

America Provides Worldwide Welfare Assistance

By Congressman James B. Utt
California

The foreign aid program started as the Marshall Plan to assist in rebuilding war-torn Europe, and it has proliferated over the past 15 years into a worldwide welfare assistance, paid for out of the American taxpayers' earnings. The total amount to date exceeds \$100 billion and is responsible for one-third of our national debt.

We are giving aid to more than 100 countries, each of which is demanding more and more each year. Many of the countries receiving this aid are in far better financial condition than is the United States. In fact, the United States Treasury is borrowing money from many of these countries.

There is a total lack of expenditure control on most of the projects. It is true that a portion of the money is for military assistance, which may possibly add to the military security of the free world, but the countries which are receiving military assistance are not carrying their equitable share to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization military establishment. And they will not pay it as long as Uncle Sam foots the bill.

A great deal of money has been used to finance factories and equipment in communist-

dominated countries. Some of these manufactured products come back to the United States, but many of them go into Russia, which is in short supply of these goods, and cannot buy them directly from the United States. So we find ourselves doing by indirection what we cannot do, under the law, directly.

Khrushchev and Tito had a real laugh recently when Tito showed Khrushchev through a large chemical plant in communist Yugoslavia, built with the American taxpayers' dollars. Of course, they were not laughing at each other, they were laughing at the stupidity of Uncle Sam.

Foreign aid has not stopped the advancement of communism in any country in the world.

We have spent nearly \$3 billion in Brazil, and Brazil is more communist today than it was five years ago.

We have spent more than \$2 billion in South Vietnam, and it is rapidly going communist. Worse than this, we have expended the lives of American boys who are fighting a losing battle there, just as they did in Korea.

Hundreds of millions of American dollars went into Laos, and that country is now firmly under communist control.

Hundreds of millions of dol-

ars appropriated in foreign aid have been literally lost, and the accountants cannot even trace where the money went.

Communist Yugoslavia is subsidizing any Hollywood motion picture that is made in Yugoslavia. That subsidy runs to as high as 89 per cent of the cost of the production. Two American pictures have just been completed in Yugoslavia, and are now being shown in this country as American films. Of course, the American actors working in that country are exempt from paying income taxes. One actor has just gone to Yugoslavia to produce another motion picture.

While our foreign aid dollar might not be traceable to these projects, the money that we do give Yugoslavia releases other money to entice American business away from home.

The American public is finally getting fed up with this global stupidity, and the people have made their feelings known to the members of Congress. The compilation of returned questionnaires, received from constituents throughout the whole United States, indicates that a drastic cut in foreign aid is wanted by at least 80 per cent of the public, and at least 50 per cent want the program eliminated. Responding to this public demand, the Administration's

original request for \$4.9 billion was reduced to \$3.5 billion and may be reduced another \$500 million by the Appropriations Committee.

The Administration hopes to have the cuts restored in the Senate.

The foreign aid program is greatly responsible for our devastating balance of payments problem, now running at the rate of \$5 billion a year, and for the loss of our gold reserve, which is at a precariously low point and can be completely dissipated any time that the foreign countries demand payment in gold for their claims which now exceed our total gold supply by \$7 billion.

Under the law, \$12 billion of gold is required to back the outstanding currency. This leaves only \$3 billion to meet our foreign gold commitments of \$22 billion.

There is no hope of getting a tax reduction as long as the federal government insists on spending \$9 or \$10 billion a year in excess of revenues.

We who are demanding fiscal responsibility and are warning the public of what will happen, are called reactionary and puritanical by the lethal left-wing. Even a professor of political science from a university in California stated that we had

Editorial Page

A Lot Of Lettuce

It took more than \$90 million of taxpayers' money to buy 500 million pounds of salad oil, and that's a lot of lettuce. This little operation of the Department of Agriculture involved about two dollars from every taxpayer, and Sen. Williams of Delaware would like us to know that we were gypped.

The idea was to support the prices of soy bean and cotton seed oil—although the market was strong, and soy oil was selling for 50 cents more than the support price at the time the purchases were made and the prices didn't seem to need any support. The Agriculture Department has a lot of your money, however, and so it went ahead.

According to Sen. Williams, it bought most of the oil from two companies which the Department's own Commodity Credit Corp. had charged with fraud just a couple of years ago. These firms had been barred "from any programs financed by CCC."

The Senator calculates that the loss resulting was about \$70 million of our money, because the oil was shipped in flimsy tin cans which buckled and broke when handled by dock workers here and abroad. Some of it

leaked out and some of it turned rancid.

When it arrived in places like Greece, Brazil and Korea, local officials were appalled. Some of them refused to let the stuff be unloaded. Others labeled it unfit for human consumption. Even the Koreans, who are hard up enough to eat most anything, couldn't eat up the millions of pounds we shipped to them. Huge stores of the oil sit around spoiling in Congo warehouses.

It was the Department of Agriculture, it will be recalled, which recently was baffled by the disappearance of 24 million bushels of grains it shipped to Austria. This time it knows where the salad oil is, at least, but it must know that it has made a series of costly mistakes in buying and shipping it. Agriculture officials won't lose sleep over it, because you will pay for their mistakes.

"This is a further example of what happens when an agency gets too much money..." says Sen. Williams.

The budget for all Federal agencies is now over \$100 billion a year, and the average family's tax bill is around \$2,000.

WASHINGTON CALLING . . .



Can't Worship The Past

By MARQUIS CHILDS
WILLIAMSBURG, Va.—In the brilliant Indian summer sun tourists from all over are streaming through this remarkable reconstruction of the colonial past.

From the Governor's Palace down to the simplest tavern the restoration has been done with scholarly care and a generous disregard for cost. The late John D. Rockefeller Jr. and subsequently his sons have put \$73,500,000 into what is a unique museum and object lesson in American history. And this is capped by a Robert Trent Jones golf course, with the fairways bounded by the brilliant gold and red of the fall foliage.

This week Marshal Tito and his wife are arriving, part of the long procession of distinguished visitors who have come to Williamsburg. They will be put up in the restored Allen Byrd house on Francis Street where Tito will see what mid-18th Century decor combined with late 20th Century plumbing can mean for the ease and pleasure of living.

The house was purchased in 1770, a year after it was built, by William Byrd III. Byrd, a reckless gambler and a gay blade, went through two fortunes and lost the family plantation, Westover, before his death in 1770. So beautifully aseptic and so piously kept is the restored house that it is doubtful if his ghost can find a refuge there.

Tito, who has had a career full of adventure and violence, would have found more in common with William III than with the present class of the Byrds, the senior Senator from Virginia, Harry Flood Byrd. The Senator's life has been a model of prudence and he is wedded to fiscal responsibility in guardianship of both the public and his private economy.

Williamsburg has many lessons for the visitor. One is the way in which values steadily rise in affluent America. The value of the Rockefeller gift has at least tripled in the 33 years since the restoration was begun.

While that is true of the solid stocks and bonds in the endowment fund portfolio, a far greater rise has occurred in the value of the antique silver, the porcelains, the brocades that are so carefully fitted into each setting. The boom in these prices is one aspect of the fantastic market in art that seems to have no end.

In the parlor of the Governor's Palace are 10 Chelsea figurines or exotic birds done in delicate, gleaming colors. They were acquired before the death of John D. Jr. for \$40,000. Recently one similar figurine came on the market and brought \$35,000.

The 10 are worth more than \$250,000.

So it goes with the splendid Georgian silver that has appreciated 10 to 20 times in value as has most of the furniture, a great deal of it English, many of the rarer pieces Early American. An interesting reflection of Europe's prosperity is that German and Italian buyers have come into the antique market in America and are now bidding up the prices.

But with its grace and charm there is one quality that the restoration for all its expertness

cannot convey. That is the excitement, the sense of adventure that pervaded the lives of the principals in the drama of independence. Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson and the others had cast their lot with danger.

They had set out to overthrow the existing order no matter what the cost to them. For the principals it had been a comfortable and a privileged order. Yet they put their beliefs, their faith in the ideal of freedom, above personal privilege.

This is the difference that, far more than the 18th Century mode of life as it is skillfully represented here, sets that time

apart from ours. So much of today's political effort is spent resisting any and all change in the passionate defense of a system that, if one accepts this view, reached a state of perfection at the instant of its creation. This attitude would surely have amazed the men who fought for our freedoms.

The American past, as this handsome stage set suggests, had the sweep of greatness. But to worship that past, to act on the assumption that all future political conduct was prescribed on tablets of stone, is to belie the men who made our revolution.

EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .



Cold War Changes, But Stays With Us

By PETER EDSON
WASHINGTON (NEA) — All the loose talk about United States foreign policy appeasement of Communist Russia needs to be taken with large grains of salt.

The U.S. State Department has just concluded another of its semiannual briefings of several hundred newspaper, magazine, radio and television correspondents from all over the country. It was getting timely, for matters are welling pretty confused and everything needs straightening out.

President Kennedy spoke off the record. But Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, Undersecretaries of State Averell Harriman and George Ball and half a dozen other top policy makers in State spoke and answered questions under a rule of no direct quotations or attribution.

The substance of their statements was released for use as coming from high government officials. So it was right from the horse's mouth.

There was a certain amount of whitewashing the reported feud between U.S. government agencies in South Viet Nam. There was some criticism of the publicity being given Mme. Nhu. There was some nonsense about the coups d'etat in Latin America not being as bad as the ones they used to have.

But on the big issue, the sum and substance of the talks was that none of the officials thinks that Soviet Russia has reformed. Nobody thinks sale of wheat to Russia and the satellites means the beginning of a new era of expanded trade.

Nobody thinks the Russians are going to pull out of East Germany. Nobody thinks disarmament, Communist country cooperation with the United Nations or settlement of the Korea, Viet Nam, Laos and Cuba crisis is just around the corner.

It was emphasized that there is no "détente"—general disengagement or relaxation of cold war tensions.

Agreements are being sought with the Russians on minor points, without making concessions. The problem is to draw the line between illusion and reality.

The hot line for crisis communications between Moscow and Washington is open and being tested every hour on the hour.

Other possibilities for improved communications with the Russians include a civil air agreement for one or two flights a week between New York and Moscow. Opening of more consular offices in both the United States and Russia is being considered to facilitate travel. Both will require long technical talks before anything is signed.

The possibility of new explosions in Laos, Viet Nam, Cuba and other trouble spots is known to be real. There can be no relaxation of tensions with Russia under such conditions.

A detente in Europe is out of the question because Soviet Russia has no intention of abandoning East Germany and permitting its reunification with West Germany.

Disarmament will be talked about some more in Geneva and an East-West nonaggression pact may be further explored. But neither offers any real hope because the Russians will not permit arms inspection within their borders.

While Soviet Russia's split with Red China is regarded as the primary reason for the Russians' apparent eagerness to improve relations with the West, American officials realistically realize that this feud between the two big Communist countries could reverse direction without warning.

Full consideration is given to the probability that if Red China and Russia should patch up their quarrel, it would mean a bad news for the U.S. and the rest of the world.

For all these reasons, American policy makers seem determined not to relax on their foreign aid programs, on maintaining North Atlantic and other alliances, on keeping America's defenses strong and at the ready.

As the situation was analyzed in one summary: "We are on the front end of large events. We do not know for sure what they will be. We do not know if they will be good or bad for us. But they will not be boring."

BERRY'S WORLD



"Now listen, Nikita, we don't want any of this wheat to go to China or Cuba . . . they're Commies ya' know."



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Watching the play, "A Man For All Seasons," not long ago, I was sadly reminded of that baffling mechanism in the human mind that makes it easy to approve and admire goodness in the past, while refusing to exercise it in the present.

As you may know, "A Man For All Seasons" deals with the life and death of Sir Thomas More, the English lawyer, statesman, author and scholar in the reign of King Henry VIII. A devout churchman, More was beheaded by his monarch for refusing to give assent to Henry's break with the Roman church.

Nearly everyone else around him—bishops and lords as well as intellectual leaders—capitulated to Henry's decree, whether or not they agreed with it. More, who deeply knew that a man is nothing but what he believes and acts upon, wanted to be neither a hero nor a martyr—and became both.

Hardly anyone today would disagree that More did the right and noble thing. He is an admirable figure. To Protestants as well as to Catholics, to those who deny God as well as to those who affirm Him. The high estimate of his person cuts across all lines of faith and unfaith.

Yet the tribute we pay to such a man is largely historical; it bears little relevance to the modern condition. For if a man

STRICTLY PERSONAL

like More were to rise today, and to take the same position against the current of the state and society, those same persons who admire More would condemn his latter-day emulator.

Not only that. Nearly all of us would behave in such a situation like the friends and associates of More, not like the man himself. We would rationalize, we would be "practical" and "realistic," we would trim our sails and perjure our convictions.

And, in order to make ourselves feel better about our wholesale abdication of conscience, we would be forced to call the modern More a "crank," or a "nut," or a "visionary." We would not apotheosize him as a martyr; rather, in the denigrating jargon of modern psychology, we would accuse him of having a "martyr complex."

Goodness cannot be lived with at too close range; it makes us feel uncomfortable; it shows us the moral yardstick by which we should measure ourselves, and, as Alcibiades said in listening to Socrates, it makes us want to run away and hide from ourselves, or else strike down the man who utters these prickly truths.

It is easy to admire More from a distance of 400 years. Admiration is the counterfeit coin we pay to be relieved of the obligation of imitating him.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

New Hampshire Confusion

By RALPH DE TOLEDANO

CONCORD, N.H.—New Hampshire is a small state, and how it votes has but a small effect on a national election. Its delegates at national conventions can hardly impose their views on either party. But New Hampshire, because it is the first state to hold its Presidential preference primary, is watched by the politicians. Next March, how New Hampshire goes in the Republican Sweepstakes will become the subject of many and varied interpretations.

Oddly enough, the result of the primary will be meaningless unless peace can be restored in the Republican Party. At present, Senator Barry Goldwater is the heads-on favorite of political leaders and GOP voters. Even labor finds little to quarrel with him except for his views on right-to-work laws. But what would happen in a primary is a complex question involving matters hardly related to how New Hampshire Republicans feel about Mr. Goldwater or Governor Nelson Rockefeller.

have yet to attempt to organize. But this they must do. For if both sides stay out of the battle, a political vacuum will be created. And, obviously, only Richard Nixon can be sucked into it. How this dilemma will be solved should make an interesting story. But it is of no help today to those who are ready to begin the drum-beating in the Granite State.

Who will be the beneficiary of this impasse? With Barry Goldwater so far ahead of Nelson Rockefeller, the presumption would be that the front-runner would derive the greater benefit. But politics does not always rest on logic. Where the Goldwater forces are ahead is in the man himself. He is liked in New Hampshire—and so is his program.

Even a random check indi-

icates that the Kennedy civil rights position is highly unpopular here and Mr. Rockefeller's stand is not liked any more than the President's. New Hampshire politicians, who might be induced to jump on the Rockefeller bandwagon, are not certain that he will try to go the distance. They still remember his on-again-off-again performance of 1959-60. The people are a wee bit suspicious of the Rockefeller prodigality. Given to frugality, and to what Mr. Kennedy's economic advisers disdainfully call the "Puritan ethic," they don't want more of the same.

But as any responsible politician will tell you, it's a long time to March. Much can happen before then—a statement that the prudent paste in their hats.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Taxpayers Will Pay For Kennedy Junket

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON — All the bills are not yet in, but one thing is certain: The beleaguered taxpayer got socked — and socked hard—for the President's cross-country jaunt of last month.

On Sept. 26, for instance, the President addressed voters at Richland, Wash. Before John Kennedy touched down, however, White House advance men had turned Richland (population 23,648) into an ultra-modern communications center.

Twenty-three special phones with direct lines from Richland to the nation's capital were installed. Four heliports were hurriedly built for the Presidential party's helicopters. Special bleachers were set up to accommodate the crowd.

Cost to the taxpayers for the Richland speech: \$600,000.

That little talk boiled down to a campaign hard-sell for Senator Henry Jackson and Governor Albert Rosellini, Democrats up for re-election next year.

The story was similar at every stop on the President's "non-political" tour. At Cheyenne, Wyo., Kennedy junked his prepared text and launched into an all-out plea for Democrat Gale McGee, who faces almost insurmountable obstacles in his race for Senate re-election.

In Montana, the President again abandoned his text, this time to plug Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, also up for re-election next year. He laid it on thick for Stewart Udall and Orville Freeman, the public's least favorite Cabinet members.

In Laramie, Wyo., Kennedy boasted of Federal funds funneled into McGee's home state. In Tacoma, Wash., he told of plans to rejuvenate a military base, promising the local economy a shot in the arm. In Salt Lake City, the President lashed into the foreign policy suggestions of Sen. Barry Goldwater, his almost certain GOP opponent next year.

What did the President accomplish? Precious little, according to newsmen on the trip. Marianne Means, White House correspondent for the Hearst Headline Service, has long been considered one of the President's favorites. In her humble opinion

the whole trip may well have been a bomb.

The New York Times' Tom Wicker was even more blunt: "Seldom in the nearly three years of office had the President's performance been so lackluster, his attention so obviously elsewhere, his prose so perfunctory and entangled, his usual electioneering fire so lacking."

"Before a packed house of 10,000 or so in Duluth, Minn. . . Mr. Kennedy bumbled and digressed through a partisan restatement of his administration's domestic program; not once did the crowd interrupt with applause."

Author James Baldwin, whose books do the best seller lists, drew hundreds to a New York brew the other night, all proceeds going to something called the Committee to Aid Southern Lawyers, described as a civil rights organization.

The group is something more than that. It is the creation of the National Lawyers Guild. In 1950 the House Un-American Activities Committee said: "The National Lawyers Guild is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party . . ."

It was not the first time Baldwin, who is not a Communist, has lent his name to questionable causes. Baldwin has contributed to a volume called "A Quarter Century of Un-Americanism," an attack upon the House Un-American Activities Committee. The book is published by Carl Aldo Marzani and Alexander Munsell. Marzani was convicted in Federal Court of perjury when he denied Communist activity. Munsell's record is on file in Washington.

Baldwin sponsored the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a group later shown to be Castro-financed and pro-Communist-operated. He worked for the freedom of Carl Braden, an identified Communist who served time in federal prison for contempt of Congress.

With other liberals, Baldwin called for amnesty for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, convicted under the Smith Act. Sciesco, who claims to have quit the party, has refused to cooperate with the FBI. He was freed by President Kennedy.

We're Beginning To Burn Up



JERRY DOYLE, PHILADELPHIA DAILY NEWS