

Editorial Page

A New And Sober Course

In the Negro's struggle for a new place in American life, the massive march on Washington may prove a turning point.

When large militant forces are at work as they are now, and as was true in the big labor battles of the mid-1930s, discipline and a sense of public responsibility are sometimes lost sight of.

These failings certainly have marked more than a few Negro demonstrations and other efforts in this turbulent year 1963. But they did not characterize the march on Washington.

The general judgment is that this huge massing of humanity in the nation's capital was completely peaceful and orderly, and amazingly well disciplined and organized. There probably has not been its like in our history.

Negro leaders obviously were determined that this demonstration be thus carried out. They had heard many dire predictions of trouble. They were also aware that some demonstrations had got out of hand and were not so much peaceful protests as disorderly and occasionally violent obstructions to normal life.

Measured by these tests, the Washington march was well done.

But even before this event occurred, there were evidences that Negroes themselves are beginning to question the continued usefulness of the street demonstration as a strategic device.

Clearly it has produced no tangible results in some places. Here and there, authorities have quickly nipped it in the bud. Ill-managed demonstrations sometimes have stirred white resistance that previously did not exist.

Fruits Of Soviet Aid

(St. Louis Post-Dispatch)

There may be some sort of lesson for the West in what has happened to the Russians in Indonesia. The Soviet Union has invested up to two billion dollars in arms and economic aid in an effort to win friends in Indonesia. Large quantities of Soviet military equipment recently were displayed to visiting dignitaries from Red China.

But despite this aid the strong Indonesian Communist party seems to have lined up with Peking in the ideological struggle with Moscow. One indicator is a resolution passed at a recent African-Asia conference of journalists, which apparently was under the control of Indonesian Communists. The resolution de-

Negroes who contend that they have serious grievances against present day American society surely are not going to limit themselves to doing things which do not disturb the white elements of the national community. But they may now decide that other approaches may prove more productive than street demonstrations.

The use of the vote, the personal or written petitioning of lawmakers and other public officials, legitimate lobbying — these are among the tactics open to all in a fully functioning democracy.

The right of peaceful assembly for protest purposes is not questioned by the courts. But this strategy carries with it more danger of excess than do the alternatives. And, as noted, the tangible gains may often be limited or nonexistent.

What, if any, specific legislative or other results may flow from the march on Washington cannot be foretold.

Yet the impression of Negro leaders and participants behaving responsibly in a large and difficult effort has now been spread wide. When tens and tens of thousands subject themselves to inconvenience, discomfort and expense, the nation cannot doubt that they have something serious on their minds. The impact could be substantial.

The Negroes can hardly outdo what they have done. They should at this moment have rounded some kind of corner.

They should be entering upon a new and sober course in which they may realize that if they are to demand privilege and opportunity, they must offer duty, discipline and high responsibility in return.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Who Could Claim Victory?

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

The civil rights marchers came and went. Washington breathed a sigh of relief that there was no violence. Life returned to its normal tempo. Congress continued to talk and debate.

One week after the great demonstration, could those who worked to bring it about — who devoted time and spent money — claim a victory? Could they point to any real achievement? Was the American conscience stirred — or was all the comment simply a way to cover up a feeling that most people had expected bloodshed? Would it result in speedy legislation?

These questions are still being asked on Capitol Hill. They were asked even as the demonstrators were packing their tents and jubilantly leaving Washington. And the best opinion seems to be that nothing was accomplished. In fact, there are those who say that the march had a negative effect.

This is an interesting theory. Those who hold it say that Congress was braced for trouble and the dilemmas it would create. Now that the marchers have gone, according to this group, the Hill can relax. It feels that it has seen the worst of it. Those who oppose the broad-gauge civil rights measure now being debated are certain there will be no repetition of the march on Washington. They are relieved and heartened. Their worries ended, they can go back to their old opinions. There will be no stampede.

On the other hand, the group that sponsored the march feels it achieved its purpose by unveiling their might to the Federal government. Having seen 200,000 crowding the Mall, Congress will presumably respond.

It is hard to tell. But it is certainly a fact that Congressmen who might have been disposed to vote for the omnibus civil rights bill and for the public accommodations law have always felt that the demonstration was a kind of blackmail operation, that to vote for the measure would look like an act of cowardice.

Congressmen, it should be remembered, can sometimes be led by the nose. But they don't want this broadcast across the land. It destroys their dignity. Of course, Congressmen, being human, respond to external stimuli. Re-election is tough enough without antagonizing the home community. The pressure of social position is usually far more potent than the cruder methods of persuasion. But no legislator likes to let it be known that he has succumbed to the influence of some powerful interest—AFL-CIO, National Association of Manufacturers, or the Association of Paperhangers with the Hives.

The march on Washington was a clearcut show of power. In a way, its non-violence makes it slightly more ominous. For the thought must always lurk that if the police department and its reinforcements had slipped just a little, if it had been one of Washington's scorching days, or if other imperponderables had come into play, the city and some of its government buildings could have become a shambles.

Many in Washington — on the Hill, downtown, or out of government — resented the march. Even among those most strongly committed to the Kennedy Administration there was a marked coolness present during the demonstrations. A head count among the members of House and Senate who will be most influential in pushing through or blocking a civil rights measure shows that few have changed their minds. The undecided have still to commit themselves. The partisans are as partisan and the opposed are as adamant as before.

For them, civil rights is not simply a slogan. Legislation that strikes at constitutional precepts cannot be lightly enacted. Congress takes its business far more seriously than people believe. And on issues like this, which can change the whole fabric of the country, there are those who believe that deliberation — not the emotion of great mass meetings — should govern action. Perhaps for the Negroes and whites who demonstrated, the march relieved tension. But it did mighty little to write new law — and this becomes ever clearer with each passing day.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Protection

This a.m. I received a newspaper in the mail called Greater Oregon. The paper is a weekly put out by Mr. J. Francis Howard, the man who had what it takes to get out the referendum petitions to give the people a chance to put the 60 million dollar tax bill on the ballot, so we the people could vote on the issue.

The paper stated while Mr. Howard was away getting the petitions together someone made two long distance phone calls, so foul and profane, the operator cut them off both times, but the party who called threatened Mr. Howard's life. Mr. Howard's son took the calls, and the printing shop foreman and the operator heard the calls.

When Mr. Howard returned Dr. Vreeland of St. Helens phoned Mr. Howard that he had 468 certified names and several hundred more being certified. On hearing of the phone calls to Mr. Howard Dr. Vreeland placed a call to H. G. Maison, superintendent of the state police at Salem, for police escort for Mr. Howard when he took the petitions to Salem Saturday or Sunday. The request was bluntly refused.

Howard Appling phoned Mr. Howard when told of the threats. Secretary Appling told Mr. Howard he was guaranteed safe use of Oregon highways and if he would phone the state police at Albany, and ask for police escort it would be given him.

But when Sergeant Kazar was called for police escort and protection he answered, "My orders from headquarters are to furnish you with no escort."

This is about the worst I've ever read, and it's all in Mr.

STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

An interesting letter arrived in the mail yesterday, signed "Unhappy Stepmother." The lady sorrowfully wants to know why stepmothers have such a bad reputation, in story and legend.

"I recently became the stepmother of two young children," she discloses, "and I find that they have all kinds of preconceptions about a stepmother being wicked and cruel and coldhearted. They have read and heard so much about the 'bad' stepmother in fiction and fairy tale."

My own theory on this subject may not appeal to a lot of people, but I think that the "wicked stepmother" fable arose out of children's resentments against their real mothers—which they were too ashamed to confess openly.

In other words, I believe that the bad stepmother serves as a substitute for our early feelings of hostility against our own parents. One of the commonest of childhood fantasies, when we feel our parents have treated us badly, is to pretend that they are not our real parents at all, but imposters who kidnapped us when we were in the cradle.

Fairy tales of every nation are full of incidents about young princes and princesses who were stolen from the castle as babies, and are subsequently restored to their rightful places and parents.

This fiction fits perfectly into the childish feeling of "not belonging" to our own family, when our parents seem harsh and unjust toward us. We retaliate, so to speak, by creating a fictional family for ourselves.

By making a boy out of the stepmother, we are able to discharge our aggressions against our real mothers without feeling any of the guilt that would normally accompany such an attitude. There seems no other way to explain the widespread antipathy to the stepmother—who, in reality usually bends over backward to be kind and understanding toward the children of her husband.

One of the wisdoms of modern psychology is the frank recognition that we sometimes hate those we love—that, in fact, we can truly hate only those who are close to us.

Parents who handle their children skillfully make allowances for these moments of hate, and do not let the children feel guilty for expressing these feelings. In the past, such expressions were taboo; and so the myth of the stepmother was created to make it easy and acceptable for young people to get rid of "bad" feelings toward their parents.

EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .



Human Rights Issues Gain New Momentum

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA) — The March on Washington focused world attention on the American civil rights controversy for one day.

But this is not the only place on earth where this issue is dominant. The Washington demonstration really focuses attention on the larger, worldwide issue, as much as the other way around. Questions of human rights are expected to be principal items on the agenda at the coming United Nations General Assembly which convenes in New York Sept. 17.

The U.N. Commission on Human Rights, created in 1946, held its 19th session at Geneva, Switzerland, last March and April. Its most important act was to draft a covenant on the elimination of all forms of discrimination.

This covenant will be put before the new General Assembly for approval. The background is important.

The U.N. Commission on Human Rights held its first sessions under the chairmanship of the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. In 1948 it drafted a Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Of the 58 U.N. members at that time, Russia and the Communist bloc nations abstained from voting on it because they were violating most of its provisions. But 48 nations approved it.

The 15th anniversary of this declaration will be observed at the U.N. this year on Human Rights Day, Dec. 10.

The first 20 of the 30 articles in this declaration cover much the same ground as the Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution.

The remaining articles cover more modern economic, social and cultural developments such as the rights to work, to rest and leisure, to social security, education, cultural enjoyment, a standard of living adequate for health and well being.

This document unquestionably has influenced the constitutions and patterns of life in many of the new nations. But in converting its high-minded principles into covenants for individual nations to ratify, the whole concept has run into opposition and delay.

The late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles rejected the draft in 1954, while the famous

Bricker amendment which would have limited U.S. acceptance of U.N. decisions was under consideration.

Secretary Dulles proposed as alternatives triennial reports on civil rights and the holding of seminars on human relations. Since 1956 there have been about a dozen of these regional seminars and two more are proposed for 1964 and 1965.

In the meantime, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights has drafted covenants on the status of refugees, stateless persons, women, children; abolition of slavery, forced labor and genocide; against discrimination in education and employment and the protection of minorities; freedom of information, freedom from arbitrary arrest and exile.

Some of these have been submitted to every General Assembly since 1955. But redrafting has not yet been completed and nothing has been approved.

In 1960, however, the General Assembly passed a Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries. A year later the assembly took note of the fact that the resolution was not being carried out and that armed repression of freedom was being exercised in too many parts of the world.

This gave a new impetus to the human rights movement. The African states, at the International Labor Organization meeting, tried to expel South Africa for its racial policies.

A similar effort was made to expel Portugal from a UNESCO international education conference in Geneva. When this move failed, African and Asian delegates walked out.

These are indications of the sentiment boiling up and likely to generate high-pressure steam at the coming General Assembly.

President Kennedy recently sent to the Senate for ratification three U.N. human rights covenants on the abolition of forced labor and slavery and to protect the rights of women, U.S. law already guarantees these rights.

This is a beginning. And as the President points out in his letter of transmittal, "American ratification of these covenants will stand as a sharp reminder of world opinion to all who may seek to violate the rights they define."

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



Automatic Machinery Approved For Russia

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

WASHINGTON — My apologies to Chester Merrow, onetime Republican Congressman from New Hampshire.

In a recent rundown on defeated Congressmen now feeding at the public trough, I neglected to recount the story of Rep. Merrow, who first won House election in 1942.

Twenty years later, Merrow gave up his House seat to try for the unexpired term of Sen. Styles Bridges, who had died. In a four-man Republican primary, Merrow, who had racked up one of the most ultra-liberal voting records of any GOP Congressman, ran a dismal fourth. He returned to New Hampshire where he proposed that a new State office building be named in his honor. The proposal was "roared down with a chorus of 'nays' that nearly took the roof off the State House," according to one observer.

After that episode, Merrow did all he could to bring about the

November defeat of Perkins Bass, his House colleague who had defeated him in the GOP primary. Result: Bass lost by a narrow margin and New Hampshire had a Democratic Senator, Tom McIntyre.

Merrow returned to Washington, where he went on the State Department payroll at \$20,000 a year as a Special Consultant to the Department of Community Affairs. His task: to inform people what the State Department is doing.

Approval has been granted for Soviet purchase of automated machinery worth an estimated \$10 million. The Administration o.k. came from the faceless bureaucrats in the Department of Commerce who ruled the "automated miners" have no military value.

Not so, says Rep. Glenn Lipscomb, the California Republican who is an expert on trade with the enemy. Lipscomb says the machines—available only in this country—are for potash mining.

While potash is used basically for fertilizers, it is also vital in the manufacture of gunpowder. Congressmen Lipscomb feels the Administration approval must be rescinded, before the machinery reaches the Soviet Union.

The machines are by no means the only strategic goods approved for shipment behind the Iron Curtain. In July the Department of Commerce issued a license for shipment to East Germany of precision control instruments which were to be used in "air conditioning."

Rep. Lipscomb's investigation uncovered the whole truth. The license was for 300 instruments that would be used in the construction of naval vessels which were being built for the USSR.

The instruments, according to Rep. Lipscomb, "have applications aboard naval ships as controls for cooling electronic and other military equipment."

On Aug. 12, the Department of Commerce granted a license authorizing shipment of technical data to the USSR. According to the Department of Commerce, the data are to be used in connection with the construction of the Gujarat oil refinery, a Soviet project in Nehru's India.



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

UN Going To Vietnam?

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

WASHINGTON, D. C. — It should not surprise anybody if Henry Cabot Lodge, who asked President Kennedy to send him to South Vietnam, turns up soon in a new capacity — the advance man for a United Nations mission to that tumultuous scene.

Before any blood vessels begin to pop at the mere mention of UN intervention, it ought to be remembered that this organization has lived two lives — indoors and outdoors — and that one of these lives has been far more useful than the other.

As Mr. Inside, a quasi-political and quasi-diplomatic body, the UN has been almost as bad as its critics say it is. Henry Cabot Lodge, and now Adlai Stevenson, serving as our UN emissaries in New York, might just as well have stayed home and written their memoirs. The UN establishment at best has been one long exercise in futility, and at its worst has been an upstart slum for the breeding of sabotage, blackmail, hypocrisy and café society.

do now about missiles-in-caves and Russian troop strength.

If Ambassador Lodge, an active Army reservist with the rank of Major General, comes up with a UN Task Force plan for South Vietnam, it may be the best way out of a very tight spot.

The U.S. Army military units in South Vietnam are there, I'm sorry to admit, on very much the same status that Russian troops are in Cuba. In both instances, they've been invited. In both instances, they're in a messy country where the central government is warring off political unrest and guerrilla attacks.

The excuses of the US and USSR for having troops in a foreign land amounts to a white lie. Officially, we're in South Vietnam and the Russians are in Cuba for "training" purposes only — but the Russians have probably killed anti-Castro Cubans, and Americans have definitely shot and killed anti-Diem Vietnamese.

It's a situation which is no good in Cuba and not much better in Vietnam, one where we'd have much reason to regret further involvement. But U.N. troops, even when they behave as badly as they occasionally did in the Congo where they shot civilians and ate prisoners, seem more apt to stop wars than start them.

Henry Cabot Lodge knows all this better than most people. Any ideas he springs for using Mr. Outside should be worth trying.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Now then, which of you is going back to school?"