

Brazil Is Considered Prize By Communists



BRAZIL'S RICH, beautiful country, bordering on all but two of its South American neighbors, is the true heartland of South America.

By LEON DENNEN
Newspaper Enterprise Analyst
RIO DE JANEIRO (NEA) — "The Lord blessed Brazilians with a rich and beautiful country but he also cursed us with Communists and incompetent politicians."

It is typical of Brazil's political climate under President Goulart's regime that the noted liberal lawyer who spoke these words asked that his name be withheld for fear of reprisals. Yet his is also the view of the ordinary Brazilian who is generally friendly to the United States and who is probably the hardest working man in Latin America.

A young waitress in one of Rio de Janeiro's plush restaurants said: "All I know is that each morning I can buy less food for my cruzeiro." President Goulart's reaction to the mounting wave of discontent in Brazil so far has been his request to Congress to declare a "state of siege"—meaning—martial law and the suspension of constitutional guarantees.

Pro-democratic Brazilians are convinced that any tampering with the constitution would only play into the hands of the Communists. The State of Guanabara's fearless and able Governor Carlos Lacerda told this writer that a state of siege would "only lead to the progressive subjugation of Brazil to international communism."

There is no doubt that Brazil is rated by Moscow as a Latin American prize above all others. With a population of 70 million, it covers almost half of South America and 1-27th of the World's land surface. In addition to its vast and yet untapped natural resources, Brazil also has the strategic importance of bordering on all but two South American countries. Red agents from Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Germany, disguised as trade missions, are invading the distressed areas of Recife and Northeast Brazil. Should a Red uprising occur in the Northeast, the Castro revolution in Cuba will seem like a firecracker.

own chaos the rest of the continent.

Is this what Premier Khrushchev hopes to achieve by fomenting strikes and "revolutionary" uprisings in Brazil? Is he trying to prove to his Chinese rivals in the Red world that under the cover of nuclear test bans and peaceful coexistence it is possible to promote "national wars of liberation" without risking a nuclear war?

Moscow's strategy in Brazil was actually predicted recently by two top Brazilian Communist leaders, Pedro Motta Lima and Jakob Goreneder, who wrote in the World Marxist Review that revolutionary strikes and a "restriction of democracy" were historically inevitable. They intimated that political and economic chaos were communism's best allies in Latin America.

And the tragic fact is that Brazil is drifting dangerously into chaos. Much of the United States aid channeled to Brazil through the Alliance for Progress and from other sources has been frittered away by inflation. President Goulart made a firm promise to stop printing more money, but he never kept it. The ravaging inflation (1,300 cruzeiros to the dollar) devours each new wage boost and gives the Communist-dominated General Labor Command an excuse for starting another round of "illegal" strikes.

President Kennedy recently stated that the "only effective way to stop communism" in Latin America is to "remove the great social and economic inequities which breed communism."

Yet—massive American aid under normal conditions should lead to no outside aid—has done little to remove the social and economic inequities and check the progress of communism.

Lacerda was surely right when he said that United States aid could accomplish little in Brazil under the present political conditions. "It is like trying to sell roses in an opium den or transmitters to people already gone amok," he said.

There are forces currently at work which seek to establish military rule. Will it be that the bayonet will become the only answer to communism in Brazil? The times here are sad, and few doubt that they could grow sadder.

Editorial Page

How Many On The Payroll?

How many public relations officers are on the federal payroll? There are thousands of them, but nobody knows the correct figure. What is their function, and how much are they costing the taxpayers in salary? This, too, is unknown to the public, which pays the bills.

Rep. John E. Moss of California, who has been invaluable over the years as a needler of federal bureaucrats—especially in the sphere of freedom of information—has decided to try to find the answers to these questions. As chairman of the House government information subcommittee, Congressman Moss has sent a questionnaire to all federal departments, asking for complete information on their public relations staffs. He also wants to know which employees are performing P. R. O. functions although listed in some other capacity.

A certain number of P.R.O.'s in government work are, of course, essential. Government departments have become so vast and so complex that employees equipped to

interpret their activities accurately for the press and public are essential.

But there is too much concentration by these functionaries on creating a favorable "image" of their bosses or their departments. Slanting or distorting the facts to such ends should be stopped.

During the halcyon days of prohibition, this country was overrun with "dry" agents. The late U.S. Sen. "Jim" Reed of Missouri, who was not one of prohibition's elect, declared that the agents "swarm over the land like the lice of Egypt."

This pungent simile is hardly justified in the case of today's P.R.O.'s, but there are altogether too many of them on the federal payroll. An unofficial count last spring put the total at 2,500—not counting the army around the White House—with annual salaries totaling 15 million dollars. Mr. Moss and his subcommittee are rendering a real service by digging out the facts as to this. The job has been long overdue.

Hoffa Flexes Muscles

If President James R. Hoffa of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters gets his way, virtually all of the nation's truck drivers will be working under the terms of a single, nationwide contract before long. The rather chilling implications of such an arrangement are of enormous importance.

The first gun in Hoffa's campaign will be fired in November when he sits down with an employer bargaining team that will represent most of the major trucking firms. This is an innovation, and one that is in a sense a step toward making Hoffa's goal a reality. Negotiation with industry-wide representatives is a necessary prelude to achieving industrywide basic contracts.

It does not follow that the employers will necessarily bow to Hoffa's union demands. Various strategic moves in opposition to industrywide contracts are open to them. But this is something the Teamster boss has been planning and talking about for a long time, and he will bring to bear all the pressure he can muster.

The Teamsters' move is of deep national concern. National contracts might force some small truckers out of business. More importantly, such contracts should give Hoffa more power over the nation's economy than any other man in organized labor. This development is one for the public, and especially Congress, to watch with care.



WASHINGTON CALLING . . .

By MARQUIS CHILDS
NEW ORLEANS — To realize how deeply committed the government is to the manned journey to the moon you have only to take a look at the Michoud operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration here.

It is a world so complex, so highly technical, that the ordinary individual is bewildered. Millions of miles of wiring, thousands upon thousands of valves and compressors go into an engine that must function with timing measured in thousandths of a second while burning liquid hydrogen and oxygen at an incredible rate per minute.

To take a great cylinder somewhat less than half the size of the Empire State Building, stuff it with machines of a complexity undreamed of a decade ago, put three men aboard and shoot it into outer space—that is the task currently facing one of the best technical brains and skill of men all over the country. To ask whether this is a task worth so much manpower and so many billions of dollars is to raise a fundamental question of national purpose and will.

In May, 1961, President Kennedy called for a manned lunar landing by 1970. When Congress and the country seemed to accept this goal, the vast enterprise went forward. It calls for construction costs alone of \$30 billion. While Michoud, where Stage One of the current Saturn I and later the lunar Saturn V are being constructed, is big, it is dwarfed by the structure at Cape Canaveral to house Saturn V before the launch. That building will hold the Capitol in Washington, including the dome and the wings without any trouble, and the door to let the rocket out is 47 stories high.

Currently in Congress and the country questions are being raised about the 1970 goal. The House cut \$612,000 out of NASA's budgetary request for the current fiscal year, suggesting the familiar threat of the annual appropriation system. Applied to so vast a project which already has such a large momentum the result could be confusion worse compounded and a cost even greater than the estimated \$30 billion.

Top NASA officials say that their best guess is that the Soviets will make a soft unmanned instrument landing on the moon before the year's end. The television pictures this advice sends

back to the Russian space center will make a sensational news item around the world.

This puts the question of national purpose in even sharper perspective. Will we react to the new Soviet challenge with a demand for more speed? Or will we take the Soviet success of instrument exploration as proof that manned landing is unnecessary and unwise? No one, it may be added, expects anything to come of the President's suggestion in his United Nations speech for joint Soviet-U.S. exploration.

These questions do not concern the men directing the Michoud operation, which is being carried out in the reconverted wartime Higgins Industries Building. They are immediately absorbed in their job and for the visitor from stagnant, dilatory Washington it is a relief to see an operation going swell forward.

In the tangled interior of a newly completed Saturn I's first stage you see three or four men working on what looks to be a giant electrical octopus. They are working from engineering drawings which come in millions from the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala. Under NASA supervision, Chrysler is doing the Saturn I work and Boeing that for Saturn V. The latter is still largely in the construction stage. A

20-story glass enclosed cube is going up for the first tests of Saturn V's Stage One engine, as well as extensive new assembly space.

By mid-1964 Michoud will have a peak payroll of 10,000 and will probably be the largest single employer in Louisiana. The statistics reeled off by the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce show what an impact this is having on the area, including an increase in personal income of \$71,000,000 a year.

Members of Congress from other areas seeing these fat contracts go to New Orleans — an even fatter share to Houston, Tex. — are filled with envy. Weren't there political considerations dictating this choice? Why not South Dakota or Michigan or Iowa? NASA Administrator James A. Webb's explanation is that since the engines are so big to move by any form of land transportation the water routes linking Huntsville, Michoud, the nearby test center in Mississippi, and Houston are all important.

It is hard to imagine this project stopped or slowed down. The machines might be put in mothballs. But the men who have been brought here from all over the country and given intensive special training could not be kept in storage, and they are the vital key to success.

'Reports Of My Political Demise Are Greatly Exaggerated'



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

GOP Struggle Destructive

By WILLIAM S. WHITE
WASHINGTON — A three-sided Presidential campaign is already going on, more than a year in advance of the election of November, 1964, in the happiest of all possible circumstances for the incumbent, John F. Kennedy.

Only he can relax at this point. The other two, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York and Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona, are involved in the most urgent contest to come at so early a date in half a century of White House politicking.

The first purpose of any national politician is to divide his antagonists and thus to rule. President Kennedy, however, is the beneficiary of such a division without having had to lift a hand for it. This is being done for him by Governor Rockefeller, Goldwater's attacks on Goldwater have become incomparably more bitter than any from the Democratic side — and incomparably more effective than any from that side could possibly be.

When Rockefeller charges that Goldwater's foreign policy views would mean a "disaster for the future of freedom" he not only goes much farther than Mr. Kennedy himself would be prepared to go. He also lifts from the President the whole burden of taking those early and precautionary steps against Goldwater which otherwise he would have to take. In a word, the situation permits the President wholly to reserve his own strategy while Republican fights Republican.

This, a destructive internal GOP struggle, is precisely the thing which above all others Goldwater has been trying to avoid—aware, as he is, that his is essentially a minority party and can far less afford family sniping than can the Democrats. This is the meaning of his persistent refusals to engage Rockefeller in intraparty public debating from which the sole unquestionable gainer would be the opposition Democrats.

It is all these circumstances—and not some Kennedy notion that Goldwater would necessarily be a soft touch — that are leading many observers to suppose that the President is actively hoping for Goldwater's nomination. But the truth is much more complicated.

The President has not in fact selected, even in private among his intimate advisers, a "favorable" opponent. He simply realizes that so long as Goldwater remains out ahead and Rockefeller continues to hit him so hard, Goldwater is inevitably going to be softened up while Rockefeller himself is not going to be promoted thereby. Thus, the President never discourages the notion that Goldwater is, indeed, out ahead.

For while Goldwater can be hurt to some extent, especially among those who generally support a strongly internationalist line, it does not follow that Rockefeller can help himself, so far as his search for the nomination is concerned. To the contrary, the Governor's greatest weakness for the nomination is not even his divorce and remarriage, as so many believe. To the professional politicians who will control the Republican convention a far greater liability is simply the divisive nature of Rockefeller's campaign against Goldwater.

It is not that all the pros and cons favor Goldwater. It is only that they are first of all

interested in keeping the party together.

The truth is that in President Kennedy there are mixed feelings as to which Republican challenger would be preferable from where he sits. Though Goldwater presumably would be the weakest GOP choice in the urban North and East, he would also be its strongest choice in the South, in the Far West and in most of the Middle West.

An election pitting Mr. Kennedy against Senator Goldwater, moreover, would create for the

President, even if he won, the gravest of post-election problems. Most surely the Southern patriarchy who largely run Congress—and will continue to do so—would return here in 1965 unwilling to give the President even as much support as they give him now. A man must not only be elected; he must give some thought to his capacity to govern after election. No other GOP candidate could raise so many difficulties for Mr. Kennedy in this latter regard as would Senator Goldwater, even if he were defeated.



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

A strange and rather wonderful paradox occurred to me the other day, while riding up eighteen flights in a crowded elevator. As I looked at the passengers around me, it seemed suddenly plain that what we call the "extraordinary man" is really the ordinary man.

By "extraordinary," I am not talking in terms of any special talent or prowess, but in terms of character, of rock-bottom decency, of the "niceness" that we immediately recognize as a sign of strength, not of weakness.

Such people are extremely rare, which is why we term them extraordinary. Yet I have the feeling that these few are the "ordinary" people, and we many are the "extraordinary" ones—even though in numbers we far outweigh them.

What do I mean by this odd statement? To understand it, consider the common cold. For the human organism, a cold is an unusual thing, an abnormal thing, an "extraordinary" thing, if you will. If a person were wholly himself all the time, if he were what he is meant to be, he would never have a cold. It is not a "normal" thing for men to have.

Now, this abnormal condition is something that almost everyone has at one time or another. Only a handful of people never have a cold. This, of course,

makes them "extraordinary" — when, in point of fact, they are ordinary and we millions who get colds are abnormal. It is not a matter of numbers or statistics, but of departures from a norm.

It seems to me that the moral and psychic and emotional norm for man is also not to have a "cold"—that is, to be like those few individuals who immediately impress us with their decency and largeness of spirit. The only thing extraordinary about them is their ordinariness, which makes them so rare, valuable and respected.

They are what we ought to be, are meant to be, and could be. They represent the natural man, somehow uncontaminated by the infections that plague the rest of us, more or less frequently. They show us what it is like not to have a cold in the head, and we know instinctively that they, and not we, represent the basic form for mankind.

We struggle along with our self-created burdens, our vanities, our lusts, our pettiness, our piques and our resentments; and through all this, we think of ourselves as quite "ordinary" people. Perhaps it is worth considering for a moment whether we are the extraordinary ones, sniffing and blowing through life — and they are so ordinary, so much what man was designed for, as to seem freakishly remote from us.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Politics Bores Voters Year Before Election

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — The biggest trouble about a debate between New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and Arizona Sen. Barry Goldwater would be shutting it off.

It is charged that Goldwater sounds off every hour on the hour, but Rockefeller is right behind him on the half-hour.

Both of them have been making speeches, issuing statements, subjecting themselves to interviews as such a clip that they're already stuck needles. They're already beginning to bore their audiences, a full year before the election.

The fact that neither is yet a declared candidate bothers no one. They're off and running. But neither seems to have a friend good enough to tell him to stop talking too much.

Goldwater's opinions have been subjected to closer scrutiny so far because he's the more controversial character.

Like Gen. Eisenhower, Rockefeller professes to be confused about what Goldwater really stands for, but the governor has been no less prolific and he can be subjected to the same criticism.

Rocky is against the Kennedy administration on just as many counts as Barry. A debate between them would be a contest to determine who could denounce Democrats the most.

Rockefeller opened up on the President with a New Year's resolution that the administration had not reduced unemployment or improved the economy.

In February the governor took off on Kennedy foreign policy, saying it hadn't achieved its goals. Then he proposed a three-part foreign policy of his own—easier said than done.

—Establish a nuclear defense partnership with Europe.

—Make a trade pact with Britain and the Commonwealth.

—Establish an Atlantic Alliance political organization.

Rockefeller is just as critical as Goldwater of Kennedy's handling of the Cuba situation, but the governor does not go as far

as the senator in how to get the Russians out.

When Rockefeller criticized the Kennedy fiscal program, it was to criticize the President's \$11 billion tax cut while proposing a \$10 billion tax cut of his own.

The governor then fell in with the GOP congressional line on holding federal expenditures to last year's level and forgetting all about tax reforms.

In April, Rockefeller opposed Kennedy's accelerated public works program. In June the governor accelerated a \$1 billion worth of state construction to create more jobs.

Rockefeller and Goldwater apparently have real differences on civil rights. The senator would leave most of the corrective action to the state and limit federal programs.

At the Governors' Conference in Miami Beach, Rockefeller took the lead for a resolution to work with the President in establishing a meaningful civil rights program. What came out was a watered-down resolution asking the executive committee to give the subject high priority.

Though Rockefeller followers can claim that the governor won on principle, it was a bad political defeat in a fight that Goldwater was able to stay out of.

On July 4 the governor let the firecracker that exploded the principal difference between him and the senator. Rockefeller repudiated the reactionary right and challenged Goldwater to disown it too.

The senator's refusal sets him on a course of getting out every Republican vote there is — conservative or liberal.

Goldwater's refusal to debate the issue formally now doesn't end the matter. It is the big issue in every primary fight they both get into. They'll be debating it right up to national convention nominating time.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q — Which president created the first national monument?
A — President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1906.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Keep going, sir . . . your memoirs might become paperback material . . ."