

Editorial Page

Shame Should Be Shared

During the 30-day period set aside as a time of mourning the tragic death of President Kennedy it would be well for all of us to consider in our sorrow the shame being suffered by the people of Dallas. It was in their city that the President was assassinated, a brave policeman killed in an attempt to apprehend the suspected murderer and then the assassin, himself, was shot to death by still another resident of that city.

The terrible tragedy could have happened in any city in the United States. So we are all equally involved in a heinous page of history written over the past weekend. Dallas alone shouldn't be expected to bear the burden of shame for the President's death. All of America should share the blame.

It should be remembered that Texas is one of the great states in the Union. The Lone Star state has furnished a tremendous amount of leadership and manpower in the past when the fate of the U.S.A. was at stake . . . like their fight in gaining independence from Mexico during the heroic

days of Stephen Austin and Sam Houston and the subsequent massacre (1836) of the garrison at the Alamo which included heroes like W. B. Travis and Davey Crockett.

In World Wars I and II Texans carried a big load in the fight to preserve our freedom. They died at the Rapido River; at Iwo Jima. There has never been a time in history when the loyalty of Texans could be questioned. They have been leaders in the fight ever since the state became a part of our great nation.

So all of us must take responsibility for the President's death. We must share in the responsibility for those who are mentally unstable, or those who lack understanding of the very foundations on which our country was founded; our American heritage and why we are the most fortunate people in the world to live under a democracy guaranteed as long as a breeze ruffles the Stars and Stripes.

Today our hearts go out to the citizens of Dallas and the State of Texas but the shame shouldn't stop at their city limits or their state borders.

First Things First

The honest disagreements among scientists and others as to the wisdom of pouring heavy U. S. effort into the moon race must be welcomed. We need all the earnest debate we can get.

But Arkansas' Sen. J. William Fulbright offers a useful corrective on this subject when he suggests that much more is involved than whether or not we spend vast sums to try to reach the moon.

What is at stake, he indicates, is how we are to apportion our tremendous but not bottomless resources among many, many important national programs—military, foreign and domestic.

The question, in other words, is one of priorities. And these, says Fulbright, have not really been wisely settled by the leadership of this country.

This does not mean no priorities are in effect. Plainly they are. The federal budget, with its allocation of expenditures, is one great collection of priority decisions. Congress, either by accepting or altering those

judgments, puts its own stamp upon the priority process.

Fulbright's point is that the whole process is not really well thought out—that we have not run up a solid balance sheet of national needs against national resources and arranged the needs in genuine order of importance.

By his measure, then, it is slightly shallow to say we are planning to spend too much money to go to the moon, when it is not clear whether we are spending too much or too little on educating scientists, helping Latin America, building new hospitals at home, expanding our highway network, attacking the problem of crime, safeguarding our nuclear "delivery systems" and so on.

Rich as we are, we cannot do all of these things at the "optimum" level. So it becomes a matter of how much of each to do, in what order.

The budget, the spending by the "private sector" of the economy, these represent our current decisions. But the demands upon the nation's resources are mounting so rapidly and so steeply that we may not be able to get by indefinitely without more fully reasoned priority judgments.

Fulbright did not mention it, but an important study in this field is under way, under auspices of the National Planning Association. This respected research organization is still in the relatively early stages of its inquiries. Yet it is heartening to know there is at least some assault on this vital matter.

This country, privately and publicly, spends untold billions of dollars with something less than full thought as to the wisdom of it. To question spending for the moon is all right. But the questions ought not to stop there.

Americanism

(Dallas Times Herald)

What is Americanism? We know what Americanism is. We were born in it, we suckled Americanism from birth. And the foundation stone of real Americanism is the freedom to believe and to disbelieve; the right to hold a point of view, no matter how much it might be counter to someone else's. On this foundation can be elected all kinds of disagreement, ideas, or divergent philosophies. But they must be contested by reason and logic, not force and the argument of brawling brawn.



THE GLOBAL VIEW . . .

Nuclear Test Ban Pact

By LEON NENEN

NEW YORK (NEA) — President Kennedy's outstanding achievement in international affairs lives after him; it is the nuclear test ban agreement he recently concluded with Russia.

Though he never trusted the Russians, Kennedy's foreign policy was based on the possibility of coexistence with them in one world. He saw the bitter conflict between Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and Red China's Mao Tse-tung as an opportunity to convince the Russians their future and the future of the entire world depended on cooperation that excluded the possibility of an atomic holocaust.

Will the new President Lyndon Johnson continue President Kennedy's foreign policies?

Historians still speculate on what the world would have looked like had President Roosevelt been alive when the last war ended in 1945. It is a known fact that his successor, the then Vice President Harry Truman, never participated actively in the conduct of foreign affairs.

Thus, when Roosevelt died there was a vacuum in American foreign policy.

Truman, in faithfully carrying out the Yalta Agreement of 1944, enabled the Russians to extend their domination to all of eastern Europe and East Germany.

Historians assent that toward the end of his life President Roosevelt realized that Russia never meant to keep the agreements reached at Yalta.

President Lyndon Johnson is in a different situation. He is no newcomer to foreign affairs. He has been Kennedy's close collaborator.

Nevertheless, there probably will be important changes in foreign policy under the new President. Lyndon Johnson is more conservative than Kennedy, has less faith in the Russians.

He is expected to try to re-establish friendly relations with French President De Gaulle and strengthen NATO and other western alliances which were in a sad state of disintegration in recent months.

Johnson doubtless will pay less attention to the academic advisers who were part of President Kennedy's entourage and seek to exploit to the advantage of the free world the conflict

between Russia and Red China. The United States is the most powerful country in the western alliance and the world's freedom in the foreseeable future will depend a great deal on President Johnson's foreign policies.

There is no doubt that for Russia President Kennedy's death has raised a hornet's nest. Nikita Khrushchev, for all his duplicity wanted to come to some agreement with the United States. He needs a breathing spell in the Red world to mend his political fences and to come to grips with Mao Tse-tung. He exploited his on-again and off-again negotiations with President Kennedy in an effort to display his peaceful intentions.

Kennedy's death is likely to unleash the anti-Khrushchev and pro-Chinese forces in Russia. In recent weeks, Mao Tse-tung has even appealed to Red generals to "eliminate" Khrushchev.

Until now Khrushchev has been able to outmaneuver his enemies. The death of Kennedy may give his enemies their long awaited opportunity to strike again.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Inside Facts Given On VP Acceptance

Editor's Note: Following is the hitherto untold inside story of how Lyndon Baines Johnson took a vice presidential job he had sworn never to accept — and thereby became President of the United States.

By PETER EDSON

Newspaper Enterprise Assn. WASHINGTON (NEA)—President Lyndon Baines Johnson once said—shortly after he had been sworn in as Vice President in 1961—that he had never expected anyone from the South could ever become President in his lifetime.

The prejudices against the South were too great, he explained. That a man from Texas could ever be put in second place on a presidential ticket and be elected was probably not beyond his hopes, but it certainly was beyond his expectations.

Yet now, by the cruellest trick of fate, Lyndon Johnson will soon find himself living in the White House. But he would be the last man to want this to come about the way it did.

It was a much kinder trick of fate that put Lyndon Johnson on the ticket with John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the man who had just defeated him for the presidential nomination at the 1960 Democratic convention in Los Angeles.

The morning after Kennedy had won, 809 votes to 404 for Johnson, the defeated candidate lay abed in his hotel suite. The phone rang. It was his wife, Ladybird, who answered. Kennedy was calling. He wanted to come to see Johnson right away.

Johnson, taking the phone, offered to go to see Kennedy, but Kennedy didn't want it that way.

Unshaven and unwashed, Johnson stilled the President's call for 45 minutes. But it was an hour and 45 minutes before Kennedy appeared at the Johnson door, followed by a swarm of reporters.

When the two men were alone Kennedy came to the point at once and said he wanted to offer Johnson the vice presidential nomination.

Kennedy wanted a national ticket, he said, representing the whole country. With 1,213 of the convention's 1,432 votes between them, they were first choices of an overwhelming majority of the delegates.

Johnson demurred. He said that the only thing he was a candidate for at the moment was reelection as U.S. senator from Texas.

Kennedy replied that he had talked to Gov. Dave Lawrence of Pennsylvania, Gov. Mike DiSalle of Ohio, Arthur Goldberg of AFL-CIO and other Democratic leaders. They had all approved Johnson for second place on the ticket.

One of the principal things that made Johnson delay was that the late Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas, who had nominated Johnson for the presidency, had told him the night before not to take second place on the ticket.

This is contrary to reports published at the time which said Rayburn had suggested to Johnson that he consider running for the vice presidency.

Anyway, Johnson wanted to talk to Rayburn and his other advisers. He asked Kennedy if they could meet again before the night session of the convention when balloting for the vice presidency would begin. Kennedy agreed.

Johnson called in his advisers as soon as he could get them.

During this session Robert F. Kennedy came to the Johnson suite to tell him that if he did become a candidate for Vice President, Gov. Mennen Williams of Michigan and some others might oppose him.

This was not a threat to try to force Johnson to withdraw, but simply a friendly warning that he might have opposition.

Speaker Rayburn, who was in the room during Bobby's visit, told him bluntly that Johnson was not a candidate for any office.

The late Sen. Robert F. Kerr of Oklahoma, another adviser who was in the room at the time, told Johnson, "If you accept that nomination I'll go get my Winchester and shoot you right between the eyes."

They discussed the situation from every angle. Kerr, leaving the room for a short time, came back to announce, "Lyndon, if you don't accept that nomination I'll go get my Winchester and shoot you right between the eyes."

That was the decision they finally agreed on. They took the position that if LBJ sat out the campaign on his ranch, Nixon might win the presidency. They decided that the best thing Johnson could do was to help Kennedy win the presidency and keep the Democrats in power.

Lyndon Johnson and Ladybird had also talked it over thoroughly between themselves. At first Ladybird was against her husband's accepting the vice presidential nomination. But then they concluded that they wouldn't want people to think that the Johnsons were too uppity to take second place on the ticket.

Later in the afternoon than he had intended to see Johnson, Presidential nominee Kennedy called Johnson on the phone. Kennedy apologized for the delay but said that he had been held up by other appointments.

Mr. Kennedy said that he had prepared a statement which he would like to announce. He read it to Johnson. Johnson approved it. Kennedy said he would announce it immediately.

Johnson walked over to the television, turned it on, and there was Kennedy announcing that Lyndon Baines Johnson was his choice and had accepted the invitation to share the ticket with him as vice presidential candidate.

As an epilogue to this story there is an anecdote about Lyndon Johnson's mother he has told intimate friends. He remembers her sitting on the edge of his bed one night during the depression, crying her eyes out because her son would never be anything better than a ditch digger.

He had a WPA pick-and-shovel job at the time. He had been in a fight that night and his nose was broken. His mother lamented that her son, with no education, would never amount to anything.

The next morning Lyndon Johnson was on the road, hitchhiking his way to the closest college to enroll. He was on his way — on his way to the White House — though he had no idea then where he was going.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What peace treaty ending a foreign war was signed at Portsmouth, N.H.?

A—Treaty ending the Russo-Japanese War in 1905.

"With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love . . ."

John F. Kennedy—Inaugural Address



Leaders Seek LBJ's Views

By TOM A. CULLEN

Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

LONDON (NEA) — European political leaders are frantically racking their brains for impressions of President Johnson, but the tragic fact is that he is virtually unknown here and on the Continent.

Many Europeans have met Johnson during his extensive travels and have been won by his southern charm, but few take American vice presidents seriously. There is no European equivalent for them, no assistant prime minister of Britain nor vice president of France as Alex Douglas-Home or Charles de Gaulle.

Meanwhile, newspaper files are being combed for facts about Johnson; his speeches are being scrutinized in London, Paris and Bonn, and attitudes are being formed on the basis of available information.

One Briton I talked to described President Johnson as "a dark horse galloping off into the great unknown on a moonless night."

This pessimism is not typical. On a deeper level, however, European confidence in America as the leader of the free world is severely shaken by the Kennedy assassination.

Politically, it could not have happened at a worse time.

Two of America's Atlantic partners — Britain and Germany — have just changed their leaders. Neither Douglas-Home nor Chancellor Ludwig Erhard has had time to play himself into office properly. In Italy, the government is shaky and the left recently has made significant gains. The Common Market is having teething trouble and Europe is far from being united, either politically or economically.

To make matters worse, Britain faces a general election in less than one year, with Douglas-Home leading a Conservative party whose fortunes are waning.

The Tory government built its platform on recognition of the United States as the free world leader. Now that this concept has been dealt a rude blow by Kennedy's death, British voters may turn toward the neutralist policy advocated by the Labor Party.

De Gaulle would appear to be the only political leader this side of the Iron Curtain who stands to gain from the presidential change-over, at least from the short-term viewpoint.

De Gaulle had adopted a patronizing attitude toward Kennedy, treating him as a jumped-up leader who had yet to learn his trade. By inference, De Gaulle regarded America as being too young and too immature to assume free world leadership.

De Gaulle may now claim that he has been justified by events.

In particular, the French president is hoping that Europe will turn to him for advice in the present crisis as it would to a patriarch. He certainly has the seniority to back up his hopes.

The truth, as seen by leveler heads, is that Europe offers no real alternative to American leadership. The Atlantic partners will just have to be patient while President Johnson gets his bearings.

Blind trust in American leadership has evaporated and it may be a long time coming back.

The optimistic ones here hope that Kennedy's death will not result in a long interregnum during which the initiative in world affairs will pass to the Russians.

That, in their opinion, would be the real tragedy.



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

Congressmen Attacked

By WILLIAM S. WHITE

WASHINGTON — A comparatively minor bill now pending in Congress to raise its own pay and that of federal judges and a host of other federal officials to something approaching a rational level has now become far more than an issue of mere dollars and cents.

It has become a test of the will of Congress to resist the most widespread and hysterical attack on the integrity of representative government within the memory of this columnist. Has Congress the courage to use this situation not as an excuse to slink away from combat but rather as an expression of its will to meet its detractors and defamers head-on? This has become the one real question.

The clear necessity is for a counterattack by Congress upon all those forces—ineffectual, and thus disgruntled, members inside, and uninformed sources outside—which are presenting that ancient institution as a very sinkhole of sloth, indifference, obstructionism, influence-peddling and the like.

Obstructionism and so on is charged simply because there is no effective majority in Congress or in the nation for some of the welfare measures upon which — thus inevitably and rightly—there is no Congressional action. Influence-peddling is being charged by innuendo simply because of two or three tasteless but not unlawful incidents, involving at most half a handful of 335 members, which the voters of the Congressional districts concerned can easily take care of by returning other members next time.

There are silly men in Congress, true. Congress makes mistakes, true. But in the present climate one might suppose that a saturnalia of corruption and incompetence existed on Capitol Hill. This blown-up noisiness is monstrously false. Worse,

it is promoting a spirit of witch-hunting which tends to reject the whole idea of representative government. Those who give countenance to this melodramatic nonsense are doing infinite harm, whether they know it or not, to the whole concept of a responsible constitutional society.

And no vehicle for a declaration now of Congress' fortitude and self-respect is so readily available as the pay-raise bill — precisely because it is widely supposed Congress will not have the guts to pass it.

What is proposed is to raise the salaries of members of the

House and Senate and of federal judges from \$22,500 to \$32,500 a year, with equivalent raises for other federal personnel. In plain fact this would be a small enough increase for a Congress which has had precisely four pay increases since 1906 and only one within the last 10 years.

In plain fact present Congressional pay is demonstrably inadequate for all save members with private income. In plain fact men holding the life of the United States in their hands are being rewarded on a scale that would be absurd in any private enterprise involving even remotely comparable responsibilities.

In plain fact so responsible an organization as the conservative American Bar Association — which is rarely accused of eagerness to toss away public money on harebrained schemes—is standing stoutly for both the Congressional and the judicial pay bills as deeply needed steps to improve the quality of public service.

But a most melancholy fact also is that other responsible organizations, holding no less stake in government, are sitting this thing out. What possible logic can move the great corporations and farm and trade and labor associations to remain silent here—not merely on the symbolic issue of the pay raise but on the incomparably bigger issue of defending the constitutional independence of the only truly representative body left in this nation?

There has rightly been much talk in our recent past about the evils of guilt-by-association. But the elected institution of Congress itself is, these days, a constant victim of something even worse. It is guilt-by-innocence based on rumors and gossip so thin, so venomous, so third-handed and even fifth-handed as to sicken and appall those who can see how and why this campaign of slander is being developed.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Wednesday, Nov. 27, the 331st day of 1963 with 34 to follow.

The moon is approaching its full phase. The evening stars are Jupiter, Saturn and Venus. On this day in history: In 1901, the War Department authorized the creation of the Army War College to provide instruction for commissioned officers. In 1945, President Harry Truman named Gen. George C. Marshall as his special representative to China. In 1951, Spanish sources indicated the United States had dropped plans for establishing air bases in Spain because of inadequate communication systems. In 1956 President Eisenhower issued a statement in which he denied that differences over the Suez crisis had weakened the U.S., British and French accord for NATO.

A thought for the day—English writer Rudyard Kipling said: "The silliest woman can manage a clever man; but it needs a very clever woman to manage a fool!"