

# Editorial Page

## A Worthless Treaty

It is the view of this newspaper that Senator Goldwater is rendering a signal service to the American people in withholding his approval of the test ban treaty until Russia's good faith is evidenced by removal of that nation's troops from Cuba.

Just as Hitler's intentions were spelled out in advance in "Mein Kampf," Russia's program of using periods of false friendliness tied in with trivial and meaningless concessions to soften up her adversaries has not only been proven by the record but plainly set forth in outlines of policy.

It is hard to believe that the state of our foreign policy has fallen so far in one year. Last October, our young President, freeing himself for a time from the debilitating influence of the Rusks and Harrimans, gave us a feeling of national pride when he assured us that communism in the Western Hemisphere would not be negotiated and the Monroe Doctrine would be upheld and also inspired our confidence by stating the fact proven by history that it is more dangerous to give in step by step to aggressive dictatorships than to stand firm.

Now we have the spectacle of Russian pronouncements that Communism is established in Cuba beyond challenge, together with extensive military and naval activity gravely threatening the Americas. We have

the recent memory of wining and dining and a friendly badminton game between our Secretary of State and Mr. Khrushchev at about the same time that women, children and helpless elderly people were being shot down in cold blood at the Berlin wall. We hear reports that our President is going to demean himself by being willing to speak to the same Mr. Gromyko who lied to him barefacedly last year about the rocket installations in Cuba.

This newspaper certainly does not recommend that the United States should start atmospheric testing, unless some real need should arise. Other nations of the world are concerned, and rightly, about poisoning of the atmosphere. If possible, we should let the Russians bear the onus of starting the next atmospheric tests.

Meanwhile, it is important to keep our powder dry. Also, we should keep our perspective. The works of the Russians are such that no faith is justified.

We say, "Stand firm, Barry. Your vigilance may save us from the sleeping on watch that could be the end of free America. You are right that in the face of Communistic invasion of the Western Hemisphere and Communistic barbarity in Berlin a treaty with Russia is no more than a piece of paper. Even taking the trouble to ratify it is much ado about nothing."

## Hope For Man, Yet

(The Blade, Toledo, Ohio)

Poor old Univac! After performing loyally for 10 1/2 years for the Army Map Service—with nary a squeak about being overworked and underpaid—Univac I, a pioneer in the automation breakthrough, finally got the sack. Not unlike many a human machine, Univac has been replaced by a young whippersnapper known as Honeywell-H 800, which is supposed to be a lot smarter, faster, and more efficient.

The map service people held a little retirement ceremony for Univac I the other day. Folks who had watched Univac perform down through the years praised it for its faithful

service, a few sentimental blokes gave it a fond parting pat on the console, and that was it. Didn't even rate a gold watch or a lapel pin.

We can all take some encouragement from this evidence that the machines that man invents that replace other men in jobs don't last forever. Many of the people who showed up to pay farewell to Univac were on the job there when the electronic wonder made its debut. And chances are, they will be around to pay their respects to Honeywell-H 800 when it, too, will follow Univac I into obsolescence.



WILLIAM S. WHITE ...

## Goldwater Holds Cards

By WILLIAM S. WHITE

WASHINGTON—So much attention is being fixed on the iffy matter of whether Sen. Barry Goldwater will actively seek the Republican Presidential nomination as to hide, in all this preoccupation with the uncertain, something that is already both certain and profoundly significant.

This is the great certainty: No matter what his eventual attitude may be toward asking for the big prize, Senator Goldwater has already made the final determination—and the undoubted capacity—to force the Republican National Convention into a historic fight for control of the mind and purposes of the party. It can well be a struggle between right and left of a severity matched in this century only by the bitter contentions of the William Howard Taft and Theodore Roosevelt forces a lifetime ago.

Goldwater, as is clear to those in position to watch him at close hand, is painfully involved in a debate within himself as to the wisdom of going all-out for the nomination. One day the balance tips toward "yes." Another day, it teeters down toward "no." But this indecision on the point of his personal ambition is accompanied by a totally fixed decision on the point of what policies the Republicans should take to the country in next year's Presidential election, no matter who the standard-bearer may be.

Goldwater has said privately that his one unshakable resolve is not to see the GOP leave next year's convention hall with a platform on the harsher domestic issues—notably civil rights—that seeks in any way to "out-promise" the Democrats. He has added that if he should seek and win the nomination he would "refuse to run on any platform that attempted to further divide the American people."

Rather, he will "insist on a statement of unity that would tend to bring America together rather than to continue to divide it for the benefit of politics." This generalization means, among other things, that Goldwater will not accept any compulsory civil rights plank that would be genuinely intolerable—as distinguished from merely unwelcome—to the Southern and Border States.

It means, too, that should he

himself not enter the race, his immense power at the convention—and it will be a power among the regular Republicans not exceeded even by that of the man actually nominated—will still be exercised to veto any platform proposal he considers to be extremist in tone.

It is not merely on civil rights that Goldwater disagrees with nearly all the other Republican Presidential possibilities now in sight—including Governors Nelson Rockefeller of New York, William Scranton of Pennsylvania and George Romney of Michigan. A similar disagreement, polite but real, exists over nearly the whole field of social welfare. All the others almost certainly would want to commit the GOP to a strong touch of urban welfare. With this, Goldwater simply will not go along.

Where the others will see this urban welfare as only a proper recognition of urban interests, Goldwater will see it as an un-

justifiable pandering to urban voting blocs.

He looks upon the Democrats as already fatally lost to a method of urban power politics which, rightly or wrongly, he believes to be increasingly disruptive of national unity. He is ready to commit all his influence against any Republican emulation of that model, any Republican "me-too-ism."

Thus, the preconditions are already firmly established—and, again, regardless of whether Goldwater himself goes for the nomination—for an immense contest within the GOP. Almost beyond question, he can win, or all but win, that contest in the convention, so far as its platform policies will be concerned. For it is not easy to see how a liberal Republican can be nominated without at least his suzerainty. And it is even less easy to see such a liberal marching from the convention hall on a platform not, at the end, essentially "cleared with Barry."

## BERRY'S WORLD



"You take the garbage out... I'm chicken!"



"Guess What! You're Almost Holding Your Own!"



IN WASHINGTON ...

## What Is The 'Far Right'?

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Back in the McCarthy Era, liberals complained bitterly that anyone who disagreed with the junior senator from Wisconsin or his followers was accused of being a Communist. The statement was hardly true, but it was broadcast to the four corners of the country.

Now the pendulum has swung the other way, and it seems stuck there. So if you stand to the right of center, watch out. A reading of the Congressional Record shows that day after day the New Frontier's orators attack the "far right" type of expelative to anyone who doesn't believe that a new Revelation is emerging from the White House.

During the debate on the test ban treaty, Senator Hubert Horatio Humphrey (D-Minn.) lashed

out against what he called "the right peddlers, fear mongers, and professional anti-Communists who hunt this land." In the cloakroom, Senator Spessard Holland (D-Fla.) agreed and complained that he was swamped by mail from the "far right."

But what were these two honorable members of the Senate referring to? Simply to the people who opposed the treaty and feel that it will endanger the United States. To say that the Soviet Union has systematically violated its treaties and cannot be trusted—a historical fact—is considered a sign that one has surrendered his soul to the "far right."

This will make difficulties for the Messrs. Humphrey and Holland. Their very liberal colleague, Senator Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), is among those placed by Capitol Hill

observers in the doubtful column on the Treaty of Moscow. And he has always been ungenerously suspicious of the Communists. In fact, he has broken the liberal code by siding with those who oppose membership in the United Nations for Red China. This therefore must make Senator Douglas a member of the "far right."

The mail against the Moscow Treaty has been overwhelming, and it grows heavier every day. One senator whose mail was evenly balanced ten days ago now finds that it is ten to one against. This is being dismissed as part of a campaign by the "far right," although no senator has yet come across the distinguishing marks of pressure tactics—similar wording, punctuation, etc. This should indicate the spontaneity of popular concern.

It is not only over such matters as the test ban treaty that the "far right" accusation is made. It has now gotten to the point where a statement in support of a balanced budget is met by the charge. Yet this is a matter of economics, and Harvard professors can be found who feel that a chronic budget deficit must be ended if this country is to avoid serious trouble.

But this is only the beginning. If you mention that there is more to the Constitution than the Fourteenth Amendment—or that by too-zealous attempts at enforcing it the First Amendment is sometimes violated—that you are daubed with the "far right" tar brush.

Federal aid to education, area redevelopment, urban renewal, raising the debt ceiling—these issues are also tests. If you oppose them, you are in league with the "far right" and, of course, not fit to be admitted to public accommodations. If you favor a stronger line against Communist Cuba, ditto.

Some Republican liberals have begun to take up the chant. Senator Thomas Kuchel of California, who owes his Senate seat to Richard Nixon, has sung the "far right" song. So, too, has Governor Nelson Rockefeller, who may have eulched himself out of the GOP nomination with the difficulty.

But does the phrase mean anything? It was first applied, and properly, to the crackpot fringe of the right. But it has been gradually extended by liberal phrasemakers and propagandists to include anyone outside what Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. called the "vital center"—a position which to him included New-Fair Dealism, socialism, and left liberalism. (Mr. Schlesinger himself conceded that the "vital center" was an extreme.)

What does the use of this misnomer—when applied to constructive conservatives—achieve? At first, it tended to smear those against whom it was directed. But it has been used so indiscriminately that it is rapidly losing its effectiveness. Eventually, it will be used as a cover by the real "far rightists"—and those who wield the term like an ax will find their efforts defeated.

"Liberal" and "conservative" are good enough words, even as defined today. Senator Humphrey would do well to confine himself to them instead of resorting to a verbal tar-and-feather technique.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

## STRICTLY PERSONAL

A reader has suggested that I incorporate in my next "prejudices" column a paragraph about the use of the phrase "true facts." He insists, and properly, that this redundancy is a common error, since anything that is really a fact has to be "true."

Grammatically speaking, he is correct. We use many redundancies in speech and writing; some of them come out of ignorance or sloppiness or the felt need for emphasis. A few, like "true facts," can be defended.

Why does anyone say he wants the "true facts" instead of merely the "facts"? What he means, I think, is that he wants more than the facts—he wants the true significance underlying them.

We all know how master propagandists, orators, politicians and special pleaders can take facts (all of them true in themselves) and glue them together to give a totally false picture of a situation.

All of us, at times, have been with persons who seem to have all the facts about a particular problem in their possession. They can rattle them off glibly; and yet their position and conclusions do not satisfy us.

This is because facts do not satisfy us. We are often in the strange position of believing them to be true and false at the same time: they may be true in a physical sense, but false in their implications or in the values they seem to carry.

It is a fact, for instance, that Lincoln suffered from involuntarily melancholia and sometimes contemplated suicide. What can we do with such a fact?

His political enemies might use it to indict his sanity or stability, but we rightly reject this indictment because it tells us little about his true character. And adding up all the facts about an individual still does not give us the essence of his personality.

Grammarians may sneer at the phrase, "true facts," but this is only because they are not psychologists, and fail to see beneath the words into a deep hu-

## Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Friday, Sept. 20, the 253rd day of 1963 with 102 to follow.

The moon is approaching first quarter.

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

On this day in history: In 1519, Portuguese navigator Ferdinand Magellan began his global voyage to find a western passage to the Indies with five ships and 270 men.

In 1873, financial chaos reached a climax in the panic of 1873, and the New York Stock Exchange closed its doors.

In 1881, Vice-President Charles A. Arthur became the 21st President of the United States upon the death of president Garfield. In 1900, the United Nations admitted 13 African countries in the opening of a turbulent General Assembly session attended by several Communist leaders.

A thought for the day — The Swedish statesman, Axel Oxenstierna, said: "Behold, my son, with how little wisdom the world is governed."

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What year was known as the "year of confusion?"

A—When Julius Caesar adjusted the calendar and made 46 B.C. 15 months long.

Q—Which was the only chemical element discovered in the Middle Ages?

A—Arsenic, discovered by Albertus Magnus in the 13th Century.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON ...

## UN Power Politics Will Create Trouble

By PETER EDSON

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Secretary of State Dean Rusk will be in New York for the first two weeks of the United Nations General Assembly session which convened Sept. 17.

Unlike Secretary Dulles before him, Rusk will not appear as head of the American delegation nor will he make the official American address in opening general debate. That will be left to Ambassador Adlai Stevenson or to President Kennedy if he attends.

What Secretary Rusk is going to New York for is to hold private talks with all top foreign dignitaries and permit them to conduct bilateral discussions with the United States.

This is what Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland calls "switchboard diplomacy." It is one of the most valuable aspects of the Assembly. It permits direct discussion of troublesome issues not on the U.N. agenda and keeps them from becoming donnybrooks in open debate.

Sosa Rodriguez of Venezuela—for the past two years his country's representative on the Security Council—is considered a shoo-in for the General Assembly presidency this year.

There will be a fight over selection of three new members of the Security Council, for there are four candidates. Bolivia will succeed Venezuela as the Latin American member. Ghana, which has been considered the British Commonwealth member, will be succeeded by the former French colony Ivory Coast as a member for Africa.

Malaya—Malaysia—is slated to succeed the Philippines which split the last two-year term with Romania. But the Communist bloc is backing Czechoslovakia as successor to Romania and a representative of Eastern Europe.

Russia has also made a proposal that the British Commonwealth seat and one of the two Latin American seats on the Security Council be given permanently to Asia and Africa. This will create a ruckus in U.N. power politics.

The United States will oppose the Czech nomination on the grounds that an Eastern European representative on the Security Council has never been agreed to. The U.S. does favor enlargement of the Security Council to give the new African and Asian nations the greater U.N. roles they seek.

Russia has consistently opposed enlargement of the Security Council until Red China is admitted to membership and replaces Nationalist China as a permanent member.

Just how enthusiastic Russia is going to be for admission of Red China to the U.N. this year—in view of the widening split between Moscow and Peking—remains to be seen.

No new nations are scheduled for admission to the U.N. this year. It now has 111 members, eventually may have 150.

The little island of Malta in the Mediterranean is next in line but will not get its independence in time. It will be the smallest U.N. member with a population of 320,000 and an area of 95 square miles—about the size of the District of Columbia.

The membership question that really has the General Assembly worried this year is a drive by African nations to expel South Africa and Portugal because of their racial policies.

The U.S. opposes this because the U.N. charter provides that members may be expelled only on recommendation of the Security Council. Tampering with membership would soon make the U.N. a too-exclusive club and destroy its value.

Failing in their drive to expel South Africa and Portugal, the Africans may resort to boycotting General Assembly or committee sessions when Portuguese or South Africans speak. The tactic of "conference rioting" was employed at three U.N. specialized agency conferences this summer.

An effort is being made to convince the Africans that accepting the disadvantages of democracy also means accepting some of the disadvantages. This includes having to sit bored or disgusted while those you don't like speak.



WASHINGTON REPORT ...

## Political Strategy Backfires On Rocky

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

WASHINGTON — A carefully-conceived political stratagem has backfired and Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller finds himself on the outside looking in.

The stratagem: Tie Barry Goldwater to the Radical Right. For months the New York Governor has hammered away at Goldwater and his conservative backers.

As a result, Rocky has thoroughly antagonized party pros who see him as a divisive element and a positive threat to GOP unity. When Rockefeller journeyed west to Ogle County, Ill., last week, he saw at firsthand the fruits of his labor.

Not a single GOP leader was on hand as Rockefeller addressed the Ogle County Fair at Oregon, a town of less than 4,000 persons.

Rep. John Anderson, who represents the area in Washington, refused to show up. So did Everett McKinley Dirksen, GOP Senate Minority Leader. Three candidates for Illinois' GOP gubernatorial nomination also declined to meet with Rocky.

That Hayes Robertson, a conservative, and Charles Carpenter, a moderate, turned down bids, was not surprising. Political eyebrows were raised, however, when Charles Percy, for a long time thought a Rockefeller partisan, refused to appear. In recent months Percy has tried to appeal more and more to the Party's regulars. He says Goldwater would make the strongest Illinois race of any GOP nominee. He has moved to cut all ties with Rockefeller.

Several local GOP leaders were conspicuous by their absence. One was Mrs. Katie Hoffman, president of the Women's Republican Club of nearby Winnebago County.

Rocky's Illinois appearance came two days after New York City voters gave him a sharp rebuke. Rockefeller had personally selected a cousin, Richard Aldrich, as GOP nominee for Manhattan Councilman — at - Large. When little-known John Lamula announced he would challenge Aldrich in the primary, Rockefeller aides attempted to have Lamula denied a spot on the ballot.

Lamula finally won the right to run, then came within 342 votes of the organization choice, Aldrich. A local headline screamed: Rockefeller is primary's big loser.

The New York Journal-American

ican saw in this "stinging rebuke a possible local handicap to Rockefeller's 1964 Presidential hopes."

To make matters worse, Democrats then rejected a GOP deal that would call off a state-wide judicial election this fall. Fearful that Rocky's popularity has plummeted badly, the Governor's aides approached Democratic leaders with a proposal.

The GOP would endorse a Democrat for a vacancy on the State Court of Appeals. The seat had been held by a Republican and party leaders hoped the Democrats would return the favor by endorsing a GOP candidate in 1965.

No dice said Democratic strategists, including New York Mayor Robert Wagner. So Republicans announced that they would endorse the Democratic candidate anyway. The New York Herald Tribune explained:

"Mr. Rockefeller, a leading candidate for his party's Presidential nomination next year, was reportedly unwilling to jeopardize his political prestige in what would have been the only state-wide contest in the Nov. 5 election."

Note: Rockefeller-endorsed candidates did win primary contests in upstate Erie County last week. These victories are not considered particularly significant as the GOP candidates were first endorsed by State Senator Walter Mahoney, GOP leader in that body.

Mahoney is a solid conservative. He will, in fact, address the first annual dinner of the New York Conservative Party, the fledgling outfit that took more than 100,000 votes away from Rocky in last year's gubernatorial race.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Roadblock

I have just read of the arrest of a man for driving his car into a train on Midland Road. I can sure understand how he felt, for I sat there an hour recently waiting for one to move. The man was arrested for being drunk. Maybe the train crew should be fined for keeping a road blocked for so long.

John Welch, P.O. Box 58, Tulare, Calif.