

Editorial Page

Criers Of Havoc

Some historians may decide to dub 1963 the "Year of the Demonstrations."

We have had all types, including that old familiar variety aimed at disrupting a congressional hearing.

Peaceful assembly to press for redress of real or imagined grievances is an assured American right of citizenship. It is obvious that peaceful assembly, by definition, does not include riot.

Evidently not so clear to some demonstrators is that it also does not include any other deliberate interference with the orderly processes of democracy, or with the functioning of the economic system which flourishes under democracy.

It is bad enough that any Americans, white or Negro, should conclude that the way to "improve" the workings of democracy is to hamstring its processes.

It is worse still when those who commit this grievous error shout "police brutality!" almost automatically when their interference with orderly life is curbed.

Such cries were heard from "students" whose avowed aim was to disturb hearings by the House un-American Activities Committee into unauthorized student travel to Cuba.

When a violation of order is the stated goal, police action to restore order is invited. Such action will surely follow. Indeed it must, if we are to keep democracy as a peaceful mechanism.

The automatic shout of "brutality" has an empty sound when uttered in such circumstances. It amounts to contending that one should be left alone to disrupt democracy and that anyone who is interrupted in this mischief is by that fact the victim of "undemocratic" brutality.

In no stronger position are those demonstrating Negroes who have chained themselves together to bar work at building sites, or tied themselves to cranes and other machinery.

They should be extremely cautious in how they charge police whose minimum responsibility at such times is to remove them as obstacles to work which reasonably must proceed.

There is police brutality in this country—in all sections. But it is a thing of excess, and needs in every instance to be proven.

The charge is not one to be leveled as a matter of course against an officer who has no choice but to remove a screaming demonstrator from a congressional hearing room or a chained group of Negroes from the path of construction trucks.

Those who so glibly make the complaint damage no cause but their own. When the police become a total and automatic enemy, the rule of law is not respected. For the police are among the necessary guarantors of the orderliness which is crucial to the democratic way.

Voice Of The Peepul

These are tough times for Joe Doakes, the average citizen, as he tries to keep up with the news.

Things are fouled up in so many places around the world—not to mention right here at home—that Joe can't remember what's going on where, much less figure out why it's going on or who's to blame.

To make it even worse, Joe can't come close to pronouncing the names of most of the places or people involved.

Nevertheless, he's giving it the old college try. And it might be interesting to talk with him and get his slant on current events.

Q. Joe, what do you think of the situation in Laos?

A. Laos? Hey, I heard a good one on that the other day. A guy says, "Boy are things loused up in Laos!" Get it? Laos is pronounced so it sounds like...

Q. Yes. It's a real cutie. Now how about Viet Nam?

A. Well, I'll tell you. You can say what you please, but that little sister-in-law of what's his name is a real doll, huh? Boy, when

you put her and Jackie together, you got somethin' to look at, I mean...

Q. You said it, Joe. But tell me—what's your hunch on the bomb test ban treaty?

A. Say, that reminds me. Did you read about how that clown Krooschef beat the pants off our man—what's his name? Rusk? Yeah. Well, did you see where Krooschef played badminton with this character and murdered him by not using a net? Bro-ther! If our guy will fall for a corny trick like that, what chance we got with 'em in anything—sports, bombs or anything? You follow me? What I mean...

Q. I follow you, Joe. Now, one last question. What is your considered judgment on the President's tax cut proposals?

A. He's cookin' on the front burner, Mac. Let's cut 'em till it hurts. But I see where some guy in the Senate says it won't amount to nothin' more than savin' cigarette money. And you know somethin'? This'll kill you, I quit smokin' just two weeks ago! How 'bout that, huh?

Yeah, how about that?



IN WASHINGTON...

Red Trade Next Step?

By RALPH de TOLEDANO
Since the Treaty of Moscow test ban has been ratified, the Kennedy Administration will press hard for the lifting of all barriers of trade with the Communist empire.

This will be President Kennedy's "next step," rather than any non-aggression pact. Not even the Mansfield-Dirksen Senate would tolerate any "peace in our time" arrangement between the Kremlin and the White House.

This is the message being waited out by gentle breezes from various Federal departments. Unrestricted trade between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., the President believes, will bring American businessmen flocking back to him and wipe out some of the bitter thoughts of the last year.

The State Department has already quietly informed U.S. exporters that it sees no harm in exploring trade possibilities with the Chinese Communist regime. This runs counter to our policy up to the present—and it might be said that the middle echelon, which makes up its own rules whether the top brass wants them or not, is going it alone. In this instance, however, approval of this back-door approach to trade with the Reds received White House approval.

At the same time, Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges has ordered a new study of East-West trade. Its purpose will be to show that by selling to the Soviet bloc and the Chinese Reds, the U.S. will guarantee its own prosperity, eliminate unemployment, and

increase production. Secretary Hodges argues that there is nothing wrong with such trade, that the U.S. benefits by it, and (the hoariest of arguments) that it will help to "open up" the Communist world.

The Commerce and State departments are not only willing to tolerate this trade with the Communists; they want to encourage it actively and openly. That this bolsters the shaky economies of the Red bloc nations does not seem to penetrate Administration minds. That the Soviets have nothing to export in return is not considered. Secretary Hodges and the Administration see the glitter of Soviet gold—and they are convinced that American businessmen are so greedy that they will grab for it, no matter what the cost to the nation.

The Administration feels highly encouraged by the expanding trade between the Soviet Union and the British Commonwealth. There was a rubbing of hands when the Soviet purchase from Canada of 227.5 million bushels of wheat was announced. There was even more satisfaction when Australia joined in by selling another 38.5 million bushels of wheat to the Soviets. This, it was believed would lead Americans to reconsider their "blind" anti-trade position, if only because they did not want other countries to grab a monopoly.

But taking the long view, what does expanded trade with the Communists in general, and specifically the Canadian and Australian wheat purchases, mean

to the Free World and to the Reds? Briefly, that once more we have bailed out the Communists at a time when economic crisis was endangering their system.

Agricultural production in the Soviet Union has been bad for years. Despite glowing claims, the small print of the Seven-Year Plan reports shows that quotas have not been met. In fact, farm production has not been able to keep pace with the growing population—much less put more bread on Russian tables.

In 1962, for example, every Iron Curtain country reported bad harvests. Yet Comrade Khrushchev continued to ship wheat to the captive nations and to countries like Brazil—taking it out of the mouths of the Russian people. This year, the Soviet harvest was down to about 70 per cent of the planned level of the Soviet Union. It was down roughly 15 per cent from last year's poor harvest. The purchases of wheat from Canada and Australia, interestingly enough, amount to about 15 per cent of last year's crop.

Without these imports, there would be bad trouble in the Soviet Union. The Kremlin would have to renege on sales to the captive nations—or further reduce domestic rations. For Comrade Khrushchev, this would be a bad blow to his leadership. He would be forced to cope with the protests of his economic planners—and the far more potent unrest of the people.

The State Department tells its journalistic friends that by buying wheat from the West, Nikita has "given himself a black eye." This is a comforting thought. Yet the Russian people don't know where their bread came from—and the U.S.S.R. has plenty of gold reserves to spend.

The next step for the President will be to tell people that we can sharply reduce our unfavorable balance of payments and reverse the outflow of gold if we start selling to the Communists the products they need to keep their heads above water.



Consumers' Council Readies For Battle

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — The long-awaited report of President Kennedy's Consumers' Advisory Council under the chairmanship of Dr. Helen G. Conover, dean of Cornell's School of Economics, probably will be made public in early October when the group holds its sixth two-day session in Washington.

The advance word is that the report will not set the country on fire or start a march of consumers on Washington to demand their rights. In its first year's work the Consumers' Advisory Council of six men and six women—call them CAC for short—has done little more than sort out the problems.

There is a long historical chapter, reviewing relations between consumers and government since the New Deal days. The peak of government interest in protecting consumers came in the OPA era of price controls and rationing during World War II. Anything that has happened after that is in a sense anticlimax.

But another section of the CAC report reviews everything that has happened in the Kennedy administration thus far which has been intended to benefit consumers in any way.

Since most of these continuing programs were launched before the President sent to Congress his special message on protecting consumer interests in March 1962, there is nothing particularly new here. Housing acts of 1961 and 1962, for example, antedate the consumer movement agitation.

Securities and Exchange Commission also has done a comprehensive job investigating the stock, mutual investment fund and over-the-counter markets. But its work—which probably will result in new regulations and legislation was begun long before the Kennedy consumer program got hot.

The President's legislative recommendations in the consumer field have met with only limited success so far.

On food and drug safety, the thalidomide case was responsible for waking up Congress on the need for greater protection as embodied in the late Senator Keftau's bill.

The "Truth in Lending" bill fought for so earnestly by Sen. Paul Douglas, D-Ill., and others, is still having difficulties in spite of recent hearings, but may sneak through.

The same is true of the "Truth in Packaging" bill introduced by Sen. Philip D. Hart, D-Mich. CAC endorses both.

But this latter proposal is running into competition from the so-called "Quality Stabilization Bill," which CAC opposes. This legislation has so many congressional sponsors, however, that if it is ever cleared by the House Rules Committee, it will probably pass. The assumption is that it would be vetoed, but it might even override a veto.

One major development, since the President's message suggested it, is the establishment in 23 government agencies of offices to protect consumer interests. These include all 10 cabinet level departments, some of which—like Health, Education and Welfare—have been built around protecting the public.

There is no central coordination of programs by these offices, however, and this is where the Consumers' Advisory Council may carve out its future niche of usefulness.

Dr. Walter Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under whom CAC has worked, believes that it needs a full-time executive director, an economist and a small staff.

There was some grousing in CAC that it did not get launched with a bigger budget and more authority. But it is conceded that CAC has yet to establish its need.

Just what the government's role in consumer protection should be has not been clearly defined. This is one problem that the new Consumers' Advisory Council may work on next year. Its first report is said merely to lay down the base lines from which to start.

WASHINGTON REPORT...



Congressman Loses Reward For Loyalty

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON—You remember Merwin Coad?

The Iowa Congressman who slipped away one day in 1961, obtained a "quickie" divorce in some small town Alabama divorce mill, then married a shapely one-time beauty queen who first came to Washington as the wife of his administrative assistant.

You know, the Congressman who didn't bother to tell his first wife she had been divorced or that he had remarried.

That's right, the Congressman who put his new wife on the government payroll at \$12,500 a year.

Well, Merwin Coad, who did not run for reelection, is back on the federal payroll. Or was, until the other day.

He was quietly hired July 30 at \$75 a day by the Agency for International Development. He joined a former colleague, Leonard Wolf, who draws down \$19,200 a year from the same agency.

Wolf, too, had a stormy Congressional career. Soon after he came to Washington in 1958, he put his wife on the payroll at \$12,000 a year. He was defeated for reelection in 1960.

Coad went on the AID payroll July 30. Agency officials explained that the former Congressman was hired to coordinate AID

activities with those of various church groups. A former minister, Coad was presumably thought to be in good standing with the men of God.

Sen. Jack Miller, who has kept close tabs on Coad's political career, insists the AID job was a reward for Coad's vote on June 21, 1962. On that date, Coad voted to give the Secretary of Agriculture extraordinary controls over farmers. The bill failed, and Senator Miller predicted then that Coad would wind up at the federal trough.

The Senator's colleague, Bourke Hickenlooper, also protested against Coad's appointment. He phoned David Bell, AID director, and told him in no uncertain terms what he thought. Bell, whose Congressional relations are bad enough, was in no position to further antagonize Hickenlooper, ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

So, on Saturday of last week, Merwin Coad "resigned."

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has spent \$21,850 on an 814-page book designed to aid the nation's teachers.

Included in the book, entitled "Programs, 1963" is—believe it or not—one section entitled "Official Girl Watchers Guide." Interested males are informed they must have 20-20 vision (corrective glasses are permitted). "Additional notebook. Average time: two and a half hours (estimate)."

Another section, concerned with social studies, states there is only one continent larger than Africa, —Asia. Then comes the poser: "So, the enormous chunk of rock that is Africa is (a) the largest continent, (b) the second largest continent."

A third section deals with business. A question here will probably not stump the reader: "But before you contact a stockbroker, you should decide what type of stock buyer you are going to be and what kind of — you want to buy."

Answer? Stock.

Another question states: "You could be one of two types of stock buyers. A speculator or an investor. Speculators speculate and investors invest."

Investors invest, if you didn't know.

There are 15 pages on How to Watch a Football Game, How to Score a Bowling Match, Coin Collecting, Roller Skating, Bridge and Chess.

Sen. Karl Mundt wonders whether the general welfare clause of the Constitution was really designed to promote the correct way to watch a football game.



WILLIAM S. WHITE...

Economics Issue Rears

By WILLIAM S. WHITE
WASHINGTON — A smashing, old-fashioned and homely political fight, free of all the subtleties and self-doubts that foreign policy questions nearly always bring, is now joined between President Kennedy and the Republicans in Congress.

The issue is not the President's \$11 billion-a-year tax-cutting program as such, but rather whether this should be undertaken without absolute guarantees of sharp reductions in federal spending.

The Republicans in the House of Representatives want to suspend the effectiveness of tax reduction unless and until the President's budget message of next January puts federal expenditures at no higher than \$97 billion in the current fiscal year and no higher than \$98 billion in the next fiscal year starting July 1, 1964.

President Kennedy, on his side, has promised to end any "unnecessary" spending and to take "a course of true fiscal responsibility." He has not been willing, however, to be tied in the way his opposition wishes to tie him.

All this looms as the greatest bread-and-potatoes struggle between a President and Congressional critics since a Republican Congress in 1948 passed a tax-cutting bill over the objections of the then Democratic President, Harry S. Truman.

Those who complain that there seems little difference between the Republican and Democratic parties would do well to watch this contest. For it will clearly show that there is indeed an enduring difference, as old as, say, the year 1898 and as current as 1963 and 1964. This difference concerns dollars and cents, and it involves, as no other public question does, two distinct public philosophies.

powerful and able set of untypical Southern fiscal conservatives, essentially argues that government spending, sometimes even when tied to growing deficits, is not in itself necessarily an evil. The contention is that deficit spending may so promote the general economy, when associated with tax reduction, as to bring in revenues large enough to more than offset a merely apparent red-ink national balance.

The essence of Republican doctrine, however, is that spending in times of large deficits is automatically and always bad because it tends to kindle inflation and in general to encourage looseness and irresponsibility, in office and outside office.

And, speaking of differences, there is another and an immensely practical one. The Republican party, as it has just demonstrated in the huge and solid party front it has been able to raise up in the House, is consistently capable of reconciling all its wings—right, left, center—to a fierce unity on fiscal matters.

Given a like degree of Democratic unity, Mr. Kennedy would already have his battle won. On this, however, he cannot for a moment depend. For the Democratic troops, though numerically stronger, are never in such issues so dependably disciplined as are the Republican troops glaring coldly from the ramparts in a cause commonly accepted as wise—and, in this case, as politically necessary.

For what is, finally, involved here is a major effort to create an all-G.O.P. case against President Kennedy for 1964—a case in which almost any conceivable Republican presidential nominee could stand without discomfort or painful yes-butts. They are going after the President on the

cry of "fiscal irresponsibility." He knows it; and he is going after them on the charge that they are endangering tax relief for the American people.

The whole affair has a good nostalgic smell about it. Here is no infinitely tricky and mortal problem about Viet Nam or the nuclear treaty where politicians on both sides are arguing within themselves as well as with others. Here is a bread-and-potatoes issue into which all can sink their teeth without worrying about a world far away. The antagonists, indeed, proceed to the combat with a certain relish; for this, at the end, the classic form of partisan combat in American politics.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Friday, Sept. 27, the 270th day of 1963 with 95 to follow.

The moon is approaching full phase.

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

Those born today include the American patriot, Samuel Adams, in 1722.

On this day in history:
In 1779, John Adams was appointed to negotiate peace terms with Great Britain.
In 1940, representatives of Germany, Italy and Japan signed the Tripartite Pact, a 10-year mutual assistance agreement, in Berlin.
In 1950, Ezzard Charles defeated former Heavyweight Boxing Champion Joe Louis at Yankee Stadium in New York City.



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS
At dinner a friend commented on a paragraph of mine about the men who are so insecure about their masculinity that they won't carry a woman's umbrella in a sudden downpour.

"We have some neighbors," she said, "who have a little boy about a year-and-a-half old. The father won't let him have a doll, or play with a teddy bear. He says it will make the boy effeminate. Don't you think there's something insecure about a man like that?"

I certainly do. Every young child, it seems to me, needs some object it can cuddle and pet and love as its very own. Until considerably later in life, little boys and little girls are very much alike in this respect.

The fathers who want their sons to be "all boy" can ruin a child as easily as a mother who over-protects her sons. "All boy" is a hideous designation, anyway, if it implies a neglect of such essential traits as gentleness, sensitivity and grace.

Although we still know comparatively little about the subject, I venture to guess that as many boys are turned into homosexuals by a crude and tyrannical father as by a soft and doting mother. If the boy cannot easily identify with his father, he turns to his mother as an "ideal" figure. Boys who are "all boy" are as



BERRY'S WORLD

unwholesome as girls who are "all girl." The professional female, who simpers and flounces all over the place and takes advantage of her femininity, is as emotionally deformed as the hearty masculine character who thinks that loudness and coarseness constitute virility.

Modern genetics teaches us that every human being has a small percentage of the opposite sex in him, which is nature's way of balancing our traits. What we call "normality" is often a matter of custom and convention: the elegant 18th Century gentleman would seem swishy to us, even though he may have been braver and more adept at fatal swordsmanship than we are.

I am convinced that the rise in the number of sexual deviates among young boys stems directly from the fact that they are not given enough paternal love of the right sort, and that the mother is charged with the exclusive responsibility for their conduct.

And it is terrible punishment upon these fathers that so frequently their frenetic effort to turn a son into "all boy" creates a son who is no boy at all, but a bewildered and resentful adolescent, uncertain of his manhood and unable to resolve his conflict. Only a father afraid of his own masculinity would take a teddy bear away from a child.



"Excuse me, Miss! Will you marry me?"