

Editorial Page

Mankind's Master Mind

The human brain contains some 10 billion nerve cells, or neurons, that form interconnections whose number far surpasses all the stars of the universe. This is the source of the infinite complexity of individual behavior.

Human civilization is something like that, being built up out of the complex interconnections of the increasing millions of people.

But there are no built-in, natural connections between people. They have to communicate by "artificial" means.

Obviously, no individual can talk personally with everyone else. By means of radio and television, however, he can address an unlimited number at one time. Records and tapes add a time dimension to that ability.

But only the printed word allows others to absorb a man's thoughts at their leisure—and only through print can a man project his thoughts into the future, either near or distant, and fasten upon the minds of others.

Just as the brain receives a constant flood of information from the environment, so is human society being flooded with news, ideas, facts, developments and discoveries in the arts and sciences and every walk of life.

The result is a worsening log jam in the channels of information and a serious time lag before the majority of men can absorb and understand these changes.

It is as if that part of an individual's brain which screens out all but essential information suddenly stopped working, allowing sensations from every nerve end to flood the conscious mind.

The effect would be chaotic and paralyzing. The situation in the field of scientific publications is approaching that state.

That is why some say we must begin to develop a "world brain"—a system to coordinate, screen and contain the world's growing knowledge.

The idea of a world brain was originated by H. G. Wells back in 1937 and was revived recently by Watson Davis, editor of Science Service, in testimony before a House subcommittee.

Like so many other Wellsian ideas, the world brain was ahead of its time. But recent advances in computers, microfilm techniques and the transmission of information have made a world brain entirely feasible.

As Davis said, we already have the know-how; all we need is the "let's-do."



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Good Will Is Purpose Of Visit By Royalty

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — On their way to a ceremonial visit with President Kennedy, King Mohammed Zahir of Afghanistan and his Queen Homaira stopped over at William and Mary College in Williamsburg, Va., to visit some of the more than 200 Afghan students now attending colleges all over the United States.

This emphasis on education is a big thing in United States aid to Afghanistan, and the Afghans like it.

The U.S. educational mission in Afghanistan is run by a consortium of American universities by Columbia and Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

They operate the little-known Education Specialists, Inc., which has a contract with U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) for teacher training and advisory services at the University of Kabul.

University of Wyoming is supervising Afghan vocational education in agriculture. Purdue is teaching animal husbandry, in which King Zahir is especially interested.

The U.S. Peace Corps has 35 teachers in Afghanistan, including 24 in the high schools, three nurses, an auto mechanic and seven printers.

And the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has a team of experts teaching new settlers how to use irrigation on former desert lands in the \$100 million Hellmand Valley Authority project, 40 per cent financed by U.S. loans.

Roads and airports are the big things dollarwise in America's aid to Afghanistan, which has totaled \$233 million since 1951. But there is no military aid, which makes it unique.

This is less than half of Russia's \$600 million in aid to Afghanistan, including \$100 million in military aid. U.S. policy is to understand that the Afghans can't be completely independent because of Russia's proximity and power.

Russia apparently wants Afghanistan as a showcase, like Finland, to prove that its neighbors can co-exist without communism. But the Afghans have always been suspicious of the

Russians and the United States offers them an alternative.

Since there are no outstanding differences between Afghanistan and the United States, this first visit of the rulers is strictly a good will tour.

They will visit General Eisenhower at his Gettysburg farm, Governor Rockefeller and U Thant, at the United Nations in New York. They also will see Cape Canaveral, Fort Bragg, University of Wyoming, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Purdue University at Lafayette, Ind., departing from there for home by the way of Beirut, Lebanon.

The only incident to mar preparations for this grand tour was a flareup over James Michener's latest novel, "Caravan," which is set in Afghanistan.

Michener spent two months in Kabul in 1955 to get material for what is not one of his best works.

There are some beautiful descriptive passages on Afghanistan's rugged mountain and desert country. But his plot involves a U.S. pavil attaché in what has always been a completely landlocked country and an American girl who marries an Afghan nomad tribal chief, for kicks.

What the Afghans don't like about "Caravan" are a couple of incidents about an unfaithful wife stoned to death by her tribe and a murderer turned over to the victim's family for vengeance.

Modern Afghanistan wants the world to forget those primitive ways and is sore at Michener.

King Zahir, who was educated in France, is descended from a family that has ruled Afghanistan as an hereditary monarchy almost continuously since 1747. His government has operated under a constitution since 1931. It is now being revised and modernized.

The king recently removed most of the members of his family from high office. For the first time, a commoner, Dr. Mohammad Yusuf, is prime minister. He is a German-trained physicist.

As further evidence of Afghanistan's new interest in higher education, the king's new ambassador to Washington, Dr. Abdul Majid, is a University of California biologist.

Confused Prospect Of A Tax Cut

If you ask about a tax cut in Washington, you get many answers.

The White House in a sanguine mood predicted that a \$10 billion cut will be enacted this year.

The overall tax slash plan, presumably approved by the administration, was unveiled by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Sen. Everett Dirksen (R., Ill.), minority leader, doubted there will be a cut this year because of the pressure of other business in the Senate, particularly the touchy matter of civil rights. His Democratic colleague on the finance committee, Sen. Gore, doubted there will be one this year or next.

Rep. John W. Byrnes (R-Wis.), a ranking House minority member, said the President can get a tax bill in a hurry if he will agree to certain government economies.

Byrnes restated a view that has been maintained by a great many critics ever since the tax cutting proposal was broached. "It would be fiscal folly," he told members of the American Bar Assn., "to embark on a program

which will reduce our revenues when spending is presently outracing those revenues."

The President pledged himself to hold the line on expenditures when he asked for income tax reduction. But he has found numerous special occasions for appropriations. The House has sturdily reduced the Presidential requests for appropriations and authorizations, whereupon he has turned to the Senate and urged that the full amounts be restored.

Lacking any assurances of administration retrenchment congressmen have been discouraged by arithmetic. Byrnes said a tax bill with about \$8 billion in reductions to be spread over two years will probably be reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee. But his talk at the bar meeting may be taken as a warning that the bill faces hard going on the floor.

This will be too bad. The tax reduction proposal was one of the administration's happier inspirations. If it fails, the President cannot fairly blame the Congress, for he has not shown much inclination to keep his part of the bargain.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Kennedy Plays Favorites

By RALPH DE TOLEDANO

The Washington press corps, a long suffering group, gravitates toward the centers of power. When an Administration as muscle-conscious as President Kennedy's abuses that power, the press tends to bite its lip and bow. And this is what has happened over the uses of publicity by the White House. More than any other President in our history, Mr. Kennedy has manipulated the Fourth Estate by playing favorites.

Unfortunately for the American press, the favorite of this Administration is television. Mr. Kennedy, through his Press Secretary Pierre Salinger, has repeatedly given the newspaper correspondents a boot in the seat of the pants and bestowed his favors on the electronic reporters.

How does a public figure do this? Obviously, at his news conferences both press and radio-TV

correspondents have an opportunity to ask questions. (That the men recognized by the President are almost always those predictably pro-Administration and not likely to invade embarrassing territory is another matter.) But if a President wishes to favor one of the media over another, he can do so by use of the "exclusive" interview.

An exclusive interview is a feather in the cap of the correspondent who gets it. It gives him status and it brings in money for his organization. Other correspondents are, in effect, forced to report what the President said—even to a rival news-gathering body. Traditionally, however, Presidents have been mighty sparing of the use they have made of the exclusive interview.

It will be recalled that there was a tremendous outcry when President Truman gave the highly-respected Arthur Krock of the New York Times an exclusive.

The press argued that this was favoring one newspaper at the expense of the others.

Now there is a great deal of irate muttering among Washington correspondents because President Kennedy has given the Columbia Broadcasting System an exclusive interview, seen on the TV screens this past week, and will do the same for the National Broadcasting Company next week. The American Broadcasting Company will ask for its share. But what of the newspapermen who also cover Washington, pay taxes, deal in the news, and make their living writing about the President?

Mr. Kennedy does not belong to CBS, NBC, or ABC. He is the President of the American people—and the American press. He has no right to use his office to aggrandize a news medium he believes will help him most. His views belong to the entire press corps or to no part of it.

Yet this is not the first time that Mr. Kennedy has played favorites. Among those who cover his activities, he has selectively fed the kind of exclusive news which is a reporter's bread and butter.

During his stay at Palm Beach last year, he called in a group of correspondents and "briefed" them at length. Other correspondents, who had won the antagonism of the White House or whose newspapers were not quite so important in the view of Mr. Salinger, were excluded.

On another occasion, the President put on video tape a long interview with correspondents from the three major networks. Then he gave the same material to the newspapermen, but on a non-attribution basis. They wrote their stories, citing "high Administration sources"—then switched on their TV and heard the President saying the same things to all the nation.

Normally, there would be a real hullabaloo over this favoritism of the White House. But the men who cover this Administration have, for the most part, learned caution. If they object too vocally to the practices and innovations of Kennedy, Salinger & Co., then they can find themselves transferred from the White House to the dog house. It takes courage to buck the President of the United States.

There would be only one way to impress on the White House that it is improper and unfair for the President to use his office to bring profit to his journalistic friends. If the White House Correspondents Association, to which I pay dues, were to protest strenuously and volubly—and if this got nowhere—then it could instruct its members to boycott Mr. Kennedy's press conferences.

This sounds quixotic, impossible, and self-defeating. It need not be. The moment Mr. Kennedy became aware of the anger among correspondents—and weighed the effect of his "image"—he would capitulate. That is the one certain thing about this Administration. CBS, NBC, and ABC may mean a great deal to the image-makers, but without the printed word the White House would be lost.



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

This pot-bellied, middle-aged, once-a-week athlete tripped on the tennis court last Sunday, trying to retrieve a ball your younger sister could have got while eating an ice cream cone with the other hand, and pulled a muscle in his calf.

The next day, heroically hobbling to the office with a cane, I learned exactly what to do with an ailment of this sort. So far as I can make out, there are 10 infallible rules to follow. These are:

1. Stay off the leg as much as possible.
2. Keep walking—the exercise will bring it back into shape.
3. Apply cold packs.
4. Apply hot packs.
5. Apply cold packs and hot packs alternately.
6. Apply only moist heat—stay away from a heating pad.
7. Sleep all night with a heating pad on the leg.
8. Bandage it tightly to support the muscle.
9. Don't bandage it, or you'll stop the circulation and retard recovery.
10. See a doctor, a chiropractor, a physiotherapist, a Swedish masseur, a baseball trainer and a faith healer.

It's surprising that nobody recommended a tree surgeon for the injured limb. With this one singular exception, I have been subjected to the most unremitting barrage of self-coddling advice that the mind of man could conceive.

Of the 26 persons who, in the space of an hour or two, came up solicitously to inquire about the origin of my limp, not one confessed complete ignorance about its therapy and cure.

Everybody had had the same thing—or something very nearly like it, or a brother who was similarly wounded in sportive action, or a family doctor who was wonderful "at that sort of thing."

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Tuesday, Sept. 10, the 253rd day of 1963 with 112 to follow.

The moon is in its last quarter. The morning star is Jupiter. The evening stars are Saturn, Mars and Jupiter.

On this day in history: In 1813 the first defeat of an English Squadron in the War of 1812 took place when U.S. Capt. Oliver H. Perry defeated the British in the Battle of Lake Erie. In 1848, Elias Howe received a patent for the sewing machine. In 1890, Empress Elizabeth of Austria-Hungary was assassinated by an anarchist.

In 1944, the first American shells to land on German soil were fired by the United States 1st Army.

A thought for the day—Thomas Jefferson, the American statesman, said: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Where Do Disputes Go?

By HOLMES ALEXANDER
WASHINGTON, D.C. — Free speech in matters handled by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is pretty much what its politically-appointed members say it is.

This statement is not a matter of opinion, but a solemn fact—and a real hindrance to the civil liberty of self-expression. Both political parties have recently had their whacks at deciding where the freedom to speak starts and stops in Labor matters.

When General Eisenhower was President, his NLRB chairman were Guy Farmer and Boyd Loomer, the latter still an NLRB member. The like-minded ruled that the free speech provision of the Taft-Hartley Act extended both to the conduct of NLRB-supervised elections and to matters determining Unfair Labor Practices. An employer could communicate with the workers, in both these areas, as long as he did not hold out a threat or a promise of benefit.

But when Mr. Kennedy became President, and Frank McCulloch became chairman of NLRB, the Free Speech provision was held not to apply to the conduct of elections. The ruling said, in effect, that if an employer put out bad literature (even if it didn't threaten or promise any benefits), he made it impossible for the workers to vote intelligently. Hence, elections in which an employer exercised free speech could be set aside.

How free is speech when Republicans interpret its protection one way, and Democrats interpret it another? NLRB members are appointed to five-year terms, so that the personality and the politics of new members may be decisive in a matter that ought to be immutable.

On Aug. 27, while Congress was rejecting President Kennedy's plan to turn the railroad dispute over to another federal agency, the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), Congressmen

Phil Landrum (D., Ga.) proposed taking Unfair Labor Practices out of the jurisdiction of NLRB and lodging them in the federal courts.

As a man usually on management's side, Landrum felt that the NLRB was too biased toward Labor. Significantly, the Railroad Brotherhoods objected to the ICC's handling their dispute for a similar reason. They felt that ICC was too biased toward management.

So, the rather complicated matter boils down to a rather simple residue. Should federal agencies decide questions of a quasi-judicial nature? Should not these questions go into the federal courts?

An alternate solution to that of dumping all these Labor disputes into the regular courts, it seems to me, might be to set up a special Labor Court. There is plenty of precedent. We already have several so-called "legislative" courts, those established by statute rather than by the Constitution. We have the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the U.S. Court of Claims, the U.S. Court of Military Appeals and the Tax Court of the United States.

Why not, then, a Labor Court to take the politically-charged Labor disputes entirely away from the federal agencies, which have little competence and much prejudice?



"Where'd you get that sweatshirt with the name of the school on it?"



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Young Democrats Are In Leftist Control

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

WASHINGTON — Far West Young Democrats are "firmly in the grasp of a highly vocal group of emotional radicals, peace-at-any-price, and other assorted lunatic leftists."

The words are not those of Robert Welch. They are those of Charles Wilson, a freshman Democrat who represents California's 31st Congressional District.

Representative Wilson, a one-time Young Democrat himself, calls the recent conference of Far West Young Democrats who met in Berkeley, Calif., a "disgrace to the honorable name of the Democratic Party."

Delegates from 13 Western States there urged diplomatic relations with Fidel Castro; withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam; and a non-aggression pact with the puppet states of Eastern Europe.

The Los Angeles Congressman brushes aside the soothing words of Allen Howe, national chairman of the Young Democrats.

Howe said he did not agree with the resolutions passed at Berkeley, but added: "The Young Democrats allow—even welcome—dissent."

Howe, says Representative Wilson, has confused liberty with license. "I think he also confuses political freedom with anarchy."

Howe's claim that the Berkeley meeting was an "isolated instance" is rebutted by Representative Wilson. "Those resolutions are typical of many that have been spewed forth in recent years at meetings of the California Young Democrats."

Nor are those in the Golden State the only YDs who have staked out tracts on the lunatic fringe. Recently YDs here passed a resolution calling for the District of Columbia to be placed under United Nations control.

"If this is meant to be a joke it is in pathetically poor taste," concludes Representative Wilson. "and if it is meant to be serious I shudder to think what else they may advocate."

Representative Wilson demands a top-to-bottom housecleaning of the Young Democrats. President Howe should not accuse the Young Republicans of right-wing extremism, the Congressman says.

"I suggest to Mr. Howe that he refrain from pointing the finger of scorn at the Young Republicans until such a time as his own house is in order. The old expression—people in glass houses should not throw stones—is entirely appropriate."

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell avoids New York like a plague these days as subpoena-seekers are waiting to slap him with an order to appear in New York Criminal Court.

It is charged he has made no effort to pay Mrs. Matilda James the \$211,000 he owes for libeling her.

The ever-suave Congressman will depart soon for the Arab sheikhdom of Kuwait. Powell, who recently delivered a House speech extolling the oil-rich Middle Eastern state, will travel first class, all expenses picked up by the Kuwaiti Government.

Powell has been told he can take along fellow Congressmen. None has given any indication he will go. The trip's ostensible purpose is to advise the Kuwaitis on modernization of their educational system.

Still another voice has been raised in opposition to the partial nuclear test ban now under Senate study.

Big Bill Knowland, former Senate Minority Leader, revealed a fortnight ago he was opposed to ratification. "Soviet Russia has never kept its treaty obligations," he says. "Look at what happened to treaties the Soviets made with Hungary, Estonia, Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Republic of China, and Bulgaria. And the Russians violated the United Nations Charter during the Korean War and again during the Hungarian revolt."

Knowland points out that U.S. negotiators first insisted on a fool-proof pact. At Geneva, he says, "we started out with demands for 100 on-site inspections, and now we end up with no inspections at all."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—Where was Basin Street? A—in the French Quarter of New Orleans where a special type of musical composition was first experimented with and now is looked upon by some as the birthplace of jazz.