

# Editorial Page

## Studebaker's Demise

In South Bend, Ind., the community is faced with a crisis due to the announcement by the Studebaker Co., that it will close its plant there within a matter of a week or so. Reason given: The company has lost \$40 million "in trying to keep the South Bend plant open."

But the concern makes further announcement that it will move to Hamilton, Ont. and continue manufacturing automobiles.

At first, South Benders were shocked at the announcement. It meant 7,000 workers in the Studebaker plant will be forced to find employment elsewhere — and at a very bad time, just before Christmas.

Business leaders in the famed Indiana city then braced and have taken the attitude that South Bend was in existence before Studebaker came on the scene; that South Bend is a good industrial town and that somehow, some way, the community will go on. They have taken a positive attitude toward the economic setback rather than a negative view.

At first blush you would get the impression that Studebaker's demise in South Bend would take with it most of the job opportunities in that city. But apparently only about three per cent of the employable people will be affected. Three per cent is big percentage when you are talking about jobs but a strenuous campaign by the industrial

development arm of the South Bend Chamber of Commerce should, in due time, pick up that slack. Naturally it will take a lot of cooperation on the part of the city council and other civic units.

Studebaker says it will capitalize on the eight per cent dollar differential which now exists. And the chairman of the board thinks that there is better opportunity of cutting costs in Hamilton. Probably from the standpoint of labor. On the other hand how can Studebaker, or other companies which are manufacturing products abroad, continue to flood the United States market with items which are produced much more cheaply than they are here? You'd expect the person who makes the world's top wages would insist on "buying American."

We hate to see a concern like Studebaker, which has been an important company in the nation for more than 100 years, leave the United States. For most of this period, Studebaker was a healthy, prosperous company. Why, suddenly — as opposed to other automobile manufacturing companies — has Studebaker fallen on such evil times? It must either be poor management, or because it has manufactured a product that hasn't been acceptable. It's hard to believe that the company will "get well" in Canada because it will be paying its employees less wages or because it will get the benefit of the Canadian-American exchange.

## Ask Tax Increase

A rather curious little item comes from North Dakota. There rural telephone cooperatives propose a change in the tax system affecting them, which would result in an increase in their tax payments.

The proposal has been made to a legislative subcommittee which has taken it under advisement. According to a co-op spokesman, "We offer this proposal as one our member organizations could tolerate without jeopardizing their operations to the point of requiring increased rates to their customers."

The proposal, it would seem, has merit — as would any move which would do away with the very substantial tax and financing advantages, which are forms of special privilege, these and other utility co-ops now enjoy. But there is still another element that deserves some notice.

According to the news accounts, a search has been going on for two years for a tax system which would place co-ops on the same tax basis as private utilities without excessively burdening them. This kind of consideration, needless to say, is not given to private utilities or any other private enterprise. Private enterprise and its customers must pay taxes in rates charged under the general existing system — and make or break in the process.

So far as telephone or electric co-ops are concerned, everywhere in the country, the fair and reasonable step would be to place them on the same tax basis, and financing basis, applied to private utilities of a comparable nature. They certainly should not be penalized. They shouldn't be favored, either.



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

## Speaker's Power Rises

By WILLIAM S. WHITE  
WASHINGTON — President Johnson's action to bring the next man in line for the Presidency, Rep. John W. McCormack of Massachusetts, into the highly secret National Security Council puts a Speaker of the House for the first time into the most intimate war-and-peace deliberations of this government.

It will do a great deal more, however, than this. It will enormously increase Speaker McCormack's real power base outside Congress, and most notably within it. There, a quietly gathering "revolt" by a handful of ultra-liberal Democrats against McCormack's authority had been signalled several weeks ago by some of those directly involved.

This whispered coming palace revolution — or, more exactly, this potential patch of good intentions and disorderly implications for responsible operation of the House — may now be said to be doubly dead before it started. Its chances had in any event been thin in the extreme, since a very considerable number of those counted upon to be eager to "go out against John" were in fact always loyal to his elected leadership and meant to remain so.

In human truth as well as in law he is the next man to the President of the United States. That official who is truly next to the President — this or any other President — is not lightly rebelled against. Even less is he successfully rebelled against.

All this aborted and minor cloak-and-dagger stuff is only accidental and incidental, however, to the true meaning of Speaker McCormack's elevation into a second hierarchy, that of the executive branch. The genuine and lasting significance of what has been done is this: The United States has made certain before history that there cannot again be such a situation as occurred when Franklin Roosevelt died in 1945 and left his successor without any real knowledge of what had been going on in the White House.

Of course, there was then an elected and sitting vice president, Harry S. Truman. But Mr. Truman had to assume the Presidency at a moment's notice in almost total ignorance of what his late chief had been doing and thinking and planning and promising. Because he had not been taken into Mr. Roosevelt's confidence — perhaps because of the cruel pressures of a two-front war — Harry Truman had not even been aware that something called an atomic bomb had been made.

that he had no vice president at his side and that as matters then stood, the presidency would pass to a non-elected official, the Secretary of State, should he himself suddenly become incapacitated.

Congress responded with a bill to make the Speaker of the House the next in line of succession for the presidency in such circumstances. Today, Mr. Johnson, too, has no vice president. Today, Speaker McCormack is by law his appointed successor, should tragedy strike. Thus, one of the first acts of the new President is to make sure not simply that he has a successor qualified by law but a successor qualified also to act, not simply after toning up on the facts but in concurrent possession of the facts all along.

As it happens, too, the close association is not only a clearly necessary one, in the highest of national interest, but also a happy and relaxed one. Speaker McCormack and the President have been for nearly two decades — a time going back to Mr. Johnson's service in the House — on a "John and Lyndon" basis.

The Speaker, moreover, though an early backer of the late John F. Kennedy for the 1960 Presidential nomination, was an equally early backer of Lyndon B. Johnson for vice president. McCormack was one of the few who believed from the beginning — rightly, as it turned out — that Mr. Johnson would accept second place if this became necessary to promote Democratic fortunes.

# Mrs. Kennedy Offers 1964 Election Aid

By BRUCE BLOSSAT  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.  
NEW YORK (NEA) — Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has told President Lyndon B. Johnson she would be happy to play any political role he might ask of her in the 1964 presidential campaign.

A source high in Democratic circles says the late John F. Kennedy's widow made this offer to the President in his office, on the occasion of her "last look" at the Oval Room where her husband had worked for nearly three years.

Mrs. Kennedy is said to have told Johnson she never before had been really closely involved in politics nor experienced in it, but that she would "do anything" the President might think helpful.

The impact of any measurable participation by her in the 1964 campaign could be immense, in the view of political observers. Remarks one: "Can you imagine the effect

of having Jacqueline Kennedy go on television and even just introduce Lyndon Johnson?" Mrs. Kennedy would stand as the living reminder of the dead President, the focus of whatever sympathy for him might still be at work in voters' minds as election time neared. And she would have great stature in her own right for the example of courage and dignity she exhibited in the ordeal of her husband's death.

If taken up, her offer to Johnson would represent for her an ordeal of another sort. The former First Lady, as she told the President, has done little in politics up to now.

Until the fateful trip to Texas, which she happily entered upon in a manner thought to foreshadow heavier political activity with her husband in 1964, she had not made a purely political journey since late October, 1960.

Her final venture in that campaign was on the day Ken-

edy rode up Broadway from Wall Street to midtown New York. She left the cavalcade at lunchtime. She was then expecting her second child, and doctors had advised her against further public appearances.

Beyond this, however, reporters who had observed Mrs. Kennedy on the campaign trail in 1960 — and earlier in Massachusetts — found her basically shy.

This reporter recalls a small incident in the bitter cold of the Wisconsin primary of 1960. The late President and his wife came to a tiny movie theater for a morning rally. Kennedy mounted the stage but Mrs. Kennedy sat down in a shadowy corner in the first row of seats.

He motioned to her to come up. "Can't I stay here?" she pleaded. He shook his head and beckoned again. She went up and sat beside him.

Though she repeatedly braved the harsh weather and

other hazards of the early 1960 struggles, Jacqueline Kennedy seldom if ever stayed on the road more than three days at a time.

She told this reporter in a 1960 interview that her reasons were two: she did not want to be away from her daughter, Caroline, any longer than that, and she found her energy running low.

Even to keep her energy at working levels for three days, she often quietly slipped a way after lunch on a crowded campaign day and went on to the evening stop — where she rested a while before dinner and reception.

She had no wish ever to speak on her trips with her husband, but a few times she did.

Once in Wisconsin in early March, he was called back to Washington to act on important legislation. Mrs. Kennedy filled in for him all the next day, making simple direct ap-

peals to voters in town after town. Later, pressed into a brief television appearance on the road in West Virginia, she heard a station manager compliment her performance. Mindful of her "breathless" voice which seldom projects easily, she replied: "You caught me on one of my good days."

The swirling confusion of politics seemed often to puzzle, if not upset her. Giving this reporter her impression of a national political convention, she remarked the general chaos and added: "All those men not going to bed for five days, and shouting and stomping around."

Against the background of such recollections, Jacqueline Kennedy's offer of political assistance to President Johnson stands out as a striking new departure. It may well be read as impressive fresh evidence of her devotion to the causes John F. Kennedy espoused.

## One That Wasn't On The Map



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

## Politics Rule Choice For Federal Judge

By FULTON LEWIS JR.  
WASHINGTON — By the middle 1950s a logjam of litigation threatened to paralyze the federal courts.

With annual regularity, beginning in 1954, President Eisenhower would ask Congress to create new judgeships, citing the heavy work load and the ever-increasing backlog of cases on the docket.

Just as annually, the Democratic leaders of Congress would reject like requests. They did not wish the President to have new tools of patronage.

Attorney General William Rogers went so far as to assure Democrats that Eisenhower would "fill the new posts on a 50-50 basis from the two political parties."

The Democrats' answer: no. Their reason was simple, as one correspondent wrote: "With all bells riding on the outcome of the 1960 election, the Democrats rejected a half-load in hopes of winning the whole loaf."

The gamble paid off. A Democratic President pushed through a Democratic Congress a bill creating 72 new judgeships. With 42 other vacancies caused by death or retirement, the President had a patronage lever unprecedented in judicial history.

Of the President's first 80 appointees, 79 were Democrats. The other was a member of New York's Liberal Party, which supported John Kennedy for President. Of those 80 appointees, seven were found unqualified by the American Bar Association.

Now controversy swirls about two men named to the bench by President Kennedy a few months before his death. They are David Rabinowitz, named federal district judge for western Wisconsin, and George Clinton Edwards Jr., appointed to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in Detroit.

Rabinowitz is an old colleague of Walter Reuther's. As far back as 1934, he was defending strikers at Kohler, Wis. Two decades later, he was still on the union payroll as the lawyer for United Auto Worker pickets arrested in the violent strike against the Kohler Company.

Rabinowitz first caught John Kennedy's eye during hearings of the Senate Labor Rackets Committee. Rabinowitz was a UAW counsel, representing labor statesmen subpoenaed for testimony.

The liberal Capital Times, Madison's chief paper, called Rabinowitz' appointment "almost unbelievable." The American Bar Association said Rabinowitz was "unqualified" to serve on the federal bench. A solid majority of Wisconsin attorneys, polled by the State Bar Association, urged Rabinowitz' rejection by the Senate.

In the same week that President Kennedy named Rabinowitz to the bench he also appointed Edwards, another former UAW leader.

Edwards' legal experience dates back to February, 1935, when he was thrown in jail in Fort Smith, Ark., on a charge of barratry (habitual lawsuits). A self-styled class warrior, Edwards had visited Fort Smith to help "downtrodden sharecroppers."

Out of jail, Edwards became the first national chairman of the American Student Union, a group later declared by a Congressional committee to be a Communist front. In that post he helped plan a nationwide strike "against war" and urged students to refuse to serve in the armed forces.

Soon after, Edwards became an organizer for the UAW, during which the bloody Yale and Towne strike occurred when strikers threw lead weights and tear gas bombs at the police. He ignored a court order to call off the strike, staged a sitdown in the company plant, and won a 30-day jail sentence for his efforts. Behind bars, he tried to organize fellow inmates in a UAW local, confident he could win them a 40-hour week and vacations with pay.

Leaving prison, Edwards rose quickly in the UAW hierarchy to become welfare director, then went into politics. In a phenomenally successful career, he was elected Detroit city councilman, president of the city council, probate judge, circuit judge and Michigan Supreme Court judge.

Only in 1949, when he sought the Detroit mayoralty, did Edwards meet defeat. In that election, a former UAW vice president, Richard Frankenstein, helped torpedo his old colleague. "I worked with Edwards when he first came to Detroit and believe me when I say he came here to organize the Socialist Party."

Both Edwards and Rabinowitz must win Senate confirmation before their appointments are official.

## Politics In State Of Flux

By DORIS FLEESON  
WASHINGTON — Behind the scenes the professional politicians are feverishly attempting to adjust to changed conditions and a new President.

Lyndon Johnson differs from John F. Kennedy in background, temperament, style and spirit. He shares some Kennedy virtues and professes the Kennedy aims.

But his faults are entirely different, and this is where the politicians must change pace, both Democrats and Republicans. Democrats have a new product to sell and to defend. Republicans will run against a fresh set of faults.

The 30-day period of mourning, added to the near approach of the Christmas holidays, cloaks much of the current discussion. Still it is starting to break through, and it can be expected to erupt when Congress convenes in early January.

For example, there is the cautiously worded statement which the House Republican policy committee released. It said that we should not lose sight of why we mourn, but adds:

"Neither should we permit the tragic event . . . to be used

as a device to cloud the future of honest debate and dissent. Efforts to make Americans feel generally guilty of the crime now are obscuring the nature of the crime.

"There is guilt, but it is not American guilt. It is the guilt of the murderer. If it was hatred that moved the assassin, that hatred was bred by the teachings of communism."

Thus the verdict of the Warren commission is anticipated and a backfire set against the present trend toward self-examination. It is not yet the Republican party line, of course, but it is the beginning of a debate which will not long be carried on privately.

Most sharply frustrated are the draft-Goldwater forces. The Senator's personal grief was sharply etched on his face as he moved slowly past the Kennedy bier in the Capitol Rotunda. For the first time, at 51, he did not seem to be quite a contemporary of the President slain at 48.

The Goldwater drive now confronts a President one year the Senator's senior and widely accepted as a moderate conservative. The President is a Southerner, and while he has had

troubles in his own Texas, the fact is bound to affect the voters in the territory marked out as Goldwater's own next year.

Even more discouraging to Goldwater admirers is the fact that not one of them is able to say that the Senator promised him categorically that he would run for President. They were assuming that the enthusiasm of his crowds would create enough momentum to sweep him into the race.

They are less sure now. A few are saying that they believe his promised January announcement will make him a candidate for reelection to the Senate.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller makes no secret of his own belief that his chances are strengthened. He is trying hard to wrap up his New York state legislative message and budget so that by mid-January he can spend much time campaigning in the New Hampshire primary.

Some New Hampshire political veterans are not convinced Rockefeller will be helped there. They recall that a well-organized write-in vote served Richard M. Nixon well in the state in 1956. They expect it to appear again this spring.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON

## Farm Bill Outlook Poor

By PETER EDSON  
Washington Correspondent  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — There is still hope that some new farm legislation may make a little progress in the final days of this session of Congress — but it's very faint. Of a score or more major farm bills, only three or four are given any chance.

Wheat legislation is given no chance at all, in spite of pressure from farm organizations and wheat state congressmen, particularly the Republicans.

The dairy bill introduced by Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., passed the Senate but no House action is scheduled.

Department of Agriculture would like action to extend the Kennedy administration conservation reserve program beyond 1964, but prospects are doubtful.

If not extended, all the acreage in the Eisenhower administration soil bank reserve could be brought back into production next year.

With nearly 10 years of new farm technology available since the soil bank bill was passed, there is considerable fear over what will happen.

Production of most major crops might soar, leading to still larger surpluses and necessitating huge increases in government farm program costs for

support prices and storage.

A major effort is being made to enlist President Lyndon Johnson's support for pending bills. Farm organizations and lobbyists vie with each other in proclaiming that the new president from Texas is indeed the farmers' best friend.

This has succeeded to a limited degree on a bill to make the Kennedy food stamp pilot plan program a permanent government operation and to get action on a new cotton bill.

Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman declared in a Thanksgiving letter to 50 state governors that President Johnson had asked for a "redoubled" effort to insure that United States food abundance is "fully" available to all who need it. This would include food stamp, school lunch and Food for Peace plans.

On cotton legislation, the late President Kennedy over a year ago advocated congressional consideration of ending the two-price system for domestic and export cotton sales, in effect since 1957.

A bill to make this change, introduced by House Agriculture Committee Chairman Harold D. Cooley, D-N.C., is supported by the American Cotton Council, Textile Manufacturers Institute and other trade organizations.

The Cooley bill would substitute a "payment in kind" of surplus cotton to persons other than producers so as to eliminate the cost differential now paid by foreign and domestic mills.

It would in effect reduce the price of cotton and cause major readjustments in the cotton industry. But its spokesmen insist this is necessary because the two-price system — which they originally supported — hasn't worked.

Speaker John W. McCormack got President Johnson's approval for the House to take up the Cooley bill Dec. 2, so that it could be brought before the Senate this year.

Passage or defeat of this bill is not considered a first test of President Johnson's influence with Congress. It was foreseen

that the House vote would be close.

Cotton Council and Textile Institute spokesmen concede that there is little chance the Senate will pass the Cooley bill this year. Senate Agriculture Committee Chairman Allen Ellender, D-La., opposes it on the grounds that it would cost the government more money than existing cotton programs.

There is more Senate support for a bill introduced by Sen. Herman Talmadge, D-Ga. It would provide a direct subsidy payment to cotton producers, like the old Brannan plan.

In the meantime, it is generally expected that cotton producers voting in referendum will approve continuance of support price payments with acreage production controls under existing legislation.

For cotton farmers to reject this plan would be a far greater upset than when wheat farmers rejected controls in last May's referendum.

## Almanac

By United Press International  
Today is Thursday, Dec. 12, the 346th day of 1963 with 19 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last phase.

The evening stars are Jupiter, Saturn and Venus.

On this day in history: In 1920, Edward D. White of Louisiana became chief justice of the United States.

In 1947, John L. Lewis withdrew his United Mine Workers Union from the American Federation of Labor for the second time.

In 1953, Maj. Charles Yeager flew a research jet plane more than two-and-one-half times the speed of sound.

In 1959, the Paraguayan government announced an invasion by 1,000 rebel exiles based in Argentina had been crushed.

A thought for the day — American theologian Jonathan Edwards said: "I assert that nothing ever comes to pass without a cause."