

Editorial Page

Hard Problem To Figure

It may not be true, as charged, that you can prove anything by statistics. But it is true that you can get good and confused by statistics.

Take the matter of marriage and divorce. In 1960—latest year of record—390,000 married couples in the United States were divorced.

This was approximately one-fourth the number of marriages in the U.S. that year. So your first impulse—unless you're a statistician—is to assume that one of every four U.S. marriages ends in divorce.

But the Marriage and Divorce Statistics Branch of the U. S. Public Health Service (how does health get into this?) shakes its head.

A truer comparison, says USPHS, is to put the number of annual divorces up against the total number of married women 15 years old and older in this country.

Do it this way and you find that only one U. S. marriage in every 109 ends in divorce.

Now this is more like it. Maybe we Americans aren't so divorce-dizzy after all.

But wait— Is it accurate to compare one year's divorce crop with ALL surviving marriages over the years?

Wouldn't it be fairer to match the total number of divorced men and women 15 years old and older with the total number of undivorced men and women in the same age group?

Or would it? And even if we did do it that way, how about the fact that many of these ladies and gentlemen may have been married and/or divorced more than once?

Confusing, isn't it? Regardless of statistical shenanigans, it's a sobering thought that in one year 390,000 once-happy marriages have gone down the drain.

It is even more sobering to remember that more than 850,000 children have been left as innocent and confused and helpless victims of these broken homes.

What of their future? No matter how you figure it, it adds up to the fact that we ought to be doggedly careful when we wed—and then do our darnedest to make it work.

Leisure Time A Peril?

One reads a lot of comments from college professors these days. Some of them can be taken with a great big grain of salt, too. Like the one that came out of London University the other day, when Dennis Gabor, professor of applied electronic physics, said he isn't sure man won't die of the third great peril, the boredom of leisure.

For the first time in history, he says, only a minority need to work to keep the rest in idle luxury and the majority are not prepared for a life of leisure.

To this we say: BOSH. In capital letters. A man can always find something constructive to do if he really wants to do so. If he has the time, what's to prevent him from taking a selling job (the business world

is crying for salesmen!) starting a sideline business, building something and selling it? He has only to use a little imagination, a little ambition, and a bit of drive and stubbornness to create work. Work is really the easiest thing in the world to find. It's the money that comes from it that is hard to arrange, but if a man is willing to stick to it, whatever he is doing, the money will eventually come. And money doesn't seem to be the problem today with those who hold jobs and have leisure time. So why not use a few dollars to earn some more?

What the world needs today as much as anything else is some good, old-fashioned "git-up-and-git." And also fewer gibberish statements like this one from college professors.



WASHINGTON REPORTS . . .

Nitze Disarmament Buff

By FULTON LEWIS JR. WASHINGTON — A wealthy disarmament buff who kicked in \$4,500 to the 1960 campaign of John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been named Secretary of the Navy.

He is Paul Nitze, an investment banker of New York and Washington and a former aide to President Truman. On Feb. 4, 1960, Nitze mailed a check for \$500 to the Democratic National Committee. On election eve, Nov. 2, he had his wife, Phyllis, sent in another \$1,000.

Several days after Kennedy's election, Nitze took pen in hand and wrote his biggest check of the campaign, \$3,000 for the Citizens for Kennedy-Johnson.

For his troubles, and loyal service during the campaign, Nitze was named Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, a post he held until recently. He was then named Secretary of the Navy, replacing Fred Korth, who resigned under fire.

Nitze's nomination will be hotly challenged by at least one Senate Democrat, South Carolina's Strom Thurmond. Senator Thurmond has carefully researched Nitze's background and finds much he does not like.

On April 28, 1960, while working as chief adviser on national security policy for candidate Kennedy, Nitze delivered a speech in Asilomar, Calif. There he urged abandonment by this country of the so-called Class A nuclear capability.

He explained that a Class A capability included an effective first strike capability backed up by a second strike capability, excellent intelligence as to the location of the enemy forces and a program for rapid recuperation.

He advocated "a series of unilateral (disarmament) actions designed to produce reciprocal action on the part of our allies and also on the part of our enemies."

To this end he urged an end to the Strategic Air Command as it is today. These are his exact words: "That we multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC a NATO Command and we

inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these systems to the General Assembly of the United Nations."

In a 1959 book, "Christian Responsibility on a Changing Planet," Nitze advocated surrender to the Chinese Communists of the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. He urged a sweeping new policy toward Red China.

"The United States should liberalize its policies with respect to travel of Chinese nationals in the U.S. and of U.S. citizens within Communist China. At the same time, our policy should move in the direction of an acceptable solution of the problems of participation by the People's Republic of China in the councils of the United Nations and the establishment of diplomatic relations with that government by the United States."

At another point in his 1959 book, Nitze wrote: "We must now declare our conviction that

we cannot support the concept of nuclear retaliation or preventative war."

On these and other Nitzeisms, the new Secretary will be closely questioned by Thurmond and his colleagues on the Senate Armed Forces Committee who must approve Nitze's appointment.

Earlier this year, Wisconsin Democrat William Proxmire took the Senate floor to praise the (Madison) State Journal as a "vigorous and hard-hitting paper."

Since that time, Proxmire has abruptly cancelled his subscription. Could this have anything to do with the Journal's disclosure that Proxmire had on his staff at \$14,000 a year a full-time Wisconsin college student? Or the Journal's editorial comment that a "replacement is desperately needed in Washington for Senator Proxmire?"

The Senator's not saying. He gave no reason for his cancellation.

'And Two Old Friends Are Waiting To See You . . . A Mrs. Fred Korth And A Mr. Bobby Baker!'



'Fall Back To The House Rules Committee! I'll Cover You!'



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Kennedy Violates Shipping Provision

By RALPH de TOLEDANO Little has been seen in the papers about countries dealing with Castro Cuba. That this trade continues is a matter of record. That the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1963 barred aid to countries which permitted this trade by ships under their registry is also a matter of record.

And thereby hangs a tail. As reported in this space in July, Rep. Melvin Laird of Wisconsin, one of a group of energetic and forward-looking Republicans, charged that the Kennedy Administration was ignoring a provision in the aforementioned act which directed the President to deny foreign aid to "any country which sells, furnishes, or permits ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba so long as it is governed by the Castro regime."

The Administration denied the charges. Mr. Laird called on the General Accounting Office of the United States to investigate. He further charged that the Agency for International Development (AID) had recognized in writing—in a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States—that it was acting in violation of the law.

The Comptroller General has handed down his ruling, though I have seen no mention of this in the public prints. Here is what Mr. Laird says about it. "The Comptroller General has ruled that the Executive is in violation of section 107(b) of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act of 1963." This is the section quoted above.

Representative Laird adds: "The Administration chose to ignore this provision in the law until the Comptroller General, at my request, instituted proceedings to determine whether it had been violated." And Mr. Laird notes: "After the investigation was begun, the Administration bent over backward to find nebulous loopholes to justify failure to act. . . . My office has a list of free world ships that have engaged in the Cuban trade. . . . The list I have in my possession which covers the period from April 1963 through Oct. 9, 1963, shows that a large number of free world ships have transported cargoes from (Red) Bloc countries to Cuba."

These ships come from a variety of countries, still getting aid. What is astonishing about this is that the President, simply by informing Congress that in his belief that continuation of such aid is in the "national interest"—and by stating his reasons for that belief—could have been in conformity with a law he himself signed. His failure to do so raises many questions.

But this is question time in Washington. Representative Oliver Bolton (R-Ohio) has asked from the floor of Congress if there was any impropriety or conflict of interest when Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt accepted the hospitality of a yachting trip from shipping tycoon Aristotle Onassis.

Mr. Onassis, at the present, is having difficulties with the Maritime Administration over failure to meet certain mortgage payments on ships he is constructing. The Maritime Commission is under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department.

Those with long memories wonder just how discreet Mr. Roosevelt was in letting himself be in the social debt of Aristotle Onassis. In the past, Mr. Onassis was penalized \$7 million by a New York Federal court for certain misrepresentations he made to the Federal government in purchasing surplus ships. On the "Caesar's wife" theory, this alone should have cautioned Mr. Roosevelt to vacation on some other yacht.

But there is even more to the story. In the days before the Kennedy embargo of Cuba and the passage of the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, the Interior Department attempted to set up a voluntary system whereby tankers would refuse to transport oil to Cuba. The shipping companies agreed to cooperate with the United States. There were two notable exceptions: Aristotle Onassis and Steve Nararchos, his brother-in-law.

If the President is—as the Comptroller General has ruled—ignoring his own law, then Under Secretary of Commerce Roosevelt must be charged with a violation of taste and of a lack of the instinct for self-preservation. He has yet to learn that in government the appearance is often more important than the act.



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

Moon Race Is A Phony

WASHINGTON — One of the most successful of all Soviet propaganda strokes has been Nikita Khrushchev's theatrical withdrawal from "the race to the moon." The American space program is, in consequence, in grave trouble.

In Congress and among the people—many of whom Khrushchev is plainly fooling most of the time in this matter—there is a clearly diminished interest in pushing that program, even though never has so vast and so potentially rewarding an enterprise been open to mankind. But would it not cost in a nifty billions? Of course, it would; but so did the development of the airplane, of atomic energy, of radio and television.

Khrushchev's reasons for his alleged retirement are endlessly debated. But not often has there been a more irrelevant debate, as has been pointed out by one of the most trustworthy experts in this field, Rep. Olin E. Teague of Texas. For it does not really matter why Khrushchev has done what apparently he has done. And, parenthetically, if he really has done it, it probably is in simple acceptance of the basic fact the Russian economy is vastly inferior to that of the United States.

What is truly and desperately important is the danger that we are about to be talked out of that maximum American effort which is the most vital need of the 20th Century and perhaps even of the century to come.

To begin with, the nation

which becomes first in space will undoubtedly become first on the earth we inhabit, probably in position to begin to control the weather and possibly even to begin to dominate some part of the infinity which has thus far lain beyond man's understanding.

And, to proceed with the obvious, the effort to reach the moon—as only the current symbol of man's search into these outer mysteries—is already showering out collateral benefits in science which are in themselves beyond price.

Grand and seemingly grandiose schemes of this kind, though easy to attack with the jeering slogans of unlettered cynicism, almost invariably produce returns which a few years later we learn we could not have lived without. Often, these returns are wholly unexpected.

For a relatively small example: The assigned mission of the U.S. 8th Air Force in England in the second World War was to destroy German industry with daylight bombing raids. A part of this job was done; but a far more immediately vital and quite unplanned thing was done, too. This was the virtual destruction of the counter-attacking German fighter air force—a bonus that we will have saved our D-Day invasion from disaster.

Khrushchev's claim that he is getting out of the moon contest has reduced the drama of the thing—which too many people in any event had seen as a kind

of high-school foot race. But, more damagingly, it has greatly assisted the old coalition against the moon attempt. One of the strangest coalitions we have ever known, it is made up of some conservatives, whose proper desire to save money is sadly misplaced here and some liberals who can rarely lift their minds above well-worn plans for spending every dollar at hand "right here on earth," to use their happily demagogic phrase.

Nothing will change the minds of these liberals. The conservatives, however, ought to ponder what they are about here. For apart from the almost indescribable strategic and scientific significance of this program, there is the bottom fact that it is already nearly indispensable to the American economy and may later become indispensable in the absolute sense.

Automation, when fully launched, will create huge pools of unemployables. Politically, these must and will be cared for, under any foreseeable regime, Republican or Democratic. Is it not better to spend the money for space than to spend the day when all this money and more will have to be thrown about for the most gigantic—and also permanent—leaf-raking schemes in the world's history?

The space program is the precise opposite of economic crackpotism. It is sensible conservatism's greatest future weapon against just such crackpotism.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON

Bolivia Seeks Self Support

By PETER EDSON WASHINGTON (NEA) — America is still the melting pot.

Anybody can come here — bad, indifferent or good—speak a piece of his mind, get an audience, get away with it.

This has been proved again by the American visits of President Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu of Viet Nam and now President Victor Paz Estenssoro of Bolivia.

Tito and Mme. Nhu have made enemies in the United States. Both were therefore picketed on their Washington visits and inhospitable things

were said about them. But this is a country of full freedom of speech—both ways.

Tito got invited to the White House. He was restrained, polite, grateful. Mme. Nhu—who didn't get invited to the White House—was voluble, charming, contradictory, honest in some of her criticisms of America, unjust in others.

But for the fact that Mme. Nhu's husband in Viet Nam was taking actions against the Buddhists which belied his wife's honeyed words in America, she might have been invited to the White House, too. This could have been in the spirit of mutual apology and forgiveness, to get on with winning the war.

That is what's really important—fighting the Communists—not indulging in personalities and mud slinging.

So with these unpleasant incidents out of the way, there is a change in pattern with the official White House visit of Paz, who brings only friendship, good news and a more hopeful outlook on Commie fighting.

Dr. Paz is an egotical professor of economics, a lawyer, and founder of the National Revolutionary Movement of Bolivia in 1941. He was exiled from his country from 1946 to 1952, when he returned to become its president after a real political, social and economic revolution that overthrew the old feudal autocracy in the potshouse of the Andes.

Paz ruled four years without a Congress, and by decree nationalized the tin mines, gave suffrage to a population of 4 million—two-thirds illiterate and three-fourths Indian—insituated land reform, diversified the economy.

He encouraged organization of labor unions. At first they were dominated by Communists, and there is still a Communist leadership in some of the unions.

But Communist membership has dwindled, and the claim is now made that Castro efforts to infiltrate the labor movement have failed. For the Bolivian economy, after 10 years, is beginning to grow.

The army of 10,000 men has been put to work a third of the time as a kind of Corps of Engineers or Peace Corps. They help the campesinos—the country people—with the digging of wells and building schools and access roads into the jungles.

The Indians who have lived in the 10,000 to 15,000-foot Andean highlands are beginning to come down into the valleys to become farmers and ranchers.

Bolivia hopes to be self-sufficient in food in the foreseeable future.

With co-operation from West Germany, the Inter-American Bank and the Alliance for Progress, a consortium has been formed to help finance this development.

The alliance doesn't like talk about "showcase" countries that demonstrate how American aid can help underdeveloped countries. But Bolivia today is said to come as close to that designation as any other.

It is not over the mountain yet. But it is one Latin American country which does not seem to be in greater danger of a take-over by either the Communists or a military junta.

Almanac

By United Press International Today is Thursday, Nov. 7, the 311th day of 1963 with 54 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

On this day in history: In 1895, the Lewis and Clark Expedition sighted the Pacific Ocean at the mouth of the Columbia River.

In 1974, Harper's Weekly ran the first cartoon depicting an elephant as the symbol of the Republican party.

In 1917, the Bolsheviks overthrew the Russian provisional government of Alexander Kerensky and Nikolai Lenin assumed power.



STRICTLY PERSONAL

Purely Personal Prejudices: The most prevalent defect in society is deafness—most of us simply do not hear what people are saying beneath the words they use, and the great creative artist is not one who is wiser or better than others, but one with the keenest sense of hearing.

The most potent enemy is the farmer friend, for he knows where all the soft spots are located, and can strike infallibly.

It is not the harshness or the lenity of the law that makes a good state, but its certainty; it matters not how severe the laws if their enforcement is capricious, arbitrary, and unequal toward the powerful and the weak.

"Virtually" is one of the most dishonest words in the language; we commonly use it when we hope to short-change the truth.

A child must be allowed to hate its parents from time to time without being made to feel criminally guilty about such feelings; indeed, only if a child is permitted to vent its hostilities against parents (within reasonable limits, of course) can the child give love freely.

Never to talk about oneself is the ultimate in arrogance masquerading as diffidence.

Young people who resent the social order should, before they assert their autonomy, keep in mind the shrewd observation of Chamfort: "When we cast off the yoke of public opinion, it is seldom to rise above it, but almost always to fall below."

Dare one say it above a whisper without being labelled as hopelessly provincial?—that it is barely possible that Paris, despite its numerous attractions, is the most overrated city in the world?

The most lacerating and in-

effectual passion is the jealousy that continues after love has fled; for it would deny to others what it is no longer desirous of possessing itself.

No event in history are so obscure or difficult of interpretation as those that are taking place right now; for the nose that is pressed up against the painting can see nothing but streaks of oil, without purpose, pattern or plan.

If we can understand the alcoholic as a "sufferer" rather than as a sensualist, only then can we generate enough sympathy to help him cope with the problem; Dr. Johnson grasped the point two centuries ago, when he commented: "He who makes a beast of himself gets rid of the pain of being a man."

Our widespread belief that curvaceous and beautiful film stars are "love-goddesses" is part of our national delusion of confusing the package with the product.

BERRY'S WORLD



"O.K.—I'll promise to stop talking about dieting, if you'll promise to stop talking about giving up smoking."