

# Editorial Page

## The Parade Has Started

Americans are a race of people that can get enthusiastic overnight. They got that way about foreign compact automobiles, stacked hair-dos, civil rights and pull tab can openers. A fad can sweep from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast almost overnight. When an American gets the bug, he just doesn't seem to be able to do things with temperance.

So it looks as if the parade of doing business with Russia with enthusiasm may be starting. Now that the U.S. has agreed to sell wheat to them, there is already talk of selling them other grains such as rice, barley, corn etc.

Now Rep. David N. Henderson (D-N.C.) is suggesting selling surplus American tobacco to them also.

Canada, he notes, is sending a trade mission to Russia to promote the sale of tobacco. "We should do the same," he said.

The administration is trying to complete the wheat deal as a one-shot sale. But there are already some pertinent questions being asked. For example, if it is decided to sell it one time then why is it not logical to sell it again and again? And if wheat is sold, why not other products? Butter has been mentioned. And how about those over-produced chickens which set off the "Chicken War" between the U.S. and the European Common Market? If Russia would only take up the surplus of birds caused by the in-

creased tariffs of the Common Market would it not be sensible to sell them?

As these questions are asked, and as talk continues, there appears a re-evaluation is ahead for the U.S. foreign policy. If the U.S. is going to do business with Moscow, what about Red China? If it is permissible to do business with one sect of Communists why not another?

Uncle Sam is faced with the task of coming up with some sort of reasonable stand for telling other countries not to do business with Cuba.

As things stand today, it is quite apparent that Washington is going to have to take a stand on whether to continue to make sales or to make the flat statement to American business that the wheat deal was and is a one-shot sale and there will be no others.

Rep. Henderson is just one of the first to start booting the drums for selling other products to Russia. And as the parade starts, one can only stand back and wonder down which road the Administration is going to travel.

The purple heart veteran down the way, who received his wound in the Pacific at the hands of the Japanese, can't help but remember the days when we sold scrap steel to Japan prior to World War II.

Remembering those days, his prediction is saying to fellow Americans — please don't let enthusiasm get the best of common judgment.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Goldwater Forces Await Announcement

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—From an organizational standpoint, the Goldwater for President campaign—official and unofficial—are now so far out in front as to leave the machines of all other GOP hopefuls tied to the post.

Eighteen state campaign chairmen already have been announced by the National Draft Goldwater Committee.

This is the work of Peter F. O'Donnell Jr., Dallas, Republican state chairman for Texas, who organized the NDCG last spring without asking Senator Goldwater's permission.

There is no connection between the senator's office on Capitol Hill and the O'Donnell headquarters two miles west at 925 Connecticut Avenue. But O'Donnell has traveled constantly the last six months to set up a national organization ready for the senator to take over when he wants it.

Instead of picking right-wing extremists who would make the most noise for Goldwater, O'Donnell decided to pick state chairmen for his group organization who have had considerable experience in regular Republican party organization and fund raising campaigns. So they are all pros.

Among those announced so far are:

Alabama—John E. Greiner, chairman of the state GOP organization which has already declared its for Goldwater.

Georgia—Joseph E. Trillie, Savannah state senator, whose organization has already raised a \$20,000 campaign fund.

Idaho—James D. McClary, Boise business executive.

Illinois—John P. Wilkie, Chicago insurance man.

Indiana—Leslie David, former Young Republican head.

Kansas—William Whorton, Wichita public relations man, former member of the late Sen. Arthur W. Fletcher.

Missouri—Clyde E. Jolly, Water-ville lawyer.

Michigan—Craigton D. Holden, St. Clair hotel man, an elected member of Gov. Romney's Citizens Committee.

Minnesota—William G. McFadden, Minneapolis executive.

Mississippi—Wirt A. Yergee Sr., chairman of the state GOP executive committee of the Southern Republican Chairmen's Association.

Montana—Jerry Harkins Jr., K.C. state legislator.

Montana—Jerome Anderson, Billings state legislator.

New Mexico—Robert J. Leon-

ard, Roswell state legislator. Oklahoma—Denzil Garrison, Bartlesville state senator.

South Carolina—J. Drake Edens Jr., chairman of the state GOP organization, which has also declared for Goldwater.

Washington—Luke Williams Jr., Spokane councilman.

West Virginia—Stuart F. Bloch, active in state GOP.

Wisconsin—Wayne J. Hood, La Crosse, former state GOP chairman and National Committee executive director.

While all this activity has been going on at the grass roots, Senator Goldwater has been building up a Washington Headquarters staff, just as any good candidate should.

Denison Kitchel, who is officially Goldwater's campaign manager for reelection to the U.S. Senate, has given up his business in Phoenix and opened an office in Washington, near the Capitol.

The Arizona senator has always been his own man. He has been taking advice from no one. But he is now relying more on a staff of professors being recruited by former Eisenhower administration lawyer, Edward A. McCabe, who has the title of research director.

The stable includes such well-known names as Chicago economist Milton Friedman, Stanford political scientist Stephen Pessen, and even a Harvard man, Gottfried Haberler.

The senator has taken on another speech writer, Bill Flythe, in addition to Tony Smith, his press secretary.

A politician doesn't build up a staff of his own like this, or allow one to be built for him, if there's any chance he will announce he won't be a candidate.

For even the suggestion for this very modest increase in the pay of the men who collectively hold the life and honor of this nation on their hands is meeting a howling chorus of complaints from two sets of critics.

One set is made up of economists whose horizons are so punched and small that they honestly believe a member of Congress should be content with less pay than can be readily earned by a good wholesale salesman in, say, cosmetics or beer. Of this set, no more will be said in this column, for their opinion is in good faith, however wrong it may be.

But the second set of critics is made up of people who know perfectly well that in today's world and at today's cost of liv-



By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON — Twelve months from this date the nation will have come through, if advance indications mean anything, one of the bitterest Presidential campaigns in our history.

For all practical purposes during this interval any initiative in foreign policy is ruled out. The best that can be hoped for is a kind of "still pond, no more moving," with no violent irruption on the foreign scene.

This may be too much to ask of a world in revolutionary turmoil and particularly since the Presidential exercise gets stretched out for a longer and longer time. Just as four years ago Sen. John F. Kennedy had already been campaigning for months, so today Sen. Barry Goldwater is almost ceaselessly on the move and his office in the old Senate Office Building resembles the strategy headquarters that was the Kennedy office in 1960.

The pious declaration of another era was that "politics stops at the water's edge." There is hardly a pretense of that today. The wheat deal, the nuclear test ban, Viet Nam, Cuba, charges and counter-charges already reverberate over these trouble areas. Any neutral ground, on which national interest might be expected to prevail over partisanship, threatens to shrink to zero.

In the principal spots where political volcanoes smoulder under the surface what are the chances of simply holding the line? What serves the American interest—a waiting period—may also serve the Soviet interest. Premier Khrushchev is

wrestling with Red China and with an internal economic crisis of serious dimensions. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the assembled American ambassadors in Bonn this week, there is no real relaxation of tensions — no detente. What we have is simply a hunting license to try to find a detente. Despite reports to the contrary, approval of a Moscow-New York plane line may still be worked out. And the deal to open consulates in both countries is also in slow-motion progress.

But these are minor steps and nothing else is expected. A non-aggression pact was never seriously contemplated despite the cries of alarm of some who set it up as a whipping boy. Unless Khrushchev decides in his own interest to stir up a crisis—in Berlin perhaps—the likelihood is for more of the present pause.

As to Cuba, the best information is that the Administration contemplates no drastic move. Except for noises from Red China the Communist bloc seems to be pulling back from support of Fidel Castro. The economic deterioration within Cuba is more rapid and an internal explosion cannot be ruled out.

The same terms apply more or less to Viet Nam. The McNamara-Taylor mission put off the beginning of victory until early 1965 even though some American troops might be removed earlier. The prayerful hope here is that the coup against the Diem regime will provide a stable government with much wider popular support.

So with a little bit of luck the roof may not fall in. But this appraisal omits one point at which the showdown is already set for a date certain. The Kennedy round of tariff negotiations next spring in Geneva will put the gravest strain on the Western alliance at a time when the taste of the chicken mess is still bitter.

Rusk found the Europeans deeply resentful over what they considered undue pressure to reduce the tariff on American chickens. The new German chancellor, Ludwig Erhard, told Rusk that he would have to give full support to German agriculture in the Kennedy round. Erhard, who will have the backing of the French, is coming here to meet with the President.

This will be another chance at least to look at the time bomb and see if perhaps it can be defused. It is impossible to imagine a President in a Presidential year not defending to the bitterest end American agricultural exports.

In Bonn Rusk held a back-ground briefing with German correspondents. The German press was off running like frightened hares over the report that American troop commitments in Germany would be cut back, thus reflecting quivering German insecurity. Rusk told them:

"You seem always willing to ascribe the lowest motives to us. We cannot live this way." As the angry noises of a Presidential campaign can be heard even now in the background, his words have a broader application. If each partisan charge is taken for fact the next 12 months can be disastrous.



By WILLIAM S. WHITE

WASHINGTON—A bipartisan Congressional committee has at last had the courage to recommend a bill for an increase in the salaries of members of the Senate and House from \$22,500 to \$32,500 a year.

It is not an adequate raise; the minimum should be \$50,000 a year, which would be, perhaps, a tenth of the annual take of one of the junior glamor girls of Hollywood. But, perhaps understandably, everything being considered, not quite enough guts to be found in any Congressional committee to propose what really ought to be done.

For even the suggestion for this very modest increase in the pay of the men who collectively hold the life and honor of this nation on their hands is meeting a howling chorus of complaints from two sets of critics.

One set is made up of economists whose horizons are so punched and small that they honestly believe a member of Congress should be content with less pay than can be readily earned by a good wholesale salesman in, say, cosmetics or beer. Of this set, no more will be said in this column, for their opinion is in good faith, however wrong it may be.

But the second set of critics is made up of people who know perfectly well that in today's world and at today's cost of liv-

## Foreign Policy Doldrums

WASHINGTON — Twelve months from this date the nation will have come through, if advance indications mean anything, one of the bitterest Presidential campaigns in our history.

For all practical purposes during this interval any initiative in foreign policy is ruled out. The best that can be hoped for is a kind of "still pond, no more moving," with no violent irruption on the foreign scene.

This may be too much to ask of a world in revolutionary turmoil and particularly since the Presidential exercise gets stretched out for a longer and longer time. Just as four years ago Sen. John F. Kennedy had already been campaigning for months, so today Sen. Barry Goldwater is almost ceaselessly on the move and his office in the old Senate Office Building resembles the strategy headquarters that was the Kennedy office in 1960.

The pious declaration of another era was that "politics stops at the water's edge." There is hardly a pretense of that today. The wheat deal, the nuclear test ban, Viet Nam, Cuba, charges and counter-charges already reverberate over these trouble areas. Any neutral ground, on which national interest might be expected to prevail over partisanship, threatens to shrink to zero.

In the principal spots where political volcanoes smoulder under the surface what are the chances of simply holding the line? What serves the American interest—a waiting period—may also serve the Soviet interest. Premier Khrushchev is

wrestling with Red China and with an internal economic crisis of serious dimensions. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the assembled American ambassadors in Bonn this week, there is no real relaxation of tensions — no detente. What we have is simply a hunting license to try to find a detente. Despite reports to the contrary, approval of a Moscow-New York plane line may still be worked out. And the deal to open consulates in both countries is also in slow-motion progress.

But these are minor steps and nothing else is expected. A non-aggression pact was never seriously contemplated despite the cries of alarm of some who set it up as a whipping boy. Unless Khrushchev decides in his own interest to stir up a crisis—in Berlin perhaps—the likelihood is for more of the present pause.

As to Cuba, the best information is that the Administration contemplates no drastic move. Except for noises from Red China the Communist bloc seems to be pulling back from support of Fidel Castro. The economic deterioration within Cuba is more rapid and an internal explosion cannot be ruled out.

The same terms apply more or less to Viet Nam. The McNamara-Taylor mission put off the beginning of victory until early 1965 even though some American troops might be removed earlier. The prayerful hope here is that the coup against the Diem regime will provide a stable government with much wider popular support.

So with a little bit of luck the roof may not fall in. But this appraisal omits one point at which the showdown is already set for a date certain. The Kennedy round of tariff negotiations next spring in Geneva will put the gravest strain on the Western alliance at a time when the taste of the chicken mess is still bitter.

Rusk found the Europeans deeply resentful over what they considered undue pressure to reduce the tariff on American chickens. The new German chancellor, Ludwig Erhard, told Rusk that he would have to give full support to German agriculture in the Kennedy round. Erhard, who will have the backing of the French, is coming here to meet with the President.

This will be another chance at least to look at the time bomb and see if perhaps it can be defused. It is impossible to imagine a President in a Presidential year not defending to the bitterest end American agricultural exports.

In Bonn Rusk held a back-ground briefing with German correspondents. The German press was off running like frightened hares over the report that American troop commitments in Germany would be cut back, thus reflecting quivering German insecurity. Rusk told them:

"You seem always willing to ascribe the lowest motives to us. We cannot live this way." As the angry noises of a Presidential campaign can be heard even now in the background, his words have a broader application. If each partisan charge is taken for fact the next 12 months can be disastrous.

## Who Owes What To Whom

(Journal of Commerce)

President Kennedy recently called attention to the fact that federal debt had risen much less than had state and municipal and other forms of debt, implying something good in this girth restriction. He had all the statistics in his favor. A recent dissertation by that justly celebrated economist, Dr. Marcus Nadlar, goes into it in a bit more detail. On the surface it looks pretty encouraging.

From 1940 to the end of 1962 the U.S. gross debt, public and private, went from \$215 billion to \$1,764.4 billion, up 445 per cent. In that period federal debt rose 585 per cent, but the total including federal agencies was up to \$840.3 billion at the end of 1962 against \$266.4 billion at the end of 1950 and \$53.6 billion at the end of 1940.

Debt of state and local governments jumped from \$23.2 billion to \$80.9 billion between 1950 and 1962 and was only \$20.2 billion at the end of 1940.

Private debt of all kinds jumped from \$273.7 billion in 1950 to \$555.2 billion in 1962, up from \$142.0 billion in 1940. Most of this was obviously in corporate debt, which was \$164.5 billion in 1950, \$115.5

billion in 1962 and only \$69 billion in 1940.

Attempts to minimize the rise in the federal debt usually stress the 42 per cent increase in population since 1940 and the 452 per cent rise in gross national product, which was up 206 per cent on a per capita basis. The richer a nation and faster its GNP rises, the better it can support debt. All this is taking habituates to lull oneself to sleep. Most federal expenditure is for wars and similar purposes, largely unproductive. It goes up from year to year for a variety of reasons, and the mounting cost of paying interest on the debt is one reason why we have to pay so much in taxes and why tax reduction drags its feet.

New as to the debt of state and local governments. With inadequate yields from real estate taxes, they have built up tax revenue from other tax sources and so far have been doing pretty well. But they are looking more and more to the federal government to bail them out, which the federal government is manfully trying to do. The state and local government debt is still reasonably productive and safe. The debt of states and municipalities is probably, overall, more productive than is federal debt, which has grown much faster.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Efficient Oppression

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

A free press, we are constantly told, is the guardian of our freedoms. No one will quarrel with this axiom. The question usually is: What constitutes a free press and what can destroy it? To the first part of the query, many answers can be offered. But the second part is subject to a more precise review.

The free press goes when the government becomes either a dispenser or an arbiter of news. For some time, American editors and reporters have been troubled by a sharp increase in management of the news by the Federal government. Where in the past the single criterion for the imposition of secrecy was the national security, it has now become the political security of whatever group of people may be in office. At present, contract negotiations involving the Maritime Administration or the Justice Department are covered by the cloak of secrecy—and the press has no way in which to determine whether or not the Executive Branch is playing hob with the taxpayer's money.

But the United States seems to be moving rapidly ahead into an era in which the dissemination of news becomes a government prerogative. The government has always been a prime source of news, but it has stayed strictly away from processing that news directly to the nation's newspapers and magazines.

The process began in the Agriculture Department under Secretary Orville Freeman. It was Mr. Freeman's fond hope that he be enabled to set up a USDA news service which would feed news on farm activities to the nation.

Why the federal government should go to the tremendous expense involved in creating a news service of this kind was never explained to the public. Presumably, Mr. Freeman believes that the U.S. press is not properly informed of the practices of government officials. Too many people, moreover, accept the anti-Freeman image that crops up in the daily press.

In any case, the Freeman idea seems to have impressed the President and his advisers. At his behest, the heads of Cabinet-rank departments and

the agency chiefs have been told to whip up an idea for a unified Federal agency to be called the National Communications System. According to memoranda being circulated in the Federal establishment, the NCS will be developed "by linking together, improving and extending on an evolutionary basis, the communications facilities of the various Federal agencies."

The National Communications System will not attempt to sell its services to newspapers. It will pour into newswriters a constant flood of "information" touting the works of the Administration in power.

Since it will be a government project, cost accounting will not be a factor in its operations. The main victim will be the taxpayer.

It is hard to believe that the boilerplate being turned out by government agencies, when dignified by a NCS slug, will not gradually filter into the pages of our free press. Result: The Federal government will be in a position to reach millions of citizens who will unsuspectingly believe that they are reading objective news.

## BERRY'S WORLD



By Mrs. Berry

"Mrs. Kennedy thinks that your Acropolis is a daring ball . . . and it might be fun to restore it sometime."

## STRICTLY PERSONAL

One of the big and important words of the last decade is "communication." It is considered to be a wholly good thing; the more the better. If we could but communicate with one another more effectively, many of our problems would be solved, our conflicts eased.

It may seem strange for a writer to minimize the influence of "communication," but I think most of us are suffering from a gross illusion. What the world lacks is not communication—there is enough, and perhaps too much, of this — but dialog.

Dialog consists of a speaker and a receiver, who keep exchanging these roles. Communication, as such, is too often a speaker who only speaks and a receiver who only receives. But this is not a living transaction, it is a mechanical thing, and has little human value.

## STRICTLY PERSONAL

that means of speech we can arrive at understanding is an age-old misconception, and it makes us talk and listen in such good faith that often we understand far less than if we kept silent and attempted simply to guess one another's thoughts."

When we read the best writers, we feel that they are conducting a dialog with us, not merely "communicating" their ideas as an orator or a politician may do. The best writers touch us at our inmost parts, provoke a reaction (whether of agreement or disagreement, it does not matter) and we find ourselves not only answering them but also talking with ourselves, as if one part of our personality were opening itself to the other.

Abstract subjects, factual statements, can be communicated, but the closer we get to the human level, the more basic we become, the more arises the need for genuine dialog between persons, in which the tone, the gesture (as it were), and the unvoiced nuances of feeling are as important as the words and phrases themselves.

## STRICTLY PERSONAL

"I believe, therefore," Ortega goes on to say, "that the measure of a book is the author's ability to imagine his reader concretely and to carry on a kind of hidden dialog with him, in which the reader perceives from between the lines the touch of an ectoplasmic hand that feels him, caresses him, or deals him an occasional gentlemanly blow."

Communication that is addressed to everyone and to no one is either trivial or pretentious; it is spoken *intra* void, to a faceless audience; and since it does not impel us to resonate with response, it fails to create any real relationship—while true dialog (so rare these days) has for its high and final end the forming of a right relationship.