

## Concern for Freedom Responsibility of All

Most Americans pride themselves, and rightly so, on being a free people. Freedom, we tell ourselves, is part of the great heritage of America, a proud distinction which sets us apart from other nations less favored.

Is there not, at times, just a touch of smugness, of complacency, in our attitude? Do we not, perhaps, sometimes take our freedoms too much for granted?

Today, with the free world beset on all sides by the freedom-killing forces of Communism, should we not re-examine our attitudes, and ask ourselves what we as individuals are doing to preserve our freedoms?

A little soul-searching, we fear, may reveal the unpleasant truth that few of us do anything specific for freedom. We talk about freedom, of course, and—put to the question—righteously proclaim that of course we are willing to fight to preserve it, should occasion require.

But do we, as individuals, actually take any steps in defense of freedom?

The fight for freedom is not a "let George do it" affair. Freedom is everyone's concern, and each of us should strike a blow at its cause.

True, it is not always easy for the average individual to know what, specifically, he can do to help. However, there is an organization dedicated solely to the task of preserving America's freedoms, and one of its functions is to detail ways whereby individual citizens can help to maintain the American Way.

Its name: Freedom Foundation, a non-profit, non-sectarian organization with Dwight D. Eisenhower as chairman and Herbert Hoover as honorary president.

Next time you visit Valley Forge, drop in at the Foundation's American Freedom Center. Here are catalogued outstanding examples of what has been done and is being done in the cause of freedom by individual Americans—by students, teachers, business and professional men, ministers, members of the armed forces, civic leaders, Americans from every walk of life.

Their contributions are available to anyone for research, study, and guidance. We think you will find them both instructive and inspirational.

## In Small Doses

Under the prevailing policy of managed news at the White House level, Americans are being fed their bitter pills in small doses.

First there was no Soviet buildup in Cuba and then, in the midst of the election campaign, a national crisis was declared confirming the warnings of Senator Keating and others that there were in fact "about 17,000 Russian technicians and military men" in Cuba and a varied assortment of missiles and bombers.

Now comes the admission that at least four American pilots were killed in the Bay of Pigs fiasco, this nearly two years after the abortive attempt of patriotic Cubans to overthrow Communist Castro.

Cuba is as great a threat to the United States and the free world as it was before the administration's "Madison Avenue" victory over criticism. Evidently we haven't had, nor are we now getting, the truth about Cuba, and slickers in Washington, who admitted managing the news, have slickered themselves into a position where and discerning American cannot be blamed for his skepticism.

If the administration's news policies did not have such a menacing undertone, they would be as amusing as the old story of "no news or what killed the dog."

## Overhaul the System

In a full page editorial, Life magazine urges immediate tax cuts—observing that "... nobody has a good word for our tax system. It is one of the worst in the world."

At the same time, Life argues that four conditions must be met if a cut is to be accomplished with a minimum of risk. These are in summary: That the President rigidly enforce his announced policy of holding down non-defense spending with a balanced budget as the ultimate objective; that monetary policy should be tailored to resisting inflationary pressures and the decline in our gold reserves; that tax cuts should be made in a series of stages, over a period of years; and that, finally, the whole tax structure should be reformed in wholesale fashion. Life concludes: "If these four conditions are met, responsible men can give wholehearted support to tax cuts. We need a better tax system. This is the year to start getting it."

To say the perfectly obvious, there will be heavy controversy over the four conditions Life emphasizes, and just what they will specify. But the basic idea behind this program is inescapable. Tax cuts which resulted in inflation that, by further reduction in the value of the dollar, would more than offset the savings, must be avoided at all costs. And all cuts should bear a relation to a subsequent general overhaul of our antiquated tax system.

Railroad efforts in the Cuban crisis have been lauded by Major General I. Sewell Morris, commander of the Defense Traffic Management Service. He said that railroad performance in the movement of personnel and supplies "demonstrated again, and most forcibly, that the railroads are a vital part of the transport support of military preparedness."

Chain Store Age says that clerk-selling is making a comeback in some variety stores across the nation. A growing number of these stores are manning counters with sales specialists to sell higher-priced toiletries, jewelry, appliances sofas and dresses. Thus the magazine observes in certain variety store lines the pendulum is swinging back to clerk selling after almost 20 years of self-selling and self-service.

## Just Because You Don't Understand-



## ROYCE BRIER

# German Attitudes, Changes Unforeseen After War

In the midst of a war, a sanguine people like the Americans have a hypnotic tendency to believe all will be well with the peace. The evils we fight against, such as Hitlerism, will be utterly destroyed, and a rational and moral pattern will be imposed on international affairs.

A year after the peace we begin to have doubts. The problems which begot the war are replaced with other problems. A war ally turns hostile. The vanquished are difficult. We find we have to relax our controls, because zeal dies.

Nothing turns out as we had expected, even planned. We find we must rehabilitate the defeated with something like the Marshall Plan, and it works better than expected. We find we must make friends with our late enemies, that in fact we need them and their energies to meet new problems arising from the ashes of the old.

So the British, also a sanguine people, discovered regarding the Germans after 1918. Nothing happened as expected, and none could foresee the rise of Hitler and a new menace.

Now we do not find the Germans a menace, but we find postwar Germany did not follow the course expected of it. We had imagined an unassertive Germany, with a modest industrial capacity appropriate to the German competence.

Then Germany was partitioned (which we had not foreseen), but West Germany began a miraculous industrial growth, also unforeseen. Nor did we foresee a Franco-German rapprochement, and a sort of economic axis, taking in smaller nations, with curious overtones of political union. This Continental hegemony is cool toward the United States and Great Britain, and distrustful of them.

The author of most of this

development is a sturdy but aged man, Chancellor Adenauer, who has a deep-seated urge to a United States of Europe, a possibility not necessarily in the interest of the Americans.

The Germans have no other postwar leader, but now time is running out for him. At 87, he can hardly live to see the U.S.E. materialize. The Germans have lately chafed under his rigid leadership, and recently he agreed to retire in late 1963. So far as can be seen, his economics minister, Dr. Ludwig Erhard, will become Chancellor.

On the record, Dr. Erhard will pursue the Adenauer policy. But few Americans understand the political party complex in postwar Germany, and we do not know if Dr. Erhard, who is 65, will last.

All we know is that a change is coming, and that whatever we had expected for two decades after Hitler, will not occur.

## A Bookman's Notebook

# Hedda Hopper's Account Of the Hollywood Life

William Hogan

Hedda Hopper opens her new book, "The Whole Truth and Nothing But," with an explanation of why she was not the first to break the story of Liz Taylor's abandoning Eddie Fisher for Richard Burton—She was asked not to print it in February, 1962, by her lawyer, who also represents Miss Taylor and Burton.

Immediately the ambivalence of her curious brand of journalism becomes apparent. For she is obviously faced with a conflict of loyalties: to her readers, whom she numbers 35 million, and the people she knows so well. A Hollywood columnist is part reporter, part press agent, part hatchet man. The triple assignment obviously bothers Miss Hopper not one bit.

The second odd aspect of the book is that here is a woman who writes for a living who has someone else write her collection of personal reminiscences. It is as if a painter asked someone else to do a self-portrait because he had not the time.

Whatever the case, the book sparkles with amusing anecdotes. When Red Skelton was asked "What can Mr. Kennedy do to repay Frank Sinatra, the man who has everything?" he replied: "He can repeal the Mann Act." There is gossip of infinite variety, with animosities and dislikes as well as affection.

Generally, the impression Miss Hopper conveys is a con-

tempt for Hollywood, yet she loves her position in that odd community. She dislikes Marlon Brando and never misses an opportunity to give him the needle, often, one suspects, unfairly. She is kittenish, but she wants the world to know she's a kitten with claws. She likes Elvis Presley; she liked the late James Dean, and she evokes the roller coaster of Mario Lanza's life with a vivid and compassionate enthusiasm.

She includes a superb description of an evening with Joan Crawford (best item in the book), and she makes

much of her feuds with Louella Parsons, a rival columnist, and others.

Hedda has been writing on and in Hollywood since 1938. Before that she acted in motion pictures. She knows a great many people and lives by dropping their names, although often she merely hints at these names. There is no question that Hedda is a lively observer who relishes every moment of her busy life. If one is interested in a relatively peppery account of motion picture personalities, here it is.

"The Whole Truth and Nothing But," by Hedda Hopper with James Brough; 321 pp.; illus.; \$4.95.

## We Quote...

DONALD G. CROSBY, Davis, U.C. biochemist, on insecticide danger — "Making sure food is completely safe is complicated by the fact that almost all foods contain natural chemicals that could be harmful, if you ate enough."

SGT. KENNETH CARPENTER, LA police investigator, on problems of mail order firearms sale — "One dealer can even sell you a war. If you want a PT boat, or a bazooka, he's got it."

L. BERKLEY DAVIS, electronic exec at S.F. convention — "The time is not too distant when electronics will be able

to take over grocery shopping."

J. C. PENNEY, pioneer merchant, in S.F., Orient bound — "I'm not a man of unusual ability, but I try to make use of every moment; I don't believe in luck."

DANNY THOMAS, Hollywood comedian — "Behind every successful man is a woman, who thinks he's an idiot."

"The way taxes are today, you might as well marry for love." — Fred W. Grown, Edgewater (N. J.) Bergen County Citizen.

## AFTER HOURS By John Morley

# De Gaulle's Action Logical By European Traditions

EL PASO—Gen. Charles De Gaulle, President of France, is indeed an uncommon statesman. His historic claim to greatness is validated by history.

He and he alone brought France from oblivion after her humiliating defeat in World War II. For this alone the entire free world owes him a lot more than he is presently receiving.

His opponents in France have joined those abroad to call him everything but what he is. The Paris afternoon newspaper, "Le Monde," anti-De Gaullist, called him a Napoleon... and so did the New York Times.

Speaking before the French Parliament recently, President De Gaulle said: "Prime Minister Macmillan compared me to Hitler... and President Kennedy to an allusion of grandeur. I am not aware of either of these things. But I am a Frenchman."

President De Gaulle is a Frenchman... and is dedicated to preserve the interests of France, first... much like Sir Winston Churchill always fought for the interests of Britain, first.

We don't seem able to produce many Americans in places of authority who fight to preserve the interests of the United States, first.

On the contrary, we seem to be concerned with upholding the interests of friend and foe alike, from Afghanistan to Zanzibar... instead of the direct welfare of the American people.

De Gaulle's position on the common market is at great variance with that of Britain and the U.S.

With the danger of oversimplification it is this. The U.S. and Britain are committed to a trade policy which encourages dealings in a free market, rather than a controlled market as the European Economy community (common market) is.

President Kennedy's proposal for a transatlantic low-tariff trade partnership with Britain is geared to the free-market policy. Both Britain and the U.S. would fare better as industrial exporters in a strong European open market, even though our prices are higher.

De Gaulle opposes this for reasons detrimental to the French economy.

France, for example, wants a closed-market for agricultural products, like wheat and grains, or she can maintain a higher fixed-price, which would be in jeopardy if the U.S. and British Commonwealth wheat and grains were to enter the common market at the lower world-price.

De Gaulle is trying to create a monopoly for French exports into the common market... for under the agreements of the six members, they cannot import cheaper foodstuffs from anyone out of the membership, which includes the U.S. and British Commonwealth.

This is De Gaulle's main objection in principle to British entry. It is strictly economic insurance for France.

He would not object to British membership on the same terms and existing agreements made at the conference of Rome, now prevailing in the common market.

But Britain insists on a preferential treatment which would bring the agricultural products of the commonwealth at prices which under-

cut France. This same objection involves other existing agreements within the common market.

De Gaulle Offended at Nassau At the Nassau conference between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, De Gaulle was not consulted, for example, on the Polaris pact.

De Gaulle felt, and rightly so, that Britain as a European power should at least consult France, or should lean to a nuclear-defense tie with Europe, instead of the Polaris pact alone with the United States.

The decision undoubtedly had much to do with France's veto against Britain's entry into the common market.

De Gaulle in a nationwide telecast, after the British rejection at Brussels, said that when Macmillan visited him, it was agreed that France and Britain would unite their forces for the common defense.

Britain's understandable position to tie in with powerful U.S. was contrary to her agreement with De Gaulle. Failure to include him, or to discuss in advance of Nassau

the possibility of a U.S. British-France defense formula or consulting France in the joint defense venture of Britain and the U.S., embarrassed De Gaulle.

De Gaulle has misgivings about President Kennedy's experience to be spokesman for the western alliance.

He did not like to be left out of his commitment to start a nuclear war over Cuba on Oct. 22, without consulting France, who would become involved.

He did not approve the U.S. stopping the attack on Nasser, when he seized the Suez canal.

He did not like our interference in Algiers and the Congo... all contrary to France's interest.

In short, President De Gaulle is a Frenchman, who is thinking primarily of the survival and the glory of France.

De Gaulle probably sent Mona Lisa here more as an instrument of diplomacy than an exhibit of art.

Perhaps he hoped that her subtle smile might suggest to the New Frontier that old European institutions are not necessarily out of date.

## Our Man Hoppe

# The Great Leap Forward

Art Hoppe

Great news from South Vietnam! At last the Vietnamese we've been arming and training for so long are beginning to fight. Unfortunately, they're beginning to fight us. But it's a start.

According to press dispatches, this encouraging note took place in a hamlet called Pleimrong. For months, our military observers, as we call them, had been feeding, clothing and caring for the villagers. And teaching them how to shoot. The villagers, being uncivilized heathens, were pretty slow getting the hang of the latter. But once they did, they promptly joined Viet Cong, attacked our outpost of civilization, shot up a couple of our observers with our own bullets, and generally demonstrated they had made the Great Leap Forward.

It reminds me of a little of the Great Leap Forward made in the neighboring kingdom of West Vhtnng.

It was in the 29th year of the campaign by President Ngo Mahnggo (a bastion of democracy) to wipe out the dread Viet-Narians (all Moscow-trained peasants). The Loyal Royal Army was at last beginning to catch onto this rifle business. Casualties now numbered well up in the tens. And while most of the wounds were accidently self-inflicted, a sense of progress was definitely in the air. But the United States was running out of money.

In fact, the U. S. ambassador sadly informed Mr. Ngo, the U. S. was broke. And it could no longer send Vhtnng its \$5 billion annual stipend to wipe out Moscow-trained peasants. "But our momentous task is almost finished," cried Mr. Ngo. "All that remains is tiling the swimming pool in my Riviera villa. I will, I'm afraid, be forced to turn to the Russians for aid."

The ambassador said Russia was broke too. "Great Fort Knox!" said Mr. Ngo. "It's worse than I thought. I shall have to call a meeting of SEATO (the Southeast Asia Treasury-Filling Organization)." And he did. Indeed, the moving address he made to his brother princes is still recited by Vhtnngian school children.

"Brother princes," he said, "we face grim times. The good, old U. S. of A. has, as you know, quintupled our standard of living. And even some of our subjects are eating better. But it has also taught our subjects how to shoot. And now that our loyal subjects are not going to eat so good, I sadly fear they will wish to shoot somebody. Like us. I suggest we turn these modern, progressive energies outward."

The suggestion was received enthusiastically. NATO, which was also unhappy, joined SEATO. The vast accumulation of American rifles, rockets and battleships in each nation was inventoried. And at last came the day of the Great Leap Forward: Everybody invaded America. Except Russia, which couldn't afford it.

Moral: Once you have taught a peaceable, backward friend your ways, be prepared to duck.

## Morning Report:

Monaco, where Princess Grace speaks to the high rollers and they speak only to the dice, is the latest country to feel General de Gaulle's wrath. Companies that sneak into Monaco will now have to pay taxes to Grace just like any place else.

The country is not up in arms. Because it has no arms. But it is up to its ears in fruitless protests. Just about like the rest of the world.

But one thing you'll have to say about the Old General. He is not only fearless but also impartial. He is ready to take on the other countries in the Common Market. Or England. Or the United States. And now Monaco as well.

Abe Mellinkoff

