

"... Down Boy ...!"

Editorial Page

Matter Of Ethics

When Negro-white racial differences were looked into recently by a committee of first-rank scientists representing the American Association for the Advancement of Science, it was found there is confusion between moral and scientific judgments on the question.

A number of critics of major U.S. Supreme Court decisions aimed at assuring equality for Negroes have argued that the rulings are wrong "scientifically." The complaint is, in other words, that Negroes are inferior and thus not entitled to equality.

Though the scientific committee here involved is not composed of specialists in the moral code, the scientists nevertheless dare to argue that the assurances of equality in the U.S. Constitution are founded not on scientific judgments but ethical ones.

They find no single word in the Constitution, its amendments, or any of the most relevant Supreme Court decisions, which suggests that scientific data about the nature of the races underlies the determination that equality must prevail.

The celebrated 14th amendment just states baldly that no state shall deprive anybody of the equal protection of the laws. The 15th declares that the right to vote shall not

be denied to anyone on account of race, color or "previous condition of servitude."

Not only these particular scientists, but legions of judges, lawyers and legal scholars long have accepted these amendments as asserting a principle of equal treatment without qualification. The legal specialists would agree with the scientists that there is no supporting scientific justification.

The scholars have pointed out that even in the Supreme Court decision of 1896 which set forth the doctrine of "separate but equal facilities" for Negroes, the notion of equality was accepted. It was simply a matter of how to provide it.

What the AAAS committee of scientists is suggesting, then, is that reports, documents, studies which purport to prove Negro inferiority on a "scientific" basis are wholly beside the point in the current racial struggle.

From this it would seem to follow that those in this country who wish in one way or another to limit the role of Negroes in American life must overturn the ethical judgments embodying the equality principle and embedded in the Constitution.

For it is upon these judgments that the Supreme Court relies today in its decisions in this controversial field.



WASHINGTON REPORT

Student Association Suffers Big Defeat

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON — Leaders of the controversial National Student Association have suffered their most humiliating defeat to date.

The group, which purports to speak for several million U.S. college students, has been under conservative fire for several years. Major schools — including the universities of Nebraska, Texas, Iowa, Oklahoma, and Indiana — have turned thumbs down on NSA, charging it with leftist bias.

Now NSA's charter member, Ohio's Antioch College, has withdrawn. That Antioch, a school with a much-deserved reputation for campus radicalism, should pull out is all the more significant. A curious coalition of liberals and conservatives argued at Antioch that NSA was "undemocratic," and the student council's vote was unanimous to get out.

The Antioch vote followed similar tallies on other campuses this fall. The University of Delaware student senate voted down NSA early in October. The school's paper said the vote was a repudiation of "the constant leftist political views, which NSA holds to be those of the American college student, and of the small minority of 'professional students' who fill executive positions."

On Oct. 4, the University of Florida at Gainesville held a campus-wide vote on NSA affiliation. Students voted "no," 3,088 to 493, and the university's paper headlined the news story: "Students Smash NSA Affiliation."

On Oct. 18, the Vanderbilt University student senate voted 240 to quit NSA. Student Sen. Bob Brant said the NSA had ignored "its watchword of academic freedom and democratic processes."

Similar votes were recorded this fall at Iowa State University, Indiana's Ball State University, and the University of Wisconsin. On virtually every campus where NSA is rejected the fight is by members of the Young Americans for Freedom and the College Young Republicans.

They have pointed to NSA resolutions which include: —Defense of Japanese student rioting against former President Eisenhower. —Praise for Fidel Castro's educational "reforms" — and earlier condemnation of the Batista Government for suppression of "academic freedom."

—Recommendation that the House Un-American Activities Committee be abolished. —Opposition to loyalty oaths

for students receiving federal loans.

—Criticism of U.S. aid to such anti-Communist allies as Spain and Portugal.

—Calls for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act.

—Protests against the firing of Communist teachers.

—Denunciation of U.S. measures to achieve nuclear superiority.

Bolivia's chief executive, a power-hungry tyrant named Victor Paz Estenssoro, showed up in Washington earlier this month on an official state visit. He reportedly made a plea for increased U.S. assistance.

All of which prompted Sen. Barry Goldwater to note that Bolivia had received \$262 million in U.S. aid by June, 1962, a per capita figure that is higher than that of any other Latin nation.

He said: "What I have learned so far leads me to conclude that aid to Bolivia should be withdrawn. It is an example of the very wrong way, not the right way, for Latin America. It exists not by its own virtues, but only by U.S. support. It is no proved friend of freedom but a parasite upon it."

Goldwater's view is buttressed by the finding of Latin American expert Prof. William Stokes: "President Paz Estenssoro and his advisers evinced from the very beginning a passionate intolerance of the opposition. They arrested a former minister of economic affairs, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, leaders of the major political parties, and many other prominent, even distinguished, figures."

"Secret police, organized under a bureau known as Political Control, ferreted out the opposition, using unconstitutional methods that rivaled in ferocity those employed by the Nazi and Communist tyrannies."

"The jails were literally filled with thousands of political prisoners and President Paz Estenssoro's words created concentration or 'work camps' to accommodate the overflow."

THEY SAY...

There must be a day of repentance for the wrongs the Negro in America has been subjected to... and a firm resolve, by all branches of the government, and by the people, that the long suffering of the Negro shall not have been in vain.

—U.S. Appeals Judge J. Skelly Wright.

Goldwater Cause Damaged

Editor's Note: NEA's roving political correspondent Bruce Blossat here reports the results of a broad survey of political sources concerning the effects of President Kennedy's death upon the 1964 election campaigns of both parties. Blossat writes from the viewpoint of a reporter who has traveled from his home base in Washington to most of the states during his political swings of recent years.

By BRUCE BLOSSAT

WASHINGTON (NEA) — President Lyndon B. Johnson is the almost certain Democratic standard bearer for 1964, but his likely presence on the ticket may dampen chances that front-running Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona will be the Republican choice.

The new President will have going for him all the advantages accruing to an incumbent, plus perhaps additional factors.

Working against Goldwater is the fact that his entire strategy is based on a near sweep of the South. With the assassination of John F. Kennedy that strategy has lost its prime stimulus. The great target of segregationist southerners is gone.

Here are the evident prospects for Johnson at this moment:

To do otherwise than nominate him as the incumbent would be for the Democrats to accept serious rebuke of their White House stewardship.

Few think this likely even though Johnson admittedly is far less suitable than Kennedy was to the northern liberal-city-labor taste. Yet for the liberals to suggest dumping Johnson would open them to severe charges of party irregularity.

A better bet is that they will try to influence him through party platforms and other pressures.

Moreover, Johnson himself, presumably with 1963 in mind, had been steadily trying to alter his earlier southern-western image and build a new one as a more broadly national figure.

When he was making ready for his 1963 trip to Scandinavia, an aide privately told a Washington observer:

"Better come along, or you'll miss the boat for 1964."

The inference was plain that Johnson's foreign forays as vice president were viewed by him as part of the new image-building process.

In the next 11 months Johnson will also enjoy something of a "honeymoon" period such as all new incumbents generally are accorded. If his performance in this span is even moderately good, it could strengthen him not only within his party but also in the nation.

One Washington veteran makes another point. Kennedy is the first president to be assassinated close to an election year. To the extent he might become a martyr in some voters' eyes, a strong sympathy vote conceivably could benefit Johnson.

A Southern Republican was skeptical. While acknowledging the chance of a "sympathy" wave, he questioned whether it would transfer to Johnson or anybody else.

Finally, Johnson as Senate majority leader was a master maneuverer in the U.S. Senate, with strong connections in the House. It is assumed he will try hard, by methods sharply different from the late John Kennedy's, to push important bills to passage in the months ahead.

But the real rub is what he will do on civil rights. A southerner widely known for his careful judgments thinks this is where Johnson will truly be measured.

"If he goes for Kennedy's civil rights bill with its public accommodations feature, he will alienate the south even more than he has already," this man says.

Johnson as vice president supported the Kennedy bill, and has taken other civil rights positions disapproved by southerners. Yet in the south, the southern source added, Johnson as a Texan—thought of also as more conservative than his predecessor — might still have some edge over Kennedy as a nominee.

Even at best, it is widely agreed, Johnson would not be the man to beat that Kennedy was says one politician: "There just wasn't anybody tougher than Kennedy."

This was an acknowledgment of the late President's admitted "star quality" which made many voters favor him on the basis of personality alone.

Johnson's plain-spoken drawing "old shoe" style is not figured to have such impact.

On this basis and his expected less effective northern appeal, politicians generally are upgrading Republican presidential chances for 1964.

But it is felt that, barring too sweeping a Johnson commitment on public accommodations in civil rights, the Goldwater candidacy is not advantaged. Supporters of the senator here and in the South concede this.

Recent sampling among southern Republican leaders showed they had little taste for another try by the 1960 GOP nominee, Richard M. Nixon, now a New Yorker.

But even he is being upgraded in some minds. Still, one southern man registered this reservation:

To the extent there is in 1964 a strong "Kennedy" sympathy vote for Democrats, Nixon might only sharpen it. "Every time the voters look at him, they may think of Kennedy."

Alternatives to Nixon as a moderate choice are no clearer than before, though a feeling exists that the changed pic-

ture may embolden northern big-state GOP leaders who do not want Goldwater.

In St. Louis, almost at the time of the tragedy in Dallas, Michigan's Gov. George Romney took issue with Goldwater's outlook on civil rights, "right to work" laws and other matters.

Almost nobody thinks New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, avowed candidate tagged as the most liberal and hand-capped by divorce and remarriage, is better off now. One Washington man was an exception: "Nothing is out of the window right now."

This same source disagrees with the majority which figures GOP prospects automatically bettered by the turn of events. Says he: "I don't know if the Republican nomination has become more valuable. With all the factors accruing to a new incumbent, I think that's debatable."

Even Kennedy was given a chance by many observers to bite into the South next year and take perhaps Georgia, Texas, North Carolina and Louisiana.

With Johnson as nominee, it is considered possible that South Carolina, Tennessee and maybe one or two other southern states might also go Democratic. This would leave very little for Goldwater beyond Florida and Virginia, which have gone Republican in presidential tests ever since 1952.

Totally unanswered at this stage is what 1968 may bring. Here Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, the late President's politically sharp brother, must be considered. Nothing is known today of his intentions, nor have his prospects been soberly appraised.

But strong feeling exists among politicians that he may soon go down the road toward high elective office. It is accepted he could be a powerful attraction as the young inheritor of all that John F. Kennedy stood for.

for President Kennedy, to buck up South Asia, and to get firsthand knowledge of the Philippines, Formosa, Hong Kong.

In Saigon he signed a new aid and training agreement with Vietnam. In Thailand he gave assurances against threatened Communist attacks from the north. In India he spent two days with Nehru, reviewing foreign aid programs.

Johnson returned from Pakistan recommending more aid for that country and he advanced by four months President Ayub Khan's visit to America as an ally worth cultivating.

This year Johnson has visited the Scandinavian countries and delivered important trade policy statements to European Common Market ministers in Amsterdam and Brussels.

The important point is not that President Johnson already knows and has visited many of the world's leading statesmen — excluding only the Russians — but that he has been in on the planning of many current American foreign policies.

He has been a member of both the National Security Council of seven cabinet members and the NSC Executive Committee of 12 active, working technicians on the White House, State, Defense and Central Intelligence Agency staffs.

In this position the man who has now assumed the presidency has developed close relations with Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, CIA Director John McConroe and White House Aide McGeorge Bundy. He has found them all to be brilliant men, "able to use their heads for something more than hatches."

Changes in staff are of course inevitable in time. Some of the more controversial aides around the White House will probably be leaving soon, to no one's dismay but theirs.

But President Johnson does not have to build up a brand new administration, starting from scratch, to carry on his foreign policies. It is a continuing operation.

This is perhaps the best assurance there is for allied foreign offices, where there has been some concern that there might be a complete change in U.S. policies.

EDSON IN WASHINGTON

Johnson No Novice About Foreign Aid



By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—"I've always been a booster for Lyndon Johnson," the new President of the United States said some months after he became vice president. "But I admire the way the young senator I put on the Foreign Relations Committee a few years ago is running the White House."

"I want to see the job of president run the way I'd do it, and President Kennedy has done that."

This revealing little story is recalled now as an indication of two things: The Kennedy foreign policies will probably be continued without interruption. And the new President has plenty of self-confidence to carry on the job.

Critics overlook a number of important points in maintaining that while Lyndon Johnson has plenty of savvy about American politics, he may lack international political experience.

Johnson was given many important foreign policy assignments as second man in the Kennedy administration.

They have not been just good will missions like his attendance of Senegal's first anniversary of independence. Nor have they been ceremonial like his presence at the inauguration of Dominican Republic's ex-President Juan Bosch.

President Johnson has not had extensive experience in Latin America. But he was President Kennedy's consultant with President Truman during the Cuba crisis. And Johnson has had close association with Mexico's presidents in years past.

In Europe during his first year in the vice presidency, Lyndon Johnson was sent to a nuclear test ban conference in Geneva. At a NATO meeting in Supreme headquarters near Paris, Johnson spoke for the United States in support of "a true Atlantic community with common institutions."

Five months later Johnson went back to Europe as spokesman for a 1,500-man reinforcement for Berlin. Mayor Willy Brandt declared that Johnson's visit "erased any doubts among the people over United States support for the city."

Johnson conferred with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and his minister in Bonn during this mission. When he came to America shortly thereafter for his first official visit with President Kennedy, Adenauer went to Austin for a speech and spent two days on the L.B.J. ranch.

In May of 1961, Johnson went on a round-the-world mission

IN WASHINGTON

AEC Planning Empire?



By RALPH de TOLEDANO

It is ironic, but not surprising, to see big-government advocates suddenly switch to free enterprise when their political oxes are being gored by the Federal Establishment. But those who wish to preserve America's private economy should give thanks for all favors.

It is certainly proper to say "amen" when Sen. Jennings Randolph (D-W. Va.) takes to his feet on the Senate floor to raise Cain about the Atomic Energy Commission's determination to build up a subsidized and controlled nuclear power industry.

It is the job of the AEC to build experimental reactors and nuclear generating plants, to advance what the scientists call the "state of the art," and to keep the United States in the forefront of all developments in the peaceful and military uses of atomic energy. It is something else again when the AEC, in effect, goes into business for itself.

Senator Randolph has cause for concern. He comes from a coal mining state suffering from chronic unemployment. So he must jolly well forget his allegiance to New Frontier principles and protest the "all out effort of the AEC to bring into being a lusty and thriving nuclear power industry that will compete with coal and other fossil fuels, regardless of the cost to the taxpayers and the economic dislocation and unemployment in adversely affected regions of the country."

(It would be better if he impressed those views on some of his colleagues who believe that if Uncle Sam does it and pays for it, then it is automatically right and virtuous.)

No one can argue that the AEC was created to supplant present methods of generating electric power or to "assure the construction" of large-scale and non-experimental plants "to demonstrate their effectiveness," as Chairman Glenn Seaborg of the AEC informs us.

"That," says Senator Randolph, "is government going too far—and too fast—to build one industry and tear down other long established ones."

To prevent this, Mr. Randolph is urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to prohibit the use of government funds for any civilian nuclear power program which goes beyond the strictly experimental.

"Why should the government continue to subsidize utilities for a reactor installation or for the supply of generating materials?" Senator Randolph asks. "Let the nuclear-minded utilities finance their own capital expansions and fuel requirements, as do utilities using conventional fuels in their generating processes."

This is a healthy reaction to

a trend which sees the Federal government taking over more and more of the economy — either directly or through systems of control. There is no reason why the bureaucrats should be using tax money to create commercial enterprises.

It would be an even healthier reaction if the attitude were more consistent. In the House and Senate, there are always critics of government expansion and spending. But usually they disappear when the Federal dollar is riding in the direction of their states or congressional districts.

Somewhat, it has failed to penetrate the legislative mind that it takes two to tango — that if one appropriation is passed favoring District X, then the rest of the Congress will expect the representatives who benefited to go along by supporting the other fellow's turn at the public trough.

If nuclear power can be produced competitively, then the utility companies should be

permitted to enter the field—to the benefit of the consumer. If it is not competitive, then the Federal government should not grant subsidies. The important point, however, is that whatever the means of generating power may be, the control of it should not be in the hands of the government.

The Atomic Energy Commission costs the taxpayer billions of dollars. Because of the nature of the enterprise and the need for security, it is essential at this time that all experimentation and development remain in government hands. But that's all.

If nuclear power plants were being set up today on a private basis, the taxpayer would be the beneficiary of more and eventually cheaper power, and (2) he would profit from the increased taxes going to the government from these operations. This is something neither the AEC nor the "public power" lobby ever bothers to take into account.

On Oct. 18, the Vanderbilt University student senate voted 240 to quit NSA. Student Sen. Bob Brant said the NSA had ignored "its watchword of academic freedom and democratic processes."

Similar votes were recorded this fall at Iowa State University, Indiana's Ball State University, and the University of Wisconsin. On virtually every campus where NSA is rejected the fight is by members of the Young Americans for Freedom and the College Young Republicans.

They have pointed to NSA resolutions which include: —Defense of Japanese student rioting against former President Eisenhower. —Praise for Fidel Castro's educational "reforms" — and earlier condemnation of the Batista Government for suppression of "academic freedom."

—Recommendation that the House Un-American Activities Committee be abolished. —Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths

—Opposition to loyalty oaths



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Purely Personal Prejudices: There is one intangible way of telling the difference between the righteous and the merely self-righteous people—to the self-righteous, no punishment of the unrighteous seems excessive or too severe.

We judge people more by their temperament than by their character; thus, we prefer the weak and amiable to the strong and crusty, for the former do not threaten our pretensions or puncture our poses.

It is much easier to accept bad fortune philosophically than to refrain from ascribing our success to our virtues instead of to luck.

Feelings can be communicated, but ideas cannot: this is why it is simple to arouse a crowd to an act of irrational violence, but nearly impossible to persuade even one man to change his basic views.

To be caught between two worlds is the tragedy of some lives; as the elderly woman wistfully remarked in one of Lillian Hellman's plays: "I was always too good, for the men who wanted me, and not good enough for the men I wanted."

A happy person is one who is not inclined to ask himself questions that are beyond his power to answer; that is why most creativity, most inventions, most advances are made by unhappy persons.

The lower orders who fail to teach their children manners don't do as much harm as the higher orders who are satisfied if their children display good manners without any substance of good feeling beneath them: a surface courtesy that masks sullenness and unresponsiveness can do more damage to the later personality than mere neglect of the amenities.

It is a grave fallacy to believe that looking into a mirror discloses how we appear to others; the mirror reflects only what we want to see, or fear to see, or think we see; it never reflects what is so swiftly and unerringly detected by even the most casual stranger: the ultimate expression of the soul, as formed and deformed by the passing years.

Nothing, in a way, can be more narrowing than travel: when we are in a strange land, the presence of someone from our own neighborhood impels us to draw close to him, even though at home we would not want to be in his company more than a moment.

If people knew what the true "self" really was, then to be truly selfish would be the greatest of virtues, for it would mean doing only those things which augmented and beautified the true self, rather than those things which diminish and demean it.

"If I'm Not Too Curious — What's Holding You Up?"



Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Sunday, Dec. 1, the 333rd day of 1963 with 30 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The evening stars are Jupiter, Saturn, and Venus.

On this day in history: In 1917, Father Edward Flanagan founded Boys Town in Nebraska for orphans or otherwise homeless boys.

In 1923, Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium and Germany signed the Locarno Pact to outlaw willful aggression anywhere in Europe.

In 1963, the New York Stock Exchange announced for the first time in history investors could buy stocks on an installment plan.

In 1950, fire swept through the Chicago Roman Catholic Parochial School of Our Lady of the Angels—killing 80 children and three nuns and injuring 100.

A thought for the day — The English writer Samuel Johnson said "Gratitude is a fruit of great cultivation."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What type of paper is used in the making of cigarettes?
A—A linen flax paper.

Q—Is the onion high in vitamins?
A—No.