

Let's Be Cautious

Americans can relax a little today over the lessening of the Cuban crisis. But there is no cause for rejoicing.

On the face of the late developments of Sunday, Khrushchev has ostensibly agreed to the demands of President Kennedy that Russia scrap all its missile bases in Cuba. He has further agreed to a United Nations inspection team to go to Cuba and observe whether this has been accomplished.

This was a hoped for development by the peoples of the United States and the world. But we must remain cautious and keep our powder dry.

Mr. Khrushchev is a wily bargainer. He gives nothing without getting something in return, even though his offer of the Cuba for Turkey trade was rejected out of hand.

What America must do now is adopt the "wait and see" attitude. Russian promises have proven false in the past and certainly this last week of crisis has shown Khrushchev to be a monumental liar.

When the bases are dismantled and

this fact is attested to by a "neutral" team of United Nations observers then we might see our way clear to a meeting with Khrushchev to debate other matters still causing considerable anxiety.

It must be remembered, however, that if Khrushchev was forced into backing down to America by a fearful political bureau, he is going to be watching carefully for any way to regain his shattered prestige.

Castro, of course, has been rendered quite useless. He is, however, still the titular head of state in Cuba and as such, he can still cause trouble.

His demands that the United States evacuate Guantanamo Naval Base in exchange for the elimination of the missile bases in Cuba could just be a wild threat for a man willing to clutch at any straw to save the blow to his own prestige.

America, of course, will never agree to abandoning Guantanamo, but it is a safe bet that we haven't heard the last of this demand—nor the demand that we scrap our NATO missile base in Turkey.

So as we breathe a sigh of relief today, let it whistle a note of caution.

Vote Yes on Proposition 24

Proposition 24, the most controversial on the ballot, results from the refusal of the State Legislature to act on some 18 bills designed to curb subversive activities.

By unprecedented volunteer action, a group of dedicated anti-communist people obtained the signatures of more than a half-million California citizens to place this measure on the ballot.

In their effort to incorporate all details of the desired legislation, some provisions have been included that would have been better clarified if the Legislature had been willing to consider and debate them.

Particularly, this includes the methods outlined for defining subversive organizations in the much disputed Section 3.

We agree with critics of the provision empowering County Grand Juries to make certain findings relative to subversive organizations. Grand Juries have sufficient duties to perform without the additional burden of making the exhaustive studies required to determine whether an organization is subversive.

It is likely that additional legislation will be required to put Proposition 24 into effect, and the Legislature could well see to it that this detail is eliminated.

Furthermore, the history of anti-sub-

versive legislation is that every section of every such law, even if perfectly written, is challenged and subjected to court test. In some cases it has taken ten years and more to uphold their constitutionality.

This will undoubtedly happen again, and if Proposition 24 has faulty sections, they will be eliminated by court action.

On the other hand, the measure contains certain provisions that are vitally needed.

Contrary to its critics, the amendment does not interfere with free speech. It simply provides that people who exercise their right of free speech to seek the forcible overthrow of American Government shall not draw salaries from or use the facilities of that government.

Proposition 24 bars subversives from holding public office or state employment, says they can not hold meetings in public buildings, and makes them ineligible for property tax exemptions. And it requires people who are entrusted with the education of our youth to answer questions by responsible and official agencies of the government.

These regulations are highly desirable and long overdue. The Tribune recommends a Yes vote on Proposition 24.

Decision for the Future

One all-important factor must concern Oakland city councilmen as they meet tomorrow night to consider an endorsement of the \$792 million rapid transit bond issue—Proposition A on next week's ballot.

Many factors will be discussed. The potential of transit for economic development, revival of business districts, and expansion of industry will be weighed.

And the cost will receive serious consideration. Is it too great? Or must we build now to avoid much greater expense in the future?

For Oakland councilmen there is a special issue.

Five years ago, state highway engineers predicted that by 1980 we will have 594,810 vehicles moving into Oakland each day over our freeway system.

This estimate was for their own purposes. It had no relation to rapid transit planning.

But the engineers did assume in mak-

ing their estimate that 40 per cent of the people will be traveling on transit.

Without transit, the load will be close to one million vehicles a day.

What are we going to do with that traffic? Whether we like it or not, this will be Oakland's problem.

More freeways? The councilmen must know what problems that would involve, in displacement of homes and business, loss of tax money, and protracted disruption of urban life.

All of our present councilmen may not be here 18 years from now to face the consequences of their decision.

But they can decide tomorrow night whether they will be blamed for a worse traffic mess than anything we can imagine today—or whether they will be remembered for having the wisdom, the judgment, and the vision to help provide a rapid transit system to solve the problem in their time and meet the needs of the future.

Crises and Strikes

What are and what should be the powers of the federal government to deal with strikes in time of national crisis? The subject becomes particularly pertinent at this time because of the dispute between the International Association of Machinists and Lockheed Aircraft.

The union on Oct. 23 said that it had "exhausted all avenues of settlement that lay within the confines of free collective bargaining" and had twice canceled strike deadlines. It asserted that "there lawfully remains only the strike weapon."

Arthur J. Goldberg, then Secretary of Labor, on July 15 warned that he would ask Congress for laws to halt strikes at missile plants and sites if unions walked out. At the request of President Kennedy, the Machinists and the United Auto Workers delayed threatened strikes for 60 days. Other aerospace firms in August and September signed with the unions, accepting a union shop arrangement recommended by a White House board with the strong support of President Kennedy. Lockheed is holding out.

The Labor Secretary said both union and management leaders had a responsibility not to make it necessary for the government to invoke Taft-Hartley or, once the 80-day injunction was exhausted, to ask Congress for further relief.

Taft-Hartley, which superseded Smith-Connally, extends no seizure power to the President. Senator Taft did, however, include such authority in amendments he proposed in 1949.

President Truman's seizure of steel plants in 1952—on his "inherent" power—was struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court by a 6-3 decision. Justice Black's opinion held that neither the "constitutional provisions that grant executive powers to the President" nor acts of Congress gave Truman such authority.

However, under the "utilization of industry" provision of the Selective Service Act of 1948—Sec. 18 A—the government is empowered to seize and operate through any agency, any "plant, mine, or other facility" which fails to produce on government orders. This would obviously be relevant to the aerospace industry. But so far as can be ascertained in Washington the Machinists Union so far has made no formal request for seizure to any agency of the federal government.

DOES HE MEAN IT?



LETTERS TO THE FORUM

Later Than We Think

Editor: I cannot understand the attitude of some men in high places who oppose rapid transit.

Even if the transit bonds are approved in November, it will be years before the system will be in operation. In the meantime congestion will materially worsen, with ensuing increases in accidents and deaths.

Los Angeles today deplore the fact they did not provide for rapid transit when purchasing the right-of-way for their freeway system.

If we in the Bay Area had purchased the land for our proposed system in 1945, millions of dollars would have been saved. Can we not learn from these mistakes? It is truly later than we think.

ROBERT ROSE,
Oakland.

So Many Employees

Editor: No thoughtful American questions the necessity of keeping our defenses strong and vital. But there are some Americans—thoughtful Americans, too—who do question whether we need quite so many people working for the government.

One of these questioners is a member of the House Appropriations Committee. Not long ago, when the committee was holding hearings on the Department of Defense budget, this Congressman offered the following suggestion:

"If I could borrow five platoons of Marines, one for each floor, and a great fleet of buses, and arrive at the Pentagon unannounced, and just send the Marines down the halls and pick one out of every four people they meet, whether in uniform or not, and put them in buses and just take the buses away, nobody but their families would ever miss them for periods of time unknown."

It may be that the Congressman was a bit severe, but there is no getting around the fact that no recession threat is evident in the field of government employment.

It may well be that here is an opportunity for constructive effort to find out the facts about the size of the government payroll, and for constructive action to bring a halt to the continuing upward trend.

Is it any wonder that so many people are getting lost in the Pentagon, and the joke is that they continue to wander around for days and are finally placed by mistake on the government payroll.

WALTER R. FRIESEN,
Oakland.

POTOMAC FEVER

By FLETCHER KNEBEL

WASHINGTON—Even Republicans are cheering Adlai Stevenson. The way he went after the Soviets' Zorin, they're calling Adlai the Ivy League Sonny Liston.

When the first blockade interception was made by a destroyer named the Joseph P. Kennedy Jr., people relaxed. It was apparent this was to be a one-family war.

Why did the Navy let a tanker through the Cuban blockade? It was only a big dose of Castro oil.

You know it must be a small world because so many people want to act as if

A TV official says there's less sex, crime and violence on TV now. No wonder people have been watching more and enjoying it less.

Reprinted by The Register and Tribune Syndicate, 1962

ON THE RIGHT

'Emancipation Day' For Conservatives

Editor's Note: The following views are those of the author and are presented here to give readers a variety of viewpoints. The Tribune's opinions are expressed only in editorials.

By WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY JR.

American conservatives have in several states of the Union been effectively disfranchised as the result of the control by liberals of both the major parties.

New Jersey is an excellent example, and to an extent Pennsylvania is, too; but New York is most brazen, and those of you who are political conservatives and have all along known that you would be able in November to vote for a governor, or a senator with enthusiasm, should consider the melancholy prospects of New Yorkers faced with the alternative of voting for either a couple of routine Democratic liberals, or for Nelson Rockefeller and Jacob Javits.

I mean, this isn't the way you should treat human beings, is it?

There is a lot of talk today about giving the vote to the Negroes, but there was surprisingly little talk about giving it to New York conservatives—until very recently.

Since the assumption by Messrs. Rockefeller and Javits of effective control of the Republican party of New York, the conservatives were out.

Record as Governor

Mr. Rockefeller's record as governor (budget increase of 50 per cent over the free-spending Mr. Averell Harriman), and Mr. Javits's as senator (100 per cent-plus rating by the Americans for Democratic Action) hardly endeared them to conservatives, whose neutralization, moreover, was more than a mere local problem, for the reason that New York continues to be the most critical state in presidential contests.

The Liberal party, New York's third party which was founded almost 20 years ago to put pressure on the Democratic (and indirectly the Republican) party to nominate left-wingers, has year after year mobilized two or three hundred thousand votes from the hard left segment of New York City's political community—mostly intellectuals and ladies' garment workers.

If every one who voted for the Liberal party candidate for President in 1960 (Mr. Kennedy) had stayed home, Nixon would have been elected President: because that handful of votes made exactly the crucial difference.

Suppose in 1960 there had been a Conservative party as active in lining up otherwise apathetic conservative votes as its Liberal counterpart?

Just Such a Party

Now there has arisen in New York, in protest over the liberals' monopoly, just such a party; a fourth party, the Conservative party, which seeks to do for the Republican party what the Liberals, in pursuit of their own interests, have done for the Democratic party, namely, to coalesce pressure upon it in order to rescue conservative principle from complete and total neglect.

If in the forthcoming election, or in the one after that, the conservatives can get as many votes as the liberals have managed to get, the Conservative party's hearing on national politics will be of stupendous consequence; the history of American politics may very well be altered.

The temptation will arise in other states of the Union to found conservative parties.

That temptation must, in most cases, be resisted; because whereas the liberals are temporarily in charge of the Republican parties in several states, their hold is shaky; whereas in New York it was wholly consolidated, precisely because of the pressures generated by the Liberal party.

If there had been no liberal third party in New York, there probably would not have arisen the need for a conservative fourth party to supply the countervailing pressure.

Influence at Polls

The purpose of the Conservative party in New York is not to found a third party of the conventional kind, with candidates who actually hope to be elected to office; but rather to found a party whose demonstrated influence at the polls proves sufficient to emancipate the Republican party from the stranglehold on it that entrenched and highly organized liberal sentiment in New York is exercising over it.

Elsewhere, conservative agitation for the most part exercised through the Republican party can hope to succeed.

Even in South Carolina, where it is popularly believed that a Republican party candidate could never, ever hope to win a state-wide office, Mr. W. D. Workman is scaring the pants off the liberal Senator Olin Johnston.

John Tower shattered the myth of Democratic invincibility in Texas; and so it may go elsewhere. The conservatives in California have obviously exercised a decisive influence over Mr. Nixon; the New New Nixon, as he is sometimes referred to.

A Needed Support

And he knows that without their support he could not hope to win the contest against Mr. Brown; and if he loses, he will have lost the final contest in an illustrious career.

So we have seen in New York a twinge of life in what was thought to be the moribund corpse of New York conservatism; and the results are bracing.

For the first time that I can remember in New York, a horde of men and women with that unique spirit that the prospect of political emancipation generates, are going about the state busily, working for their own candidates, Messrs. Jaquith and O'Doherty, against two Republican candidates who have shown themselves convinced that it is the role of the state to manage our affairs domestically, and mismanage our affairs internationally.