

Editorial Page

Facing Our Problems

A nation or a society which is not able or willing to solve its problems cannot endure.

This is as obvious as it is indisputable. America today is assailed from without and within with problems and threats that are perhaps unequalled in its history.

It is spending billions of dollars and investing billions of work hours year in and year out to protect itself against the problems from without.

Is it doing as much to save itself from the problems from within?

The answer has to be "no."

The country is torn with internal discord and strife—worker against employer, group against group, race against race.

Apparently, we Americans lack the capacity to resolve these conflicts. At least, we have not resolved them.

And this failure is perhaps the gravest national danger of all.

Take the railroad crisis, for example.

This threat to the national economy and welfare should have been met long ago. Machinery to settle it should have been available and put to use as soon as it became apparent that the two sides could not or would not reach an agreement under their own power.

Labor-management disputes should never be permitted to endanger the public health, the public safety, the public welfare, the public economy, or even the public convenience.

Yet we have endured and tolerated over the years prolonged work stoppages in newspapers, public utilities, civic services, transportation, and even in schools and hospitals.

We seem as a nation and as a society to be strangely and tragically lacking in capacity to settle civil rights issues which have been simmering for more than a century, and which now are boiling.

We seem to lack the capacity and even the desire to give and take, to compromise.

To many Americans, "compromise" is a dirty word.

It suggests that someone has chickened out. It implies a surrender of principle. It

hints of an under-the-table deal, of conniving. Actually, compromise can, and often does, mean just the opposite.

It can mean that persons or groups or races with conflicting views have put public welfare above personal pride and prejudice, and have yielded a bit to reach agreement that may save many acute inconvenience if not actual harm.

It is true that Webster defines "compromise" as "a surrender." But he first defines it as "a reciprocal abatement of extreme demands or rights."

The key word here is "extreme."

It has become standard operating procedure in America for both sides in a dispute to enter bargaining sessions with demands that are obviously extreme and often impractical of attainment.

The intent, of course, is to demand the impossible and come away with the acceptable.

This strategy may be a trifle devious and unquestionably time-consuming. But it gets the job done more often than you'd think — if both parties involved are willing to compromise.

The device of compromise is no Johnny-come-lately gimmick.

Two hundred years ago Edmund Burke, Britain's great statesman and orator, said: "All government—indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act—is founded on compromise and barter."

He was referring, of course, to honorable compromise and barter.

America needs, and needs badly, the capacity to settle its internal conflicts before they get out of hand, as they too frequently do.

A good way to help acquire this capacity is for each of us to develop and use a spirit of give and take, a willingness to surrender self-interest in the public interest, to substitute humility for stubborn pride and understanding for prejudice.

Even a casual review of the national and international situation will confirm the suspicion that we have no time to lose.

Couldn't Care Less

(The Sun, Baltimore)

The seed was planted and the golden grain was harvested—40 million bushels of it. It was shipped off to the grain elevators and the farmers got their subsidy for it. Later it was carried to the ports and loaded onto ships. Ship after ship started forth over a period of four years with its cargo of surplus grain consigned to Austria—part of one of those barter deals that the governments engage in.

Of all the thousands involved in this transaction, no one ever bothered to inquire whether the grain got there. Then around last Christmas, as we get the story, an agricultural attache in the United States Embas-

sy in Vienna happened to glance through a batch of reports of grain shipments consigned from the United States to Austria. The total came to 40 million bushels, which seemed just a bit out of scale since it amounted to six bushels for every man, woman, child and new-born infant in Austria. He asked someone about it and so in time it developed that 24 million of these 40 million bushels had disappeared en route and never got there.

So the State Department and the Department of Agriculture sat on the story for six months. How did the story finally leak? We don't know, but we can guess that some jobholder in on the secret thought it just too good a joke to keep to himself.



WASHINGTON CALLING . . .

Congress Studies Itself

By MARQUIS CHILDS
WASHINGTON—Lazy, indifferent, inefficient, venal, outdated—these are some of the epithets that with increasing frequency over the years are heaped on Congress.

So tarnished is the image that Congress itself has begun to notice. With editorials and cartoons hitting hard at the stolid pace of the present session a first tentative step has been taken to determine what reforms might help. But this step is so hedged around with barriers protecting the worst abuses that its usefulness is questionable.

The contempt for Congress and the state legislatures is such that it seems to reflect a distrust of representative government. The institution, as a few members of Congress realize, is not sacred. The power to nullify and obstruct has in other lands proved to be also the power of self-destruction.

The Senate Rules Committee approved a concurrent resolution establishing a Senate-House committee to study the organization of Congress. But the resolution says that the 12-man committee—six from each body—is not (repeat not) to consider "rules, parliamentary procedures, practices or precedents." This is like a police chief telling a precinct captain to investigate a series of robberies in his district but not to inquire into the means that were used.

Moreover, nothing could better illustrate the ring-around-the-rosy of Congressional procedure than the probable fate of this resolution. To be effective it must be approved also by the House

Rules Committee. The word from the House side of the Capitol, where 80-year-old Howard W. Smith (D., Va.) presides over rules, is nothing good.

Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D., Pa.), the most forthright Congressional critic of Congress, says he will try when his resolution comes up on the Senate floor to count the House out and make it a Senate operation. If he succeeds there will at least be an inquiry.

This happened last in 1946. Two conscientious men, Sen. Mike Monroney (he was then in the House) and the late Sen. Robert M. LaFollette Jr., put through a reform bill which brought some changes. Clark and the co-sponsor of the present resolution, Sen. Clifford Case (R., N.J.), point out that the LaFollette-Monroney inquiry operated under a similar restriction excluding rules and procedures. So they hope for a net gain even though the frame of reference is narrow.

The reforms that critics both in and out of Congress put forward match the abuses these same critics cite. First and foremost are unlimited debate—the filibuster—and the custom of seniority in the selection of committee chairmen. The first is written into Senate Rule 22, requiring a two-thirds vote to shut off discussion. This means the Southern conservatives with a little help from conservative Republicans can go on talking as long as they can muster enough votes to hold the floor indefinitely. That is the tactic they will try against the civil rights bill.

Seniority is untouchable because this is the means by which a

few men go on year after year exercising the power to delay and obstruct. These committee chairmen, whose average age is nearly 60, would have to approve any substantial change in the system. They show no signs of voting themselves out of power.

Senator Case in a reform bill has proposed some modifications of the brassbound system. For example, he would set the time limit on committee consideration of legislation proposed by the executive. Within, say, 30 days measures sent from the White House would have to be either forwarded to the floor or rejected. That would put a restraint on the current custom which is simply to bottle up at least two-thirds of the proposals that go into the Congressional hopper.

Clark attacks the Senate establishment itself in a book of that title, just published, comprised of his and other speeches on reform. This Philadelphia with an upper-case background hits the old club spirit which is the ultimate heresy. He proposes that an age limit be put on committee chairmen. He proposes a committee bill of rights providing that a majority of members be allowed to convene meetings, call up bills for consideration and shut off debate of issues in executive session.

These and other detailed proposals go to the heart of monopoly power. And that is why they seem to have little chance of acceptance. But Congress is feeling the hot breath of public opinion and a first, small step has been taken.

"He Stuck in His Thumb and . . ."



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

Common Sense Approach

By WILLIAM S. WHITE
WASHINGTON—The American position in South Viet Nam which is to say the free world's position in the fateful battle to halt creeping Communist military aggression in Southeast Asia—is looking up.

Given luck and a determination by the American people not to contribute by an ounce to either pressures on this government coming from both left and right, we may yet come out with a significant victory.

The biggest change in atmosphere proceeds right from the White House. President Kennedy has now made it plain that he does not propose to lose the war out there by yielding to the loud and foolish demands of either screaming pacifist—liberals or bellicose ultra-conservatives here at home.

The liberals—now in spirit imperceptibly joined by Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations, though the matter is none of his business—want Mr. Kennedy to throw out the anti-Com-

munist head of South Viet Nam, Ngo Dinh Diem, because of his alleged "persecution" of the Buddhists. They thus also would throw away a military victory over invading Communist guerrillas.

They can see nothing good in Diem, though he is the only Vietnamese politician in sight with the known capacity to continue American-backed resistance to the Communists.

The ultra-conservatives want Mr. Kennedy to go along with everything Diem may do, however divisive. Since he is indispensable to the anti-Communist cause we must not lay a finger on him to check excesses which threaten to hamper the military action itself.

Happily, however, President Kennedy has promised not to be led up either of these blind alleys. He has proclaimed the only rational policy: Whatever helps win the war over the Communists we will support; whatever interferes with it we will oppose. We are not going to oust Diem to please one crackpot wing here at

home, nor will we sit by silent, and see Diem go on making avoidable mistakes, to suit the other crackpot wing.

The President has been under much criticism, a criticism in which this columnist has not always been behindhand. He is therefore entitled to great credit for his decision, since it will please nobody but the moderates—who rarely talk up as they should. Most deeply it displeases the Democratic left-wing, which has generated a shrill passion against Diem in its invariable recoil from any leader anywhere who believes in killing armed Communists rather than endlessly "negotiating" with them.

Saluted, too, must be Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Hilsman, a wartime guerrilla fighter with Merrill's Marauders and now a policy planner who is sensibly "tough," has long been carrying this mess on his plate in stout refusal to panic in either direction.

Weeks of careful inquiry indicate that the actual situation in Viet Nam comes to this: The so-called Buddhist rebellion against Diem, a Christian, is undeniably profiting the Communists. Certainly they exploit it, if they did not help to start it. He was right to put it down, to the considerable degree that it is a political putsch and not a legitimate expression of religious grievance.

Diem has, however, sometimes gone too far in the means by which he has put it down and this is doing no good at all, least of all to the joint Diem-American war plan. For one illustration, 15 of his 17 top field officers are basically Buddhists, and any continued Diem extremism against the rebelling Buddhists might bite deep into allied military morale.

Common sense dictates that we moderate Diem—to whom we have pawned the lives of 14,000 American troops—just as common sense also dictates that we not be stampeded into some hysterical anti-Diemism that would help nobody but the Communists.

complex operations of the body and its relationship to the mind and the emotions, we may discover that the ancients had a sounder view of the human organism than we do—and that it is the unremitting pressure of day-after-day toil that creates weakness and breakdown, rather than sustained effort over a long number of hours.

Most of the effective men I have known, in business, science or the arts, work hard and long—but take frequent and extended vacations throughout the year. Routine can be a deadlier enemy of social development than relaxation.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Weird—n't it, comrade . . . babushkas are becoming fashionable in America!"

EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .



Landis Case Brings Enforcement Scrutiny

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—Echoes are still bouncing around on the 30-day imprisonment of former Harvard Law School dean James M. Landis for failure to file income tax returns for five years.

Tax experts recognize there is an important moral principle here, as well as a legal question.

The successful functioning of the American voluntary income tax assessment system is based on the assurance of people who do pay their taxes that those who evade payment are forced to pay up and given just punishment.

Landis's excuse for not filing returns from 1956 through 1960, when he had average income of over \$70,000 a year, was that he was so busy with his clients' business he didn't have time to take care of his own. Also, it was brought out in court that he was under psychiatric treatment.

When formal charges were filed against the former high government official, he admitted guilt, paid up \$94,000 in back taxes, penalty and interest due in full. So the government lost nothing in the long run.

In the light of this record, the question being discussed now is whether the sentence handed down by Federal Judge Sylvester J. Ryan in New York district court was fully justifiable, too heavy or not heavy enough? And is it comparable to sentences handed down to others found guilty in similar cases?

Internal Revenue Service enforcement officials say frankly they don't know whether the Landis decision has any precedents or not. They don't keep their records that way. Neither does the Department of Justice, which does the prosecuting. Nor do the courts keep records nationally.

Every case of delinquency,

fraud or other evasion of federal tax liability taken to court is tried before one of 400 district judges. Circumstances and amounts involved in each case vary and so do the judges who hear them. There is no uniformity in the decisions they hand down, except those imposed by the limits of the law.

In 1961 Department of Justice recommended the first judicial seminar in Boulder, Colo. The purpose was to get judges, in closed sessions, to come to some agreement among themselves on sentences they hand down in various types of cases.

IRS Commissioner Mortimer Caplin's report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962—last one available—shows that 1.5 million tax delinquency investigations were conducted. Taxes, penalties and interest brought in from 935,000 of these probes totaled \$165 million. But the average was only a little over \$176 on each return.

Last year IRS had to handle about 350 million pieces of paper. It can't check this much business manually. On the 96 million returns filed, information indicating fraud, delinquency or other civil or criminal violation of the tax laws was obtained on about 125,000 cases.

The 125,000 cases were reduced to about 15,000 considered the most important. About 4,000 of these were then investigated in depth by the 1,750 special agents of the IRS Intelligence Service. Of the 4,000, only 1,200 were recommended for prosecution.

This situation is going to be completely changed when the IRS automatic data processing—ADP—is fully operational in 1968. It will then be possible to check every return and catch every delinquent. This will make possible more uniformity in tax law enforcement.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



Negro Downtrodden Under Castro Regime

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON—In January of this year, Patricia Robinson, a young resident of New Rochelle, N.Y., joined other militant supporters of Fidel Castro in picketing Attorney General Robert Kennedy. The reason: Kennedy's Justice Department had mapped plans to prosecute William Worthy, a left-wing newspaper, for unauthorized Cuban travel.

In July of this year, Miss Robinson asked the State Department for permission to visit Cuba, as a reporter representing the Washington Afro-American, a newspaper her family owns. The permission was granted.

The Afro-American has run an astounding on-the-spot report from Miss Robinson in which there is no mention of Communism, of Soviet troops or Chinese technicians. Instead the Cuban people are said to have chosen "a new political and economic system, where each shall be rewarded to his need and from each shall be demanded according to his ability."

One of the revolution's greatest accomplishments, Miss Robinson writes for her Negro readers, is creation of a "new humane society" (not to be confused with the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) in which there is no segregation. That assertion is flatly contradicted by thousands of Cuban Negroes in Miami who have formed the Association of Cuban Exiles of the Colored Race.

The leaders of that group insist there was no segregation before Fidel Castro took over. Dictator Fulgencio Batista, as a matter of fact, was a poor Negro. Negroes occupied high positions in the government and in the armed forces. Cuban's greatest military hero, Antonio Maceo, was a Negro, and the Cuban National Day of Mourning is celebrated on the anniversary of his death, Dec. 7, 1896. Maceo, known popularly as the Bronze Titan, achieved the highest rank in the Cuban revolutionary forces that fought the Spaniards for their country's independence. He is revered in Cuban history.

Prior to Castro there was no discrimination in the professions or civic life. There were no discriminatory practices in hiring or firing. That situation has now changed. A 23-year-old Negro, Juan Corbes Ibanez, recently fled Cuba in a small boat. He told Miami reporters: "I had to abandon Cuba because the black race has been relegated to a position of inferiority. Negroes are constantly watched. If caught conspiring against the regime they are summarily shot without trial."

"Castro wishes to make it appear that his government is for the colored race. That is totally

false. Before Castro, no one had to remind me in Cuba that I was a Negro, because the racial problem did not exist. We all lived like one great, big family."

A similar tale is told by Denis Evans, another Negro who recently fled Castro's humane society. He said tens of thousands of Cuban Negroes have applied for permission to leave the island. All have been turned down.

Juan Corbes Ibanez reports that Castro recently invalidated the passports of several thousand Cuban Negroes. An explanation is offered by Oscar Paez and Carlos Luch, former sugar mill workers now living in Miami:

"Never has Negro been exploited more. But the Communists won't let them out because they know a Negro exodus would be a major setback for their propaganda."

Nelson Rockefeller is not the only member of his family to antagonize Republican professionals. Brother Winthrop, perhaps the richest man in all Arkansas, has been severely criticized by Arkansas State Chairman William L. Spicer and Henry Britt, the party's general counsel.

Rockefeller, says Spicer, has tried to usurp the duties of the GOP State Central Committee. He has irritated many by his dogged preference for brother Nelson. Explains Spicer: "If Barry Goldwater is the nominee in 1964, the Republican Party will carry Arkansas for the first time."

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Tuesday, Sept. 24, the 267th day of 1963 with 98 to follow.

The moon is approaching first quarter.

The morning star is Jupiter.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Those born today include John Marshall, chief justice of the U. S. Supreme Court for 34 years, in 1755.

On this day in history: In 1960, the "Black Friday" panic hit Wall Street as a result for an attempt by financiers Jay Gould and James Fisk to corner the gold market.

In 1934, Babe Ruth made his last appearance as a regular player with the New York Yankees.

In 1935, President Dwight Eisenhower suffered a heart attack while vacationing in Denver, Colo.

In 1939, President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev met at Camp David for talks that resulted in the friendly "Spirit of Camp David" between the two leaders.