

Editorial Page

The Dull Delinquents

It has now become usual to deplore in sharp terms the all too customary youthful disturbance which mar big holiday weekends at many of the nation's seaside and other resorts.

They are deplorable. But they are something else, too. They are a great big crashing bore, not only to those who have to deal with them, but to many who hear of them.

If some of our psychologists are right and this sort of behavior is designed to be attention-getting, its tiresomeness for others ought to be something of a blow to the unruly participants.

Why is it a bore? Because underlying this inexcusable conduct is the assumption that life in this country for some young people just isn't worth a thing unless it can somehow be juiced up with beer drinking, wild driving, rock-throwing, general vandalism and riot.

We all know that America has come a long way from the captivating innocence that marked its earlier history. But can we really accept the idea that for some of us there is no shred of this left?

The answer ought to be "no," which is why these tales of youthful depredation are so wearying.

What is the matter with enjoying a beach as a beach instead of as no more than a setting for a raucous brawl?

Why can't trees in a park or wood be appreciated for what they are, instead of hacked

at, cut down or otherwise marred as if they were somehow hostile objects?

What is wrong with parties where youngsters just have fun instead of trying to break up the place?

Who says playgrounds have to become battlegrounds? Why should the baseball park, the football stadium, the swimming pool, ever be the scene of marauding misbehavior?

Whatever became of just plain fun, as distinguished from "kicks?"

We've all heard that youngsters' search for "kicks" reflects their quest for identity, for attention, for manhood or womanhood, for a way, too, to express feelings of hostility engendered by the complex age they live in.

Grant all this. It still doesn't let the unruly kids off the hook altogether. For the many who get beyond asphalt, brick and concrete, the marvelous world is still here to be taken at its worth.

And you don't need a primer at hand to respond warmly to the sky, the sun, the water, the trees, the sand and all the games and pleasures linked with them.

Unless we are ready to concede that a good many kids are monstrous automatons incapable of feeling the stimulus of these things, then we have to say they have the eyes, the hearts and the minds to respond.

Those who react instead of wrecking, corrupting and deprecating what they see about them are indeed incredible bores. They are still baffled by one of life's most easily fathomed secrets.



WILLIAM S. WHITE ...

Enduring Double Standard

By WILLIAM S. WHITE
WASHINGTON—A good deal of junior-grade cynicism on the outside is almost totally confusing what is happening on the inside, and why, in the Senate's grave debate looking toward ratification of the limited nuclear test-ban treaty.

Academic-minded and bureaucratic-minded people who don't know the Senate, and commonly think of it as a large body of inevitably small and ignorant "politicians," are attributing all sorts of absurdly melodramatic motives to men in this debate.

The Republican Senate leader, Everett Dirksen of Illinois, comes out for the pact. So they run about crying that he is "trying to take over the mantle" of the late Sen. Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan as a bipartisan foreign policy leader. Or, if not that, it is simply that the Kennedy White House has "taken Dirksen into camp."

A sophomoric skepticism hereabouts, arising among commentators and others who take their line from the anti-Congress establishment in this country, has long been based upon the assumption that Senators are invariably only "politicians." Diplomats and State Department advisers and any and all world-disarmers, of course, are invariably "statesmen."

Thus, when Dirksen takes his stand for the treaty—as when Senators like Richard Russell of Georgia and John Stennis of Mississippi take their stand against it—there is instantly a mad search to find elaborate and pseudo-cynical explanations for very simple truths. Dirksen in fact supports the treaty for the same reason a large majority of its other Senate supporters do.

Like them, he is worried about possible tricks by the Russians—whose record to date in keeping their international agreements is far from good. But, like them, he knows that a President of the United States has made this treaty. Like them, he knows that a President is the final proper authority under the Constitution for the conduct of our foreign affairs. Like them, he knows that in such matters there can be only one President at a time, be he Democrat or Republican, be he right or wrong.

This, then, is the far from complicated explanation of why Republicans like Dirksen and Leavertt Saltonstall of Massachusetts back this treaty. It is not that they are "afraid" not to do so, or that they are scrambling for public kudos or somebody's "mantle." All politicians, of course, want to be reelected. But very few Senate politicians, in things touching life or death for this country, are nearly so afraid of doing their duty, as they see it, as the anti-Congress establishment perpetually believes them to be.

Now, Senators like Russell and Stennis have also read the Constitution. They, too, know all the things that the Dirksens and Saltonstalls know. But in their case, it happens that their main legislative responsibilities have long been in the field of military defense. Thus, they are aware, in a peculiarly intimate way, of the profound misgivings about this treaty which actually run among the highest military officers.

From where the Russells and Stenniss sit, it carries more risk than opportunity, more possible peril than hope for peace. So they oppose it. They do not oppose it in some dark conservative coalition conspiracy against the President and the liberals. They do not oppose it because they don't like what Mr. Kennedy is doing in the South about civil rights.

Good Senate politicians—the Russells and the Stenniss, and equally the Dirksens and the Saltonstalls—are abundantly tough in taking care of their political interests, to a point. But they know where the cut-off is. They know the cut-off is that point where playing politics in the ordinary sense is not permissible because it is playing politics with national security and with ultimate duty.

In a word, there are now and always have been two political worlds; and there is, politically, an enduring double standard. The rule of thumb among good politicians—Senators, Presidents and even such lofty types as diplomats, wherever these latter are able to understand politics at all—is this: Hit the opposition with every stick at hand on home issues; but walk softly, and remember personal and national responsibility, when it comes to mortal issues involving this nation abroad.



HOLMES ALEXANDER ...

Welfare State Falters

By HOLMES ALEXANDER
WASHINGTON, D.C.—For those who can't understand why the American Congress (that is, the American people) keeps resisting the proffered benefits of more welfareism, there comes a helpful hint from a national survey just made in Great Britain, inventor of the democratic welfare state.

Out of this same study, conducted by the Institute of Economic Affairs in London, here also rises an explanation of why America's magnetic needle of popular approval keeps pointing at Barry Goldwater, who likes people but loathes welfareism.

The British opinion pollsters asked a broad selection of citizens—covering all ages, social classes and political sympathies—what they would do with a windfall of 1000 pounds. Blow it on a new automobile, a trip abroad, home improvement? Or put it into education, health insurance, retirement savings?

Astonishingly, a majority of Britons passed up the materialistic choices—the car, the trip abroad—and elected to buy do-it-yourself plans for educating their children and looking after themselves in sickness and old age. In question after question aimed at discovering whether Britons preferred state paternalism to private thrift, they came out for the latter. Practically everybody who was polled believed in public charity for the needy, but not public control over the welfare spending of the nation as a whole.

The picture that emerges, say the publishers in a bland British understatement, "is different from the conventional assumption of almost universal support for the welfare state."

Considering that the United Kingdom has been under womb-to-tomb welfareism since the defeat of Churchill's government in 1945, this document, entitled "Choice in Welfare," promises to insert some domestic economic issues into next year's British election. Up till now that coming contest has seemed to be concerned with sex, scandal and internationalism. And considering that Senator Goldwater has been taking almost exactly the same positions which this British study now enforces, there seems to be some hope that both of the English-speaking races may get a chance at self-expression on welfareism.

A reader who cares to take "Choice in Welfare" in one hand and Goldwater's book, "The Conscience of a Conservative" in the other, will have the exhilarating experience of seeing how a political thinker, while rather under-

educated by modern standards, has the wisdom of insight which we just don't find in our over-educated masters. Goldwater didn't possess, and apparently didn't need, these supporting statistics to reach the conclusions which they validate.

"Socialism . . ." he wrote several years ago, "subordinates all other considerations to a man's material well-being . . ." (Socialists) are, moreover, in a hurry. So that their characteristic approach is to harness the society's political and economic forces into a collective effort to compel "Progress." In this approach, I believe they fight against Nature . . . Only a philosophy that takes into account the essential differences between men . . . can

claim to be in accord with Nature."

The matter of choice vs. compulsion is the heart subject of this factual study and of the Goldwater philosophy. Free enterprise allows people to go into the market and express a preference for schools and doctors, pensions and dentures, while socialism runs a monopoly and allows no preference. The theory that an Affluent Society must look after people because they are too flabby and indifferent to look after themselves and their needy neighbors comes a real cropper in the British survey.

Goldwater, by the light of his own intuition, has been knocking that theory around the head for many years.



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS
Purely Personal Prejudices: Patience does not mean, as so many people think, merely passive waiting; but is a creative act of hoping for events and preparing oneself to cope with them when and if they happen.

When the husband too ardently desires boy children, and the wife wishes intensely for girls, I always suspect there is a latent resentment against the other sex on both sides; the best marriages seem to be those in which each parent prefers children of the opposite gender.

Until we know more accurately how responsible society is for producing criminals, our system of punishment will be based on vengeance rather than reform.

The human personality gives off a scent, like the bodies of some animals: the man who expects to be offended usually is; the man who is afraid of being cheated almost always is. We generally react in compliance with the fears of others, which seem to invite our contempt or ill-feeling.

Conservatives and liberals might not be such implacable enemies if they knew how desperately each needs the other—the conservative to be taught a wider grasp of humanity, and the liberal to be given a deeper sense of reality.

There is always a good excuse for not raising wages: in bad times, conditions don't warrant it; in good times, expenses are high and earnings must be reserved for the bad times that are sure to follow.

If "all things are relative," as most modern people glibly assert, how can we judge among them?—for even two relative things need a third thing, which is not relative, to be compared to. The theory of relativity may apply to physics, but it wreaks terrible harm in ethics.

The best and tersest explanation of the steady output of creative productions was given by Auerbach, when he wrote: "The little dissatisfaction which every artist feels at the completion of a work forms the germ of a new work."

Grecian ladies, according to Homer, counted their age from their marriage, not their birth; which seems a much more sensible treatment of this delicate subject.

The myth that a strong army prevents war has carried more nations into war than any other illusion of mankind; the only thing that prevents war is universal disarmament, which only the weaker nations favor. To paraphrase Hegel's remark about history—all we learn from war is that we learn nothing from war.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Library

I have been following the library situation in the paper.

It seems if the new librarian were hired for the consolidation and Mrs. Cote fired that in all fairness Mrs. Nixon, city librarian, should be fired too. Then there is some question as to the efficient functioning and interest of the board. Since there are members on the county board who are also on the city board, maybe in all fairness there should be a completely new, impartial board appointed to work with the new librarian in formulating procedure and policy for the consolidation.

The board is appointed by the court, which probably we should get all new, too, since, according to reports in the paper, instead of a three-man government it has apparently degenerated into a one-man dictatorship.

Since when do we tolerate this in a democratic country? It is time citizens checked into the situation and made some changes. It has been from small beginnings and people's complacency that other countries lost their freedoms to dictatorships.

G. D. Rutherford, 2124 Reclamation.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Thursday, Sept. 19, the 282nd day of 1963 with 83 to follow.

The moon is approaching first quarter.

The morning star is Jupiter.

The evening stars are Jupiter, Saturn and Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1863, Union and Confederate soldiers met in the battle of Chickamauga, Ga. The rebels won the following day.

In 1881, President James Garfield died in Elberon, N. J., from wounds inflicted by a disgruntled office-seeker on July 2.

In 1960, Soviet Premier Khrushchev received a cold reception when he arrived in the United States to attend the United Nations General Assembly.

A thought for the day—President James Garfield said: "This nation is too great to look for mere revenge. But for the security of the future I would do everything."



Could Shoe-Pounding Era In UN Be Ending?

By PETER EDSON
WASHINGTON — (NEA) — First tests on how much Soviet Russia may have changed its tactics if not its strategy for the cold war will be shown at the 18th United Nations General Assembly convening in New York Sept. 17.

Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland, in charge of international organization affairs, sees a few straws in the winds of change.

This may be an indication that the Kremlin finally has realized that the underdeveloped countries, the United States and the rest of the non-Communist world find much good in the U.N. and see a future for it in a world of peace.

Up to a year ago, the Russians opposed everything about the United Nations. When former Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold was killed in a Congo plane crash, the Russians expressed condolences for the man, but had no good word for his office. Grumpily they accepted U Thant as his successor.

What the Russians really wanted was their "troika" principle of neutral, non-Communist and Communist administration in the U.N. to be substituted for a one-man secretary generalship. They wanted three undersecretaries in control of every U.N. agency, giving the Communists veto power over all programs.

When only a few non-Communist countries supported the Communist bloc on this reorganization plan, the Russians abandoned it. But they still opposed U.N. peace-keeping efforts in the Congo and elsewhere, and they boycotted all such operations, financially.

In recent months, however, the Russians have changed their tune. Russia's Chairman Nikita Khrushchev proposed that U Thant and the U.N. organization verify removal of Russian missiles from Cuba. It was Cuba's Fidel Castro who blocked that.

The Russians thanked U Thant for his services, however. And for the past year they have refrained from criticizing him. They invited him to Moscow for the test ban treaty signing.

When the Yemen case came before the Security Council earlier this year the Russians did not follow their previous standard operating practice of vetoing what was essentially another U.N.

peace-keeping operation. Change of policy may not have been the deciding factor in this case, though. Maybe it was just that the U.N. mission to Yemen was financed by the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia. It didn't cost the Russians a ruble.

In the more recent Security Council consideration of South Africa apartheid policies, it was noteworthy that the Russians refrained from their usual practice of beating the United States over the head for its racial policies.

Such an attack had been anticipated. Text for a speech had been prepared to answer the Russians if they should raise the issue.

It never had to be delivered. Chief Soviet delegate Nikolai T. Fedorenko didn't mention the United States even once during debate on charges of other African nations against South Africa.

One reason for this may have been that the Russians did not want to antagonize the United States while the nuclear test ban treaty was before the Senate for ratification. A more valid explanation given is that the Russians themselves are now concerned about the world-wide nature of the racial issue.

This had been stirred up by the Chinese Communists. In their dispute with the Russians, the Red Chinese have tried to propagandize the idea that they are colored people, too, and that the future struggle for world domination will be the colored races against the whites—including the Russians.

Washington officials who keep a close watch on United Nations affairs are not deceiving themselves that these warm Russian gestures of friendship indicate a thaw in the cold war.

The big iceberg of Communist opposition is still there. It probably will show through the fog when the \$96.6 million U.N. budget for 1964 is presented to the General Assembly for approval. The special session last spring arranged for financing U.N. operations only through Dec. 31, 1963.

The \$200 million in arrearages and the possible suspension of voting rights for some members presages a long and bitter battle. Also, the old controversies are still on the agenda—Laos, Cuba, the Congo, Korea.



Hungarian Policy Undergoing Change

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON — Trial balloons, brightly colored pink and yellow, float gently overhead. Scattered shots have failed to bring them down and there is little reason to doubt recurring reports that Kennedy Administration will shortly resume full diplomatic relations with Comrade Janos Kadar's Hungarian government.

The first balloon was sent aloft in May, 1962, launched by the London Economist. An account in that journal reported a U.S.-Hungarian deal as being in the works in which this country would recognize Hungary, drop its opposition to the seating of the Hungarian UN delegation, and make sure the "Hungarian question" was left off the UN agenda.

Predictably, the report was denied by State Department sources.

In December, 1962 and February, 1963, seven U.S. Senators—four Democrats and three Republicans—wrote to Secretary of State Dean Rusk pleading that there be no change in U.S. policy toward Hungary. They were, reports Sen. Tom Dodd, assured "There had been no change in our policy."

Yet there had been. U.S. diplomats were instructed to mingle socially with Hungarian envoys at the U.N. Vice President Lyndon Johnson laid out the red carpet at his Texas ranch for Hungary's UN Ambassador. Acting on orders from Washington, Adlai Stevenson approved a plan in which Australia's Sir Leslie Munro, a steadfast anti-Communist, was sacked as Special UN Representative on Hungary.

In May, the State Department sent up to Capitol Hill a top-secret Memorandum entitled "Report on the Changing Situation in Hungary" in which it was claimed that the Kadar regime no longer operated a Stalinist police state.

The report was ridiculed by Hungarian exiles whose pipelines into Hungary remain in working order.

One month later, in June of this year, Ambassador Stevenson laid down a new U.S. policy: We would not oppose seating the Hungarian delegation.

Again letters from anxious Congressmen reached Foggy Bottom. On June 18, Assistant Sec-

retary of State Frederick Dutton assured legislators there would be no further changes in U.S. policy. "The Department," he wrote, "has no plans to send a Minister to Budapest at this time."

Within a month the situation had changed. No longer was it denied we would send a Minister to Budapest. Dutton referred to Kadar's sweeping amnesty (termed a fraud by exile leaders). He said this country must "utilize all opportunities for maintaining and broadening U.S. contacts with the Hungarians."

Shortly thereafter, on Aug. 9, the New York Times reported from Washington that "normal ties" between Washington and Budapest were about to be instituted. A similar story, obviously leaked from the same source, appeared in the Washington Star the same day.

Radio Budapest broadcast to the world: Undersecretary of State Averell Harriman has met three times with Communist boss Kadar on resuming normal relations.

Late last month, the country's exiled leaders met in Washington and implored Washington to drop all plans for "normalization" of U.S.-Hungarian relations. They said:

"We believe the Hungarian people oppose any such action by the U.S. Government. Should normal diplomatic relations with Hungary be restored, 100 million people still in Communist captivity in Europe will feel that the United States has violated its self-proclaimed devotion to the principle of self-determination."

"It will be interpreted that sheer expediency and not dedication to principles determines the policies of the United States. It will stand as an indication that the status quo in East Europe has been recognized by the United States and the Western Powers. It will demoralize the captive peoples and thus weaken an essential deterrent to aggressiveness in Europe."

The State Department issued a collective yawn. Similar words—from Senators Lausche, Dodd, Keating, Mundt, Scott, Dominick, and McCarthy—had been heard before. The striped pants boys couldn't care less.

BERRY'S WORLD



"... I dunno, boss—he says he composes avant-garde music!"