization in Af-

rica.

—Modify Communist doctrine on

world domination and concentrate

on better living for Russian peo-

ple.

—Completely withdraw Russian

support of Cuba.

—Settle the Berlin question by

allowing reunification of Germany

under free, democratic elections.

"There is too much day-to-day

thinking about our relations with

the Communists," says Judd in

summary.

"We go into a conference with

maintenance of the status quo as

our maximum objective. The Rus-

sians go into a conference with

that as a minimum objective. They

want more. We don't think far

enough ahead."

The likelihood that Khrushchev

eventually will purge Mao Tse-

tung is foreseen by Chinese Na-

tionalist sources on Formosa. If

that happens, it is expected that

Peking again will fall under Mos-

cow's domination.

Tao Hsi-sheng, chairman of the

Central Daily News of Taipei, sees

little possibility of Mao softening

his antiwestern attitude in an

attempt to consolidate his own

position and win allies to China's

side in opposition to Russia.

Resumption of talks Sept. 11 be-

tween American ambassador John

Moors Cabot in Warsaw and Red

Chinese ambassador Wang Ping-

nan after a four-month lapse is

interesting but not significant. The

talks have been going on for

eight years without result.

Red China's Premier Chou En-

lai has relayed to Washington

an invitation for a new world-wide

conference on disarmament. But

it is given even less standing than

French President Charles de

Gaulle's similar proposal.

President Kennedy declared, in

fact, at his last press conference

that a continuation of Red China's

present policies would lead to a

more dangerous situation in the

1970s than any faced by this coun-

try since the end of World War II.

There is no hope in that outlook.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Rockefeller Blasts Young Republicans

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

The man who wasn't there has

offered a less-than-penetrating

analysis of the recent Young Re-

publican National Convention.

Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller

turned down an invitation to ad-

dress the San Francisco conclave

for sound political reasons: His

appearance was a guaranteed

bomb.

Nevertheless, Rocky sounded off

the other day: "Every objective

observer at San Francisco has

reported that the proceedings there

were dominated by extremist

groups, carefully organized, well

financed and operating through

the tactics of ruthless, roughshod

intimidation. These are the tactics

of totalitarianism."

Rockefeller went on to charge

that supporters of Barry Gold-

water "disgracefully subverted" the

convention in electing Donald

"Buz" Lukens as National Chair-

man.

The record has been set straight

by E. Strother Smith, co-chair-

man of the Virginia YRs. Unlike

the New York governor, Smith

was in San Francisco. As a mat-

ter of fact, he and his fellow Vir-

ginians backed Charles McDewitt,

whom Lukens defeated for Na-

tional Chairman.

Virginia YR leaders authorized

Smith to write Rockefeller as fol-

lows:

"The Executive Committee of

the Young Republican Federation

of Virginia was truly shocked and

amazed to hear anyone with such

a position of trust and responsi-

bility as you have making such

a false and prejudiced re-

marks about a group which has

done so much toward the furth-

ering of Republican aspirations

across the United States as have

the Young Republicans."

Point by point, Smith dissected