

Editorial Page

The South Seeks A Savior

The Wallace-Barnett plan for slates of independent presidential electors, committed in advance to no specific candidate, probably will never get off the ground in 1964.

But under some conditions, the South might plump for a man like Georgia's Sen. Richard Russell.

It is acknowledged widely that President John F. Kennedy is in major political difficulty in the 11-state Old South and some border territory.

Since in noncampaign years opponents tend to be more vocal than proponents, there is no way of being sure that Kennedy's unpopularity is sufficient to deprive him of states like Georgia and North Carolina — which would be making a real wrench if they deserted the Democratic ticket.

The animosity toward the President conceivably could have such breadth and depth, though there are many who doubt it.

Assuming the defections might be serious, one confronts next the unlikelihood of most southern states going for a Republican candidate of the complexion of New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

It is a Kennedy-Rockefeller race, in the view of some southern observers, that might well produce a separate Democratic-conservative movement in the South behind Russell or some other.

Obviously, in these circumstances, a man of Russell's evident stature might command a high proportion of the South's substantial electoral vote. It would go well beyond anything G. W. Wallace and Ross Barnett of Mississippi could muster for their limited "independent" effort. In the southern political bank, the latter two have little credit.

But careful, though soundings by one veteran of the national political wars suggest that an independent southern movement would evaporate completely if Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona should be the 1964 Republican nominee.

A check has been made with a considerable number of key southern Democratic senators and some other leaders. Without exception they indicated that GOP nomination of Goldwater would have such appeal in their territory that voters would feel no need for another conservative, anti-Kennedy slate.

Most of these leaders would not be likely to come out openly for Goldwater. But at the minimum many would refrain from endorsing and working for the President.

The Solid South? Clearly this is now just a phrase for the pages of history. The region is in the greatest political flux it has known since Reconstruction days—and bids fair to stay fluid for years to come.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Congress World's Greatest Deliberating Body

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA) — It has taken Congress the full nine months-plus to give birth to its first two important decisions of the year — on the test ban treaty in the Senate and the tax bill in the House.

In this period Congress has been able to give fewer than 100 of President Kennedy's 250 legislative recommendations any consideration at all. Two-thirds of the administration program hasn't even been taken up in committee for hearings.

In addition, more than 8,500 bills have been introduced in the House and more than 2,100 in the Senate. Of these 11,000 measures

originating with congressmen, fewer than 100 — one per cent of the total — have been enacted into law.

Only five new laws passed this year are considered of major importance.

These facts and figures emphasize the need for reorganization of Congress better than all the words in the 17,000 pages of Congressional Record proceedings.

Congress isn't exactly on strike against the rest of the government. Both Senate and House are working longer and harder this year than in any Congress since World War II.

But the end result is a slow-down and an inability to make decisions that is more crippling than a strike.

What Congress really needs is the same kind of action it took in the railroad labor crisis to prevent a strike.

If Congress can't modernize its own work rules to eliminate legislative featherbedding, it should turn the job over to arbitrators empowered to bring in a binding decision.

But the chances for any such action this year are slim.

Under bipartisan sponsorship of Senators Joe Clark, D-Pa., Clifford Case, R-N.J., and 39 others, the Senate Rules Committee has finally cleared a resolution to set up a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Similar resolutions have been introduced in the House by Reps. John V. Lindsay, R-N.Y., Henry Reuss, D-Wis.

But nobody outside of Congress is pushing this project. And what it needs more than anything else is a public lobby to demand reform.

It has even been suggested that President Kennedy could well show a little more interest in this project, since he has been the principal victim of congressional lethargy.

While the President keeps up a front of not wanting to interfere with Congressional procedures, he certainly interfered on reorganization of the House Rules Committee.

Assuming that the Clark-Case

resolution can be sieved through the crowded congressional "colander" this late in the year, the Joint Committee would be authorized to make recommendations to improve organization, simplify operations and attain better relations with other branches of government.

Three other resolutions approved by the Rules Committee would permit study of specific reforms:

—Set aside four hours of each session for debate pertinent to legislation under consideration and nothing else.

—Allow committees to meet without obtaining special permission while only routine business is being considered.

—Authorize Congress to handle matters pertaining to the budget more efficiently and expeditiously.

But reform of Senate and

House rules which are responsible for many of the delaying tactics used by congressmen opposed to a pending measure during floor debate would again be excluded from consideration by the new Joint Committee.

Senator Clark and others are of the opinion that no real streamlining of Congress can be effected until its antiquated work rules are brought up to date.

Senator Case is spokesman for another group which believes the power of committee chairmen must be curbed.

Any action Congress might take on reforms approved by the Senate Rules or House Administration committees could not be made effective before Jan. 1, 1965.

That means the 1964 session will have to plod along under existing traditions which encourage inaction.



EDMUND VALTMAN, HARTFORD TIMES



WASHINGTON CALLING . . .

Setbacks Aound In Foreign Aid Program

By MARJORIE CHILDS

WASHINGTON—While she may be heaven's gift to television, Madame Ngo Dinh Nhu's impending visit to the United States is regarded with something less than enthusiasm by officials responsible for the foreign aid program.

Word has come from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where work on the authorization of funds had progressed to the mark-up stage, that the whole business must be put on ice until after Madame Nhu has her say. She is going on Meet the Press, Face the Nation, Issues and Answers, Today and wherever a television camera is trained on her dynamic personality.

Madame Nhu has an impetuous way of expressing herself, as witness some of her recent comments about American officers and Buddhist monks. She is too clever by half, which is one thing friend and foe alike agree on. And the real concern is that with each appearance she will put another stone in the way of foreign aid not only for her own country, South Viet Nam, but for the entire program.

The uproar in Saigon and the Madame's explosive words are only part of the bad luck that has dogged the program at the very time widespread disillusion was setting in. Two other events came along to make a triad of misfortune haunting officials who must work with Congress to get another year's appropriation.

President Sukarno in Indonesia let loose his more wild-eyed followers to burn the British Embassy and seize British property. This is another act in the long and dismal pattern of irresponsible nationalism. Instead of getting down to the hard and difficult tasks facing a new country Sukarno indulges his people in periodic outbursts of Indonesia first and damn the consequences.

Taking on new and even more complicated problems, as in his insistence on forcing the Dutch out of New Guinea, the flamboyant Sukarno distracts attention from past failures. In the outlying islands fertile land is comparatively empty in marked contrast to the dense crowding in Java. Yet little if any progress has been made in resettling farm families. An air force equipped with jet planes by the Russians is exhibit "A" in the nationalist display Sukarno puts on.

Foreign aid was designed to help newly developing countries get on with the hard tasks for which they are so ill equipped, and there have been gains in Indonesia. Inflation has been damped down. But measured against the country's rich resources it is far too little, and patience is rapidly running out.

The third in the miserable triad was, of course, the tragedy of the Dominican Republic and the overthrow of Juan Bosch. This heart-breaking reversal came as it had begun to appear that the Dominican Republic under Bosch's leadership was demonstrating the success of representative government working in close harmony

with the big neighbor to the north. The same gangster-like military who were the agents of the Trujillo dictatorship seem to have taken over again.

These faceless men are making the proper anti-Communist sounds, hoping for the belated blessing of Washington. If they get away with their piracy no government in Latin America can feel secure. That is the dilemma for American policy-makers.

As though the real troubles were not enough rumor has furnished others. American aid is supposed to have provided Emperor Haile Selassie, of Ethiopia, a current visitor in Washington, with a yacht with his private quarters lined with solid gold. The fact is that \$3,000,000 went to convert a mothballed seaplane tender as a flagship for Ethiopia's coastal force and as commander-in-chief the Emperor has quarters papered with gold wall-paper at \$125 a roll.

President Kennedy's associates say he now realizes that he made the initial mistake when he named a committee of conservative businessmen to expatiate the foreign aid program. The theory was that they were to be educated on the need for the program and their weight would persuade Congress. But General Lucius Clay took over and the end result was a chilly report which forced a cut of nearly a half-billion dollars in the President's original estimate of \$4.9 billion.

So matters have gone from bad to worse as Congress delays. And waiting in the wings is Rep. Otto Passman who, along about mid-November when appropriations are finally considered, will come rushing out with both guns firing on his favorite target. It is in this state of suspended animation that aid administrator David Bell and his deputies are trying to buoy up their hopes and somehow keep the show going.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Monday, Oct. 7, the 280th day of 1963 with 85 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The morning stars are Mercury and Jupiter.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Those born today include American poet James Whitcomb Riley, in 1849.

On this day in history: In 1777, American revolutionary forces led by Gen. Horatio Gates defeated the British in the second battle of Saratoga, N. Y.

In 1961, at least 31 persons were killed or missing when typhoon Kit hit the Philippines.

In 1961, 37 persons were killed when a British Derby Aviation DC 3 crashed in the French Pyrenees.

A thought for the day — James Whitcomb Riley said: "The ripest peach is highest on the tree."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Denial

In view of District Attorney Crabtree's Antigambling Drive I would like to relate a couple of facts that have influenced our American society and are similar to Mr. Crabtree's Drive.

France has a very slight problem with youth and alcoholism in comparison to that of the United States. This is because the French youth is brought up with alcohol and it is nothing new to him, while in the United States it is security or a symbol of manhood to the youth. Someone is denied something, so they go out and get it and sometimes it causes trouble where as when they have access to it, it causes no trouble.

"The Molasses Act of 1763 was intended to force the American colonists to buy their sugar and molasses from the British West Indies. Supplies purchased from the French, Dutch, or Spanish islands could be imported into the colonies only after the payment of a very high duty. Since the British West Indies could supply only about one eighth of the molasses needed by the colonists, the act almost compelled colonial merchants to evade the law.

"But for a long time Great Britain did not seriously attempt to enforce the Molasses Act. Instead, the British government followed a policy the statesmen referred to as salutary neglect. The government was content, as one British statesman put it, 'to let sleeping dogs lie.'

"In 1763, however, the British government needed money to pay its war debt. One way to secure this money was to adopt a new mercantile policy. When the British government began, after 1763, to develop this new policy, it ran head on into real trouble. The conflict did not end until the thirteen colonies declared and won their independence from Great Britain." (Rise of the American Nation, Todd and Curtis.)

This goes to show that when a group's income is cut off, it only leads to rebellion.

Mr. Crabtree probably believes his reasons for this Antigambling Drive to be sound, and I may be wrong in criticizing it, but I believe denying lodges, churches, clubs, and schools some of the milder forms of gambling that they participate in is going to cause trouble, especially when it is a major source of income. Will our community-building organizations be able to build good citizens of our youth in face of the eminent trouble to be caused by this farce?

Name withheld.



STRICTLY PERSONAL.

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

The high incidence of troubled youth in our time—of which juvenile delinquency is only one aspect—is caused by many combining factors, and it would be foolish to isolate one factor for special blame.

Yet it seems to me that, if society is a seamless garment (as I believe), the garment of the young is related to the problem of the old. In our society, in our time, both the young and the old are detached from the core of family life.

This pattern is distinctively new in the 20th century. We live in the age of the "atomized family"—father, mother, and children revolving around the axis of a common income. The old-style "clan family" has all but been abolished, except in parts of Europe or in some rural communities.

I was the last of my family to have been born in a house that contained not only parents, but grandparents and uncles and aunts as well. I was born in a "three-generation" house, but my children were not, nor will their children be. Each family constellation of parents and children is now its own separate galaxy.

As a result, there is isolation at both ends. The old people live alone, or in dreary nursing homes (except for the few who can afford otherwise); while the chil-

dren grow up lacking that wider contact with the adult world that was formerly provided by clan living.

Whatever disadvantages may have inhered in the old system, I think that its breakdown has a significant relation to the widespread discontent among young people and the increasing sense of forsakenness by old people. Any feeling of continuity through the generations is lacking.

It is this continuity, this sympathy, that we still find (although diminishing) when we visit a country like Italy, where the generations intermingle freely within the same house and neighborhood. But America is predominantly the country of the young middle-aged; the children have their own world, and the old people are pushed into limbo as speedily and as decently as possible.

In the history of mankind, the truncated parent-and-child family is a social novelty and psychological burden. Discipline is harder, recreation becomes structured and external to family living, indifferent sitters take the place of grandparents or uncles and aunts; in short, the home turns into a launching-pad and is no longer seen as a refuge. I have a strong conviction that we will not solve the "problem of the young" until we attack the "problem of the old" at the same time.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Landis 'Serving' Term In New York Hospital

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON — For \$20,000 a year, you'd think Ed Guthman could mind the store.

As Bobby Kennedy's number one press agent, Guthman should be available to members of the press at least from 9 to 5. There were several days last week, however, when Guthman was nowhere to be found.

Not that several score newsmen didn't try.

The story begins Aug. 30, when Federal Judge Sylvester Ryan sentenced James Landis to 30 days in prison. Landis, a former Presidential adviser, had neglected to file an income tax return for several years.

Soon afterward, rumors began to circulate: Landis would complete his prison term without ever seeing the inside of a prison cell. Landis, it was said, was held up in high-priced room in a posh New York hospital, Harkness Pavilion, receiving credit for his jail sentence.

Spokesmen at the pavilion would say nothing except that "our instructions from the Justice Department are to refer all calls concerning Mr. Landis to either Edwin Guthman or Jack Rosenthal of the Justice Department public information office."

Guthman was "out" and would not be back for several days. No, his office had no idea where he might be reached.

Rosenthal, too, was unavailable for comment. A secretary told one newsmen: "It has taken five days to reach Mr. Rosenthal. That's how very busy this office is."

When located by this office, Rosenthal admitted Landis was in the hospital, in a \$48-a-day room, guarded by two male nurses at all times. But, Rosenthal explained, Landis pays part of the \$48 out of his own pocket.

Rosenthal insisted the Landis case was not the first time a convict had served out his sentence without even entering a prison hospital. When pressed, however, he said he could not remember another case.

Congressional opposition continues to mount over Marshal Tito's upcoming state visit. South Carolina Democrat Strom Thurmond told Senate colleagues that Yugoslavia's Tito is one of the wildest and most dedicated Communist operatives in the world. The invitation, he said, should be rescinded.

Ohio's Frank Lausche, maverick Democrat, stood on the Senate floor to quote from Tito's chief aides to the effect that their loyalties lie only with Mother Russia.

New York Congressman Frank Becker, a Republican, has introduced a bill that would deny the use of federal funds for any expenses incurred by Tito on this trip. Likelihood for passage is slim, however, as the Democratic leadership is almost certain to have the measure bottled up.

Support of Tito's visit by Speaker John McCormack is a 180-degree turnabout for the Massachusetts Democrat. During the Eisenhower Administration, as Majority Leader, McCormack led a successful House revolt that persuaded Ike to cancel plans for a Tito visit.

All during the Senate debate on ratification of the partial nuclear test ban, administration leaders insisted that U.S. acceptance of the same treaty as East Germany did not mean tacit recognition of that state by this country.

Then one day, State Department press agents slipped up. Undersecretary of State W. Averell Harriman called in the photographers for a special celebration. A representative of Malagasy (Madagascar) was scheduled to make his nation the 100th country to sign the pact.

Hours later, the department realized that East Germany and Outer Mongolia (Communist puppet states we do not recognize) had been numbered among the first 99. They quickly announced that the Malagasy Republic was the 98th nation to sign.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Mac's Dangerous Move

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Very hush-hush, Defense Secretary McNamara has asked his assistants to make up plans for a new and, I believe, dangerous method of procurement. There is much grumbling and head-shaking at the Pentagon over the projected move, but as one veteran official put it, "In this administration, you do as you're told."

What Mr. McNamara hopes to put into effect is grandiosely called "counter-cyclical procurement." What it means is chilling to the blood, the Pentagon, if Secretary McNamara has his way, will buy military hardware not as it is needed but as the economy calls for massive pumping.

In other words, if there is prosperity in the land, then military procurement will be drastically reduced—no matter what the international situation. If unemployment begins to rise, the Pentagon will rush through orders for new weapons or re-orders for old ones. If missiles are in short supply, the Pentagon will ignore the fact — just so long as the nation's economy is on the rise.

Thus, "counter-cyclical procurement"—or procurement that runs against the economic cycle.

Secretary McNamara's Pentagon is being organized to employ this "counter-cyclical procurement" as soon as possible on a regional level and in political fashion. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is highly elated over its "Project 60" which divides the country into 15 regions. Each region is under a special procurement officer who reports directly to the secretary, ignoring responsible civilian and military officials.

If the regional chief feels that things aren't going too well in his area, he is expected to let Mr. McNamara know so that defense funds can be siphoned off into the district. Here, again, this is a new wrinkle. In the past, the Pentagon was expected to favor to some degree depressed areas in allocating defense contracts. But under Project 60, need (political or economic) rather than efficiency or low cost is the major criterion.

Under "counter-cyclical procure-

ment" the nation's military power will decline when we are prosperous and rise when we are having economic troubles. Or so it would seem. But since the lead time on weapons is so great—and adversely affected by stop-and-go procurement—the money necessary to prime the economic pump would be a long time going into the pipeline of production — and larger sums would be needed. Designers of new weapons systems — if this administration ever gets around to such matters — would never know whether or not their blueprints are ever to be used. The chaos in procurement would be fantastic.

Under Project 60, there would be another dangerous factor. If regional economic needs are to be the guideline for procurement, who is to say if political considerations are supreme. Already this administration is penalizing states which happen to be Republican,

and tossing the juicy contracts to those presumed to be Democratic.

Most frightening of all is the consequence of these new forms of procurement. The Pentagon is the nation's biggest customer, spending well over \$3 billion a year. If it is to pick and choose the time for making this or that weapon, guiding itself (however conscientiously) by its reading of economic signs, then it will in effect begin to control the economy. Its experts, moreover, will have to keep a grip on a variety of raw material sources. This can only lead to a repressive effect on the free market which — to work at all — will have to succumb to wage-price manipulation.

All of this explains why civilian and military officials at the Pentagon look so worriedly at Secretary McNamara. They do not know what he will do next—or what area of the national life will fall into his grasp.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Charles, how do you expect us to meet the Soviet challenge in education if you think of the library only as a place to neck?"