

Editorial Page

Bigger Than Gigantic

Today, thanks to the challenge of communism, automation, expanding population and numerous other factors, people are more conscious than ever of the question of government vs. private enterprise.

A competition seems to be developing between the two which, at quick glance, promises to benefit all concerned—business, people and nation.

Sentimentally, private enterprise is the "good guy" in this country; big government is the "villain."

It's popular to praise the one and decry the encroachments of the other in general terms, much the same as it is safe to support morality and a "return to the old virtues" without explaining exactly what you mean.

But how many Americans realize that the largest single privately financed construction job in the nation's history—and probably the world's—is nearing completion? Next time someone laments over the rumored death of free enterprise, ask him to name this project.

The answer? The Colonial Pipeline —

the longest (2,600 miles), largest (39 to 36 inches in diameter) and most expensive (\$350 million) pipeline in existence.

It begins in Houston, Texas, swings through the southeast and then north through nine of the original 13 colonies, crossing streams and rivers, snaking through swamps, climbing mountains and spanning valleys.

The pipeline will end eventually in New York Harbor. Distance from Houston is 1,600 miles, with 1,000 miles of spurs along the way connecting major cities.

With more than 70 million motor vehicles in the United States, Americans consume petroleum and petroleum products at the rate of more than 10 million barrels a day. (One barrel contains 42 gallons.)

Later this year, the Colonial will begin moving an initial 600,000 barrels a day. It will take no less than 9 million barrels (or about 378 million gallons) just to keep the line filled.

No, we haven't yet reached the point where the government does everything.

'Sanctions' By Teachers

(The Christian Science Monitor)

Is teaching a profession or a trade? For many years the National Education Association has approached it from the standpoint of a professional society. More recently some teachers, particularly in large cities, have joined labor unions authorized to bargain for them.

Heretofore the easiest touchstone of difference has been the attitudes of the respective organizations toward a teachers' strike. For example, the United Federation of Teachers (affiliated with the AFL-CIO) is planning for a possible walkout this September in the New York City schools unless pay schedules and school staffs are improved.

Meanwhile, the recent NEA convention at Detroit walked right up to the question of applying "sanctions" if the Governor and Legislature of Utah fail to make more liberal provision for the schools in that state. A situation there has been shaping up for more than a decade which results in the state's lagging

almost 30 per cent behind the national average of expenditures per public school pupil.

Many teachers in Utah have said they will refuse to sign contracts this fall unless conditions are bettered, and the NEA may advise teachers in other states not to accept offers of employment there.

These are not ideal ways of arriving at standards of outlays for public education. But in organizations as large as the school systems of a state or a metropolis, group action appears inevitable. Whether a community gets professional standards or trade union standards or no standards in education depends much on public interest in education.

Teachers' organizations can become lobbies or pressure groups to an undesirable degree. But their interests usually lie in the direction of a community good—the best possible education for its children. A forward-looking citizenry usually can avert situations that foment either strike threats or sanctions



HOLMES ALEXANDER ...

Man In The Clutch

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Rulers of nations must sometimes "play God" and practice intervention that alters the course of natural or man-made law. It is a dangerous practice. It is only justified when the overriding wisdom of the action surmounts the hosts of disaster and ends in an ultimate good.

This prelude, I don't doubt, may be hyperbolizing, but let's see. I'm thinking about the Congressional action which postponed for 180 days a nation-wide railroad strike, with its expected unemployment of six million citizens and the disruption of our military and economic economy. In order to gain the postponement, Congress assented to the unsatisfactory practice of letting an Arbitration Board decide what to do about the work rules for feathered firemen and train crews.

This, or course, is not the democratic way or the way of collective bargaining under our Labor-Management Relation Laws. It is a bad precedent in that it removes these important questions from the threshold and from the battle place where the questions could be decided by a labor strike or a management decision to go temporarily or per-

manently out of business. But on these two issues, the railroad companies and the railroad workers had agreed to arbitration. On half a dozen other issues, both sides could not agree to arbitrate. They could only agree to continue negotiating without a work stoppage.

Congress is rarely in a position to substitute wisdom for precedent or for fundamental morality, but American Presidents often have been. Jefferson overreached both his principles and his authority when he made the Louisiana Purchase from Napoleon. Lincoln was on very firm Constitutional ground when he issued the Emancipation Proclamation. Theodore Roosevelt behaved like a piratical dictator when he seized the Isthmus of Panama, which is now the Canal Zone. Franklin Roosevelt stretched all the elastic out of the executive power when he declared 50 destroyers to be surplus property and traded them off to Britain to fight World War II.

Congress, because of its collective and deliberative nature, does not have the opportunities that Presidents have for cutting Gordian knots which might take too long to untangle. In this instance, Congress had before it a bad bill from the White House (to turn this labor dispute over to the Interstate Commerce Commission) and a strike deadline set for Aug. 29th, the day after the Negro March on Washington. Action seemed better than inaction.

In statecraft, as in sports, it sometimes happens that an obscure player steps into the stellar role and has his hour of glory. Professor Gale McGee (D., Wyo.), a lean liberalissimo on the Senate Commerce Committee, was the man in the clutch this time. The McGee Amendment was a one-shot arbitration measure, limited only to the two work rules disputes, calculated to achieve an emergency solution, fully cognizant of violating what McGee and many others regarded as a moral code—although in the national interest.

I went to see McGee and asked him to discuss his amendment, to which the Senate gave 90 affirmative votes and which be-

came law with the President's signature. McGee told me:

"We had decided to keep the heat on both sides, the railroad management and the Brotherhoods. We were determined to force them to settle without a strike. Having put our hands to the job, we were going to finish it."

"I hit upon the Aug. 12 agreement, where both sides agreed to partial arbitration, as the key to a solution. My amendment was intended to end the attrition of impotency, caused by this Labor-Management deadlock. By making it a one-shot operation I hoped to do as little damage as possible to the deep principle that goes against compulsory arbitration, even in the national interest."

"For awhile on the floor, it seemed that I would miss having a majority by six or eight votes, but we kept discussing it, and the pieces came together."

As a hard-core Liberal, McGee seldom gets a hurrah from this corner, but this time he deserves one from the nation. He looked good in there on the railroad dispute. In fact, he looked like a statesman.

THEY SAY...

When we became independent we did not say to Britain, "Get out." We said, "Stay and help us." We bar help from nobody, except the Communists.

—Prince Abdul Rahman, prime minister of Malaya.

We have been godlike in our planned breeding of our domesticated plants and animals but we have been rabbitlike in our unplanned breeding of ourselves.

—British historian Arnold J. Toynbee, on the population problem.

There is a coincidence between happy marriage and education—the more the better.

—Dr. David Fulcomer, marriage and family professor, Colorado Women's College.



WASHINGTON CALLING ...

Churches Could Force Civil Rights Action

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON — In the aftermath of the emotional outpouring of the civil rights march it is evident that one force and one force alone can persuade the Congress to pass far-reaching civil rights legislation.

The churches of America have it in their power to convince doubting legislators of the need to bring social justice to millions of citizens deprived of their American birthright. In short, this is a moral rather than a political issue if it is to generate support sufficient to overcome the bitter resistance of the Southern bloc with its conservative Northern allies.

The march itself laid the base for this support. Conspicuous from beginning to end were the representatives of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish faiths. They spoke eloquently in support of the goal of the marchers, and clerical figures, many of them carrying placards, were interspersed throughout the vast crowd.

This was followed by the strongly worded statement of the World Council of Churches. It was a grave warning to Christians who support segregation "by action or inaction" and thereby betray Christ and the "fellowship which bears His name." The Council, made up of the principal Protestant and Eastern orthodox congregations, was saying in effect that Christians failing to work to end segregation are as guilty of undermining their faith as those actively supporting segregation.

Pope John XXIII in his great encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," called for recognition of the rights of every individual of whatever

color or race as a child of God. When Pope Paul VI met with President Kennedy he publicly expressed his concern for the civil rights program. Except for a few splinter extremist groups religious support for integration covers the whole religious spectrum.

The question is whether this support will be translated into concerted effort to convince the waverers that a majority of Americans of every kind and color and not just the leaders of a few pressure groups want action. In many states—in the Midwest, in the Plain and Rocky Mountain States—the proportion of Negroes to white is small. Unless Congressmen from these regions hear from the folks back home who have a real conviction of the need to correct ancient wrongs they may get the impression that no one cares very much.

The most controversial section of the Administration bill calls for desegregation of public accommodations. Rumors persist of a deal between the majority and minority leaders that would eliminate it or water it down so that it would have little effect. Passionate advocates of civil rights would be disillusioned if this would be the outcome of the current struggle.

The legal base for the public accommodation section is, in the Administration's concept, in the commerce clause of the Constitution—the right of the federal government to regulate commerce between the states. Since Mrs. Murphy's boarding house has no measurable effect on interstate commerce it would be exempted. But, to many, that seems a

legalistic approach subject to haggling over the scope of public accommodation to be covered by law. Sen. Kenneth Keating (R., N.Y.) says that a far stronger base would be the 14th Amendment to the Constitution adopted just after the Civil War.

This is in broad terms a guarantee of the rights and privileges of citizenship to all. In the view of Keating and others it would be a channel for the deep moral conviction motivating so many hundreds of religious leaders. The Administration has indicated that support for public accommodations could rest on both constitutional pillars.

Wide support from religious leaders can supply another element essential to success of the civil rights cause—restraint and responsibility. Demonstrations getting out of hand defying law and order can only alienate the moderates and persuade the doubters that civil rights is the equivalent of mob rule. The danger of violence spilling over from the Negro ghettos in the large cities and the crime rate among young Negroes—the alienated, the dispossessed, the uneducated without jobs—are a threat to the whole movement at this critical juncture.

Finally, timing is an important factor. Majority Leader Mike Mansfield talks hopefully of bringing up the civil rights bill in the Senate by mid-October. It would take precedence over tax reduction on which the White House puts such high priority.

A vote would come, in the Mans-

field timetable, four to six weeks after the measure was brought up—hopefully before Dec. 1. But

many obstacles stand in the way that only deeply held faith can overcome.



WILLIAM S. WHITE ...

Kennedy Plans Fence Building West Visit

By WILLIAM S. WHITE

WASHINGTON—President Kennedy's forthcoming "nonpolitical" tour of 10 states, all but one of them in the West or upper Middle West, actually is the opening of a major push to bring about some highly political effects, indeed.

Briefly, the President desperately needs some reconciliation with that vast area lying beyond the Mississippi to the Western sea. This is a project in political reclamation.

The President carried the country in 1960 by a very thin measure in electoral votes. But geographically he lost the country badly, and nowhere so damagingly as in the West.

From the very beginning, his greatest political weakness has lain in the fact that in the spatial sense his has been a minority and essentially sectional administration—Eastern-based, Eastern-oriented, and Eastern in both interests and manner. The returns of 1960 showed him all but blacked out in the immense stretches from the midlands to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Kennedy's most acute problem is not even that of being reelected. Rather it is the problem of how, even assuming reelection, he is to be able to govern effectively unless he can sustain the almost solidly pro-Kennedy—but now gravely threatened—phalanx of Western Democratic Senators which happens to be up for reelection next year.

These are the urgent realities underlying his choice of itinerary for what is billed by the White House as "a tour of conservation and natural resources areas" Sept. 25 to 29.

The true "conservation" objective is not even that of conserving as to expand the President's own acceptability. The true "natural resources" objective is to keep in the Senate, after 1964, the resources of such men as Mike Mansfield of Montana, the Senate Democratic leader; Gale McGee of Wyoming; Clair Engle of California; Howard Cannon of Nevada; Frank Moss of Utah; Henry Jackson of Washington; Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota; and Quentin Burdick of North Dakota.

When he was nominated for President in that clamorous night of long ago at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, John F. Kennedy was put over primarily by hard-handed urban bosses shepherded in from the East. Many believed—and this columnist has good reason to think that Mr. Kennedy himself was foremost among them—that in the very circumstances of this victory in a battle over Lyndon Johnson lay the seeds of a probable Kennedy defeat in the war of the coming November.

For it had all been much too urban, much too Eastern. Recognizing precisely this, the then Senator Kennedy took the inevitable decision overnight. He knew he simply had to broaden his appeal. This is why he asked Johnson, a Texan whose essential strength was actually probably greater in West and Midwest than in the South, to take second place on the ticket.

This wise Kennedy approach to nomination and election has, however, not yet been followed by similar wisdom in office. The President has been increasingly surrounded by Eastern-thinking political advisers using Eastern-made techniques, concentrating on the urban and largely ignoring the other spaces that are not nearly so wide open as they used to be. This has been unfortunate for him in two ways.

It has served to regionalize his Administration; to make it in the eyes of many non-Eastern Democrats a show being run by "them" rather than by "us." And it has been wholly inappropriate to the plain facts of life in Congress.

For the sole effective member of the House leadership who is Eastern is Speaker John McCormack of Massachusetts; the critical mass of leadership is non-Eastern. And in the Senate the effective Democratic leadership is totally non-Eastern. Indeed, from all the East there are not three Democratic Senators in senior, and therefore effective, positions upon whom the President can rely for any real help. He can get it from some rare Easterner like John Pastore of Rhode Island, one of the most underrated men in public life; but that is about that.

IN WASHINGTON ...

The Government Cuts Our Economic Throats



By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Every day in every way, the American people are told that they must have economic growth if the nation is to prosper. Every day in every way, the government acts to cut down that growth and to give advantage to businessmen of other nations. In short, "business" is a dirty word if applied to Americans—but let us, indeed, let us encourage the business of France, Great Britain, and Japan, at the cost of this country.

It pains me more than a little to write this. Over the years, I have been a free enterprise man. That is, I believe in the operation of the market to keep prices and costs and profits in line. But free enterprise no longer applies in this country. The government arrives at decisions which make free trade theories seem stupid and discriminatory to American business. And when American business finds itself at the short end, American labor suffers.

Let me give one example. The Tariff Commission, the President, and U.S. Customs are supposed to keep a sharp eye on the pricing practices of the world. If any nation begins to dump its products in the American market—and that means selling them at a lower cost than it sells them at home—then we are to leap into the saddle and put a stop to this. American industry, by law and anti-trust fiat, cannot compete in this price and throat cutting operation. To do so would invite action by Robert Kennedy's Justice Department.

The steel industry is being slowly pushed to the wall by the dumping practices of our overseas friends. The Japanese, for example, sell two-inch pipe to the U.S. at \$36.25 a ton less than they sell the same pipe at home. Our British cousins sell their pipe at home for \$133.03 per ton. They dump the same pipe on the American market for \$132.92 per ton, before shipping costs and duty. But even when these costs are added, the price comes to \$166 per ton in the States.

U.S. producers sell the same pipe at \$198.16 per ton, which would be competitive if the British were not dumping their steel. Shipping charges for British steel pipe, added to their domestic price, would put them in a completely non-competitive position. At present, because the Administration shuts its eyes, American steel pipe must face a \$30 differential with British pipe.

The government, however, refuses to exercise its rights and its discretionary power to force the British to compete fairly. If duties were raised on British steel pipe—and subsidies withdrawn—the American producers would be able to hold on to the domestic market, and there would be no unemployment for David McDonald's United Steelworkers.

The American steel industry has repeatedly furnished the appropriate authorities in our government with the facts about the illegal dumping of steel products.

Since some foreign producers keep their prices secret, the U.S. industry has been forced to set up a real intelligence operation. Through it, they have been able to supply our officials with the pertinent data.

But somehow, no one seems to pay any mind to these facts and figures. As a result, imports of steel products have more than doubled in the past year. In some instances they have tripled. This has meant a gradual decline in steel employment. It has forced American steel companies to step up the pace of their automation. It has slowed down the economic growth which President Kennedy has said is so essential. And it has contributed to our very dangerous balance-of-payments deficit.

In terms of employment alone, the rising tide of steel imports—the results of foreign dumping—have resulted in a loss to this country of 70 million man-hours of labor and approximately 37,700 jobs in the steel industry alone. Since every lost job affects the rest of the labor market, it would take an IBM machine to figure the total loss in employment. Bit by bit, the dollar cost is edging toward the \$1 billion mark.

What puzzles me is the refusal of the proper governmental authorities to move against these encroachments on the steel industry. The law is clear that this country is not to tolerate dumping. In other economic fields, where the U.S. has been in a position to dump its products into overseas markets, we have retrained.

It would seem that we are allowing the rest of the world to practice free trade while using our tariff regulations not to protect our own industry but that of other countries.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

I witnessed a minor automobile accident yesterday morning. Two cars brushed fenders slightly, and each of the drivers (as usual) seemed to be partly at fault.

The two men got out of their cars and approached each other with expressions of anger and resentment. Then, about three paces apart, they suddenly recognized each other as slight acquaintances—and the tension was immediately broken.

Each became sheepish and apologized; the hot tempers disappeared and were replaced by philosophic shrugs. The matter was settled amicably within a few minutes; they waved goodbye to each other, and drove off.

There is a deep lesson here, if only we would begin learning it. Anger and aggressiveness come from fear; and fear comes from strangeness. The only element that had changed in this whole accident pattern was the mutual recognition that the other was no stranger.

Hiding within our elaborate mechanization of civilization is the primitive fear of the alien, the outsider, the barbarian from the other end of the forest.

When an emotional crisis strips off our mask of civility, we snarl and bare our fangs at the savage who has shocked, alarmed or angered us.

Except in rare cases, it is difficult to dislike someone you know, and it is almost impossible to treat him with the hostility you might exhibit toward a stranger.

For, knowing someone, however slightly, means making some kind of identification with him, and thus recognizing that he is not a dangerous foreigner but a man pretty much like yourself.

Motorists drive more prudent-

STRICTLY PERSONAL

ly and politely in a small town, for instance, not because they are better people or better drivers, but simply because they know almost all the other motorists, and would be ashamed to display the ruthless bad manners of motorists in the anonymous traffic of a big city.

What is true on the highway is true in the world. Knowledge, of a personal sort, is the only effective barrier to war. It is the man who has seen no country but his own who is most willing to take up arms against an impersonal enemy.

The real tragedy of the Iron Curtain is not that it keeps us out, but that it keeps the Russians in.

Soviet leaders, since the beginning, have fought relentlessly against "cosmopolitanism"—because they are aware that the Russian who gets to know the world, and feels at home in other countries, can never again regard us as the barbarian from the other end of the forest.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Monday, Sept. 9, the 252nd day of 1963 with 113 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The morning star is Jupiter. The evening stars are Mars, Saturn and Jupiter.

On this day in history: In 1776, the term "United States" was made official by the Second Continental Congress.

In 1850, California was admitted to the union as the 31st state.

In 1919, almost the entire Boston police force went on strike, leaving a major American city without law protection for the first time in history.

Letters To The Editor

Full Production

Economic fallacy time again. As the President has informed us, we must banish old clichés which hinder our progress. One which needs a spot high on the list is "full employment." This is not what the President had in mind but since he has a "commission, full employment," I doubt if he would agree.

Our liberal brethren feel that once we have achieved full employment we will have the country moving again—they want to push it down the road to more socialism.

Full employment has been achieved in history though—the pharaohs of Egypt had it, slave holders insist on it, Communist labor camps achieve it without even straining. Just a good dose of coercion by a dictator, commission or big government can easily produce full employment.

one of the ends. What should we be striving for, full production of course. The means to this end is full employment.

A gentleman observed pulling a 20-foot string down the street was asked why he was pulling it. "Well," he said, "did you ever try to push one?"

We need to get our horses and carts in proper perspective. Now is time to insist that the President, his advisers and our congressmen need to clarify their thinking. You as a voter can use this means to express your disapproval of our "onerous" tax burden. But we can not cut federal income until we cut federal spending, so you see our legislators have a good many horses and carts out of alignment.

Teachers need to know how to teach but unless they are well grounded in their subjects all of their teachings are for naught. You are a voter but it avails you nothing unless you vote.

Remember "ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country." James K. Shaler, Medford, Ore.

BERRY'S WORLD



"... Nothing to worry about, Mr. Nebru—It's only a case of borderline anemia!"

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q — When was the U.S. Coast Guard created?
A — In 1790.

Q — Why is Maryland called the Old Line State?
A — Because its "troops of the line" won special praise from George Washington for gallantry during the Revolutionary War.

Q — What English explorer wrote a history of the world while in prison?
A — Sir Walter Raleigh.

Q — What will be the terminal points of the Pan American highway?
A — Fairbanks, Alaska, and Buenos Aires, Argentina.