

Soviet Blackmail Against U.N.

Charter Provision of Action on Reds
For Refusing to Share Expenses Cited

The Soviet government is attempting to blackmail the United Nations. It has announced a refusal to pay its share of the U. N. expenses in the Congo. The other Communist members take the same position.

When a member of a club refuses to pay dues, he is usually dropped from membership. When a member says he will pay dues only if the majority of the club bow to his wishes, the custom is to denounce any such pressure and expel him from membership.

Last Tuesday the Soviet government formally notified the secretary general of the United Nations that it would not pay its share of a \$66,625,000 appropriation needed to cover the expenses of the first six months of the U. N. emergency force in the Congo. The Soviet delegate told the General Assembly's administrative and budgetary committee that the money is being spent in the Congo in violation of Security Council directives in order to support "Western colonialists" and that Russia and the Communist bloc "does not feel it can participate in paying the costs."

This provokes a crisis in the future of the U. N. Will it yield to blackmail and let any member decide whether or not to pay its allotted share of the expense of the organization? The U. N. Charter says in Article 17: "1. The General Assembly shall consider and approve the budget of the organization."

"2. The expenses of the organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly."

Under Article 19, the Charter says: "A member of the United

Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member."

But none of the Communist bloc members is bankrupt or financially incapable of paying the assessments imposed by the General Assembly.

The record shows, moreover, that the Soviet Union has paid none of its share of the expense for policing the Gaza Strip, authorized by the U. N. after the Suez crisis in 1956. Out of the 1960 bill of \$20 million, this country is paying \$9,697,064, but the Soviet Union now has been in default of its assessments for four years, totaling more than \$10 million. Other Communist-bloc countries have followed the same course.

The Soviet government takes the position that it will decide for itself what assessments it will pay of those levied by the U. N. General Assembly on all members. In effect, this means that, if the Soviets don't like a particular resolution or directive, even though a majority of the members formally adopt it, there will be a refusal to pay until the Assembly conforms to the wishes of the minority dissenters. This is a form of blackmail which, if tolerated, will mean worldwide loss of respect for the United Nations organization. Indeed, it is conceivable that failure to meet its obligations could mean the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the Security Council, too. It has often been argued that, since the Moscow government is a "permanent" member and holds a veto in the Security Council, it can never be expelled from the United Nations. But a close look at the language of the charter disputes this view.

Thus Article 6 says: "A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Also, Article 27 says: "Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members."

Certainly payment of dues and assessments is a "procedural" matter, so the Soviet government's single veto would not be sufficient to prevent expulsion. And how can any organization survive if it can't get the money for expenses from its members?

The United States pays the biggest share of the U. N. expenses. The estimated cost of all U. N. operations in 1960 is about \$283,850,000, of which this country will pay nearly half, or approximately \$120,500,000. Why should the United States bear such a burden when the Soviet government decides for itself what expenses it will pay and those on which it will openly wince? The Soviet Union this year will pay around \$17,455,000 for some of the regular expenses of the U. N., but declines to pay any assessment of which it doesn't approve, though there is nothing in the Charter to sustain such defiance or such pressure to change policies by withholding money contributions. This is really blackmail.

(Copyright, 1960)



POTOMAC FEVER

By FLETCHER KNEBEL

Rules for the fifth debate: Each candidate will be allowed an opening and a closing alibi.

Democrats fear a last-minute Nixon surprise. Sample: "I shall go to Quemoy, and Ezra Benson to Matsu—forever."

Nixon and Kennedy applaud the expansion of the American League to 10 teams. Nixon claims this shows the prestige of American baseball vs. that of the Soviet Union has never been higher, while Kennedy notes this will be a growth rate of 25 per cent a year under his administration.

Female undecided voter: She doesn't know whether to vote her prejudices or her husband's.

Cook's glossary: Parsley—What good little boys and girls who eat their spinach get when they grow up.

Teen-age dictionary: "Or something"—A well-known thing or place as in "He's her cousin or something," or "She used to live in Kankakee or something."

Likelihood of a Staggering Vote

Reverse of Apathy Found in Crowds
Listening to Nixon and Kennedy

On the big question—who is winning the presidential campaign?—there can be no more sense of assurance than there was two months ago or two weeks ago. But from many sources—talks with all sorts of politicians, personal observation on whistle-stop and other trips with both candidates, and so on—some other important things at least now seem very clear.

The prospect is that a staggering total vote will be cast in this election. The national decision, whether it shall favor Democrat John F. Kennedy or Republican Richard Nixon, will have been a decision taken by the people themselves with a degree of voting participation we have never seen before.

There is the reverse of "apathy" among the public. To know this one has only to see at first hand the immense, patient crowds drawn up in the snow for Mr. Nixon, drawn up in the rain for Senator Kennedy.

There is far less automatic partisanship than in past presidential campaigns. Old-line habitual Republicans are not necessarily and unthinkingly Republican this time. Ditto old-line and habitual Democrats.

There is much anxiety in the country. Wherever and however one meets people—on a campaign train, an airliner, a restaurant in town or city—this concern quickly breaks through the conversation. What troubles people?

No single answer can be given, for the worry and concern seem a many-sided thing. Some vaguely fear war; some thinking Senator Kennedy might bring it about,

some thinking Mr. Nixon might. Others fear recession.

This correspondent's guess, however, is that what basically troubles most people is not really fear. It is rather an awareness that we are entering a new and unknown era, leaving the comfortable years of Dwight Eisenhower and walking toward new years with a new man—whether it is to be Mr. Nixon or Senator Kennedy—easily young enough to be Eisenhower's son.

An enormous number of voters either have not made up their minds; are changing inconclusively back and forward from day to day; or are simply unwilling to indicate their choice if they have actually made it.

No really vast number seems to back either candidate in the deep, emotional way that people used to back Roosevelt or Truman or Thomas E. Dewey for that matter. Neither candidate is idolized; neither candidate, but for scattered exceptions, is hated.

Both are widely thought to be competent; but neither is widely thought to be an indispensable man, or a genius. Both are seen as good fighters, fair fighters on the whole, who are giving the public a good show.

It does not follow, however, that the people think of this campaign as a jolly game. They think of it as a deeply serious contest, indeed. It is as though they believed time has run out on the old strictly emotional political attitudes in which a voter's own favor, in which a voter's own nobility and his opponent a dreadful

few who probably ought to be in jail.

This remarkable process of coolly weighing up one man against another goes so far that you will run occasionally into a great phenomenon. It is possible sometimes to hear even an associate of one candidate say a reasonably fair word about the other candidate.

There is a great deal of public sympathy simply for the immense exertions being made by the candidates, the sacrifices they are so demonstrably making in terms of physical exhaustion. The sentiment among many ordinary voters even in desiring the defeat of the other side's candidates is "Don't cheer, boys, the poor devils are dying."

Perhaps what we are doing now is saying goodbye to a whole political era in which simple love for one candidate and simple malice toward another formed the voting standard of millions.

Architecture Staff At CU Adds Two

Catholic University has added two instructors to the staff of its School of Engineering and Architecture.

Dr. William R. Osgood comes to the school from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. He also has served on the faculty at the Illinois Institute of Technology.

John H. Baltrukonis, new professor of civil engineering, is a graduate of Catholic University. He has been employed by Space Technology Laboratories, Inc., Los Angeles; Hughes Aircraft Corp., Culver City, Calif., and the Lockheed Missiles and Space Division, Van Nuys, Calif.

A Clash of the No. 2 Candidates

A Good Show, With Lots of Hard Blows
Predicted if Lodge and Johnson Meet

Arguments over the fifth and final telecast between Treasury Undersecretary Scribner, acting for Vice President Nixon, and Leonard Reinsch of the Cox newspapers, acting for Senator Kennedy, have been a kind of championship match on its own.

A tentative date has been set for next Monday in Philadelphia. Since both sides hope to capture the big Keystone State and have reasons to be optimistic about it, this seems to be an agreeable choice. All else has been a hard fight.

Vice President Nixon is demanding a confrontation of the vice-presidential nominees, former United Nations Ambassador Lodge and Senator Johnson of Texas, but he does not want the public to watch them argue with each other. His idea is that each should make a set statement.

This condition suggests that he thinks Mr. Lodge has the best of it pictorially and by reason of his nearly eight years in speaking for the United States in the United

Nations. Mr. Lodge is also believed to have strong appeal for women voters, especially because he is identified so strongly with peace and the arguments against the Russians.

Presumably also Mr. Nixon would like to remind the crucial States where all the major fire is now centered by both presidential nominees that Senator Kennedy is running with a Texan who is a civil rights moderate.

Democrats know Senator Johnson as an accomplished controversialist who can on occasion speak with deep feeling and conviction. They would unhesitatingly enter him in a real debate with Mr. Lodge and, indeed, with practically anybody. The Senate Majority Leader also has an enormous fund of knowledge about the day-to-day operations of the Government as reflected in Congress. It would be difficult to out-know him on major matters.

His service goes back to the New Deal days, for he was elected to the House in 1937

and to the Senate in 1948. In 1953 he was elected Democratic leader and his associations since then with the Republican President have been close, much too close to suit liberal Democrats.

Too, he served with his Republican rival when Mr. Lodge was a Senator which would add another arrow to his quiver, since he knows Mr. Lodge's strength and weaknesses well. Thus Mr. Nixon is well advised not to give that encounter, should it take place, free rein.

It could just happen that the public, which has seen four Nixon-Kennedy telecasts, might relish the new flavor more than the old and attach undue importance to the outcome of a Lodge-Johnson hassle.

Reporters who know both vice presidential rivals well would gamble on their giving a good show, with neither hesitant to deal hard blows.

The general strategy at this point is clear in both camps. It is to cut losses in the States with fewer electoral votes and hit the big ones hard. In this effort foreign policy looms large though it is Senator Kennedy's hope to get in some final sledge-hammer blows about the lagging state of the economy.

separation of church and state and disowns any such practices. Here again we have a clear example of the fact that actions by the church outside American practices are not relevant to Senator Kennedy. He will uphold the Constitution of the United States.

As a matter of fact, it is immature to suggest that a Catholic could, if he wished, do any harm to the constitutional provisions under which we live. The great hope for our country is that in this campaign the voters will vote their convictions and not allow religious prejudice to intervene. Senator Kennedy is in a difficult position. While the G.O.P. high command has forthrightly denounced use of the anti-Catholic smears, the fact remains they are being used in behalf of Mr. Nixon. This fact makes it the more imperative that Republicans take the lead in condemning as false and un-American the use of the material now flooding the mails and being handed out in political crowds.

The SANTA SHOP
OPENING
Saturday
8001 Bradley Blvd.
Bethesda, Md.
A Fairland For
Kiddies and Adults

Kefauver Confident for Kennedy

Tennessean Calls Republicans Jittery
And Sniffs Democratic Victory

NEW YORK. — Senator Estes Kefauver, the tall Tennessean, dropped into New York for a speech and a word of cheer to the party faithful. The Senator, whose coonskin cap was a political symbol of strength and meaning a few years ago, has been busy speaking for the nominees. Very few speakers, other than the principals, receive a big press. But, the amiable Tennessean has been going here and there exhorting the voters in behalf of Senators Kennedy and Johnson.

He also is confident, both publicly and privately, that the trend is running toward the Democrats. "You can sense it," he said, "the way a good fox hound can smell out the trail. And by now the Republicans are showing signs they know it, too. They haven't panicked. But, they have shown their concern. They are throwing the President into Pennsylvania as an extra, late attraction. And the Vice President, too, is revealing the jittery state of his nerves. He looks to me to be off balance. He talks that way, too. He just hasn't measured up to his party's image of the sort of candidate they wanted."

"There is a dissatisfaction with the Nixon campaign among Republicans. This is becoming a subject of public conversation. Even when they thought he outdid Senator Kennedy on debates they still weren't satisfied. Mr. Nixon never quite measured up to what they want from him. I think we've got them licked."

Senator Kefauver also believes California to be ready for a Democratic vote. This is not merely because there are more party registrants. His

ANNOUNCING...

AMERICA'S BETTER BUY

IN A true thrift car!



'61 ENGLISH FORD LINE ANGLIA

SAVES MORE THAN U.S. COMPACTS...

GIVES MORE VALUE THAN OTHER IMPORTS

Lee D. Butler, Inc.
1121 21st St. N.W.
Washington, D. C.

Jet Motor Sales, Inc.
1534 Pennsylvania Ave. S.E.
Washington, D. C.

Moore-Gear Motors, Inc.
4400 Connecticut Ave. N.W.
Washington, D. C.

John Gifford Motors
2501 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Va.

Shirlington Motor Co.
2790 South Arlington Mill Dr.
Arlington, Va.

MacGregor Motors, Inc.
416 West Main St.
Charlottesville, Va.

Palmer Mercury
3110 Hamilton Street
West Hyattsville, Md.

Trio Motor Sales
RFD Box 260, Rte. 29-211
Fairfax, Va.

George Washington Garage
210 North Loudoun St.
Winchester, Va.

Bert Spriggs Motor Sales, Inc.
1013 West St.
Annapolis, Md.

Auto Show Ltd.
Route #40
Hagerstown, Md.

Mark Motor Co.
210 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Md.

Hill & Sanders, Inc.
11250 Viers Mill Rd.
Wheaton, Md.

We make this challenge:
Compare Anglia with Volkswagen
and Renault Dauphine!

FEATURES	ANGLIA	VW	RENAULT
Engine	Up-front	In rear	In rear
Horsepower	41	40	32
Top Speed	71.0	68.2	64.8
Rear Gas Tank	Yes	No	Yes
U.S. Size Nuts & Bolts	Yes	No	No
Turning Circle (ft.)	32	34	31
Weight (lbs.)	1625	1617	1481
Length (ins.)	155.6	160.9	156.6
Front Door Width	43.1"	42.0"	42.0"
Luggage (cu. ft.)	13.0	10.0	9.6
Glove Box	Lockable	Lockable	Open
Fresh Air Vent	Opt. Extra	No	No
Ash Trays	3	2	2

WHY PAY MORE... OR SETTLE FOR LESS than Anglia? Now available at 700 Lincoln-Mercury and independent dealers' throughout the country. For name of nearest dealer, call Western Union Operator 25. Or write: Lincoln-Mercury Division, Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Michigan.

ENGLISH FORD LINE
ANGLIA
THE BETTER IMPORTED ECONOMY CAR

