

EDITORIALS

House Cuts Title I Funds

June 26 was a bad day for children, blacks, and poor people generally in the House of Representatives.

The House resolved itself into the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union to consider the appropriations bill for the departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare.

"The problem before the House," said the Washington Post, "was how to cut the funds available for vital needs in the United States in order to pay the ransom demanded for release of the recently executed tax surcharge law."

The House did this by reducing funds for those with the least political power—children, blacks, and the poor.

The country's educational programs were particularly hard hit. An attempt to restore a \$135-million cut to ESEA Title I, for example, failed by a teller vote of 149-116.

The Chester School District has received \$1,773,000 in ESEA Title I funds in the last three years. Cuts in that program may affect local projects.

Other programs of assistance to ghetto schools with large numbers of impoverished, educationally deprived children were also chopped.

Minor sums recommended for bilingual education, training and rehabilitation of the handicapped, enlarging the Teachers Corps, prevention of school dropouts—all were rejected.

Once again, the potential effect on Chester is undeniable. It participates in a Title I-financed bilingual education program. And its request to use members of the Teachers Corps during the next school year has already been rejected for lack of federal funds.

Some congressmen pleaded passionately for these programs. One charged the House "washed on a moral commitment."

Another begged Congress not to "turn its back on the most helpless of our people."

Others suggested that those who lament increasing crime rates might better support programs to reduce dropouts and train and educate young people.

All was to no avail. "Plainly, the House robbed the poor to pay the rich," commented the Washington Post.

Neither of Delaware County's congressmen, G. Robert Watkins of Birmingham nor Lawrence G. Williams of Springfield, was present for the voting on these measures.

Rep. Watkins was participating in the centennial celebration of Cain Township in Chester County. He was the principal speaker at government day ceremonies, an engagement he had accepted several months earlier.

Rep. Williams addressed a meeting of the Haverford Township L. G. Williams for Congress Committee at the Llanerch Country Club in Haverford shortly before 5 p.m., and attended the annual banquet of the Homebuilders Association of Philadelphia and Suburbs at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia at 6.

All this happened on a Wednesday, the middle of the three-day, Tuesday through Thursday week during which \$30,000-a-year congressmen are normally in session.

THE LAST AMERICAN



7 A Peculiar Institution

It is a pity that agreeable to the nature of things Slavery and Tyranny must go together and that there is no such thing as having an obedient and useful slave, without the painful exercise of undue and tyrannical authority.

One thought to be dying out, slavery, thanks to the cotton gin, ended a long period of dynamic growth at the beginning of the 19th century.

In 1790, there were 700,000 slaves. By the time of the Civil War there would be a million or as many as the entire population of the United States in 1790.

Contrary to the popular picture, the antebellum south was much more than mummies, mansions and huge plantation fields wherein

thilled hundreds of carefree, loyal blacks. As late as 1860, more than 200,000 slaveowners had five slaves or less and 338,000 owners, or 88 per cent of the total, had fewer than 20. The large planters, however, wielded a political and economic power far out of proportion to their numbers.

It was the spread of King Cotton to the West that was responsible for the greatest cruelty of the system—the internal slave trade, which took husbands from wives, children from parents (while it rejuvenated the economy of the older slave states whose lands were worn out). Slaves were property, and property had no marital or parental rights under the law.

The constant problem of runaways testifies that thousands of slaves found their lot intolerable. For those who did not flee, sabotage and slowdowns were ways of resisting the system.

Black Codes, which grew more and more severe over the years, regulated every aspect

of the slave's life. Patrols of white citizens regularly policed the countryside. There were two kinds of slaves—field hands and the usually lighter-skinned household servants, with little in common between the two. There was also a growing population of free Negroes in the cities, many of them skilled artisans, whose opportunities were often better than those of discriminated-against Negroes in the North. A few grew rich and even owned slaves of their own. For some, like the café-au-lait mistress of New Orleans, life could be positively luxurious.

It was in the fields, however, that what remained of the Negro's African heritage persisted and was transformed into something uniquely American. It was in the fields that the great spirituals were born, that song of that great day when the Lord would deliver His children from bondage.

NEXT: The Black Rebels

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Cut Defense Costs

To The Times:

I think the time has arrived when the U.S. taxpayer should heed the warning voiced by former President Eisenhower. In his farewell address to the nation upon leaving the office of president, he warned that we

should beware the industrial and military complex in this country. Some senators are now beginning to question the sanctity of the ever increasing defense and military budgets that are being foisted on the backs of the U.S. taxpayers. As a World War II veteran,

I am aware of the tremendous waste in the military. Of course, this is always covered up by the already inflated budgets.

I KNOW we are not supposed to quibble over a few billion dollars when we are engaged in a war, but at a time when the cost of defense and fighting a war is consuming 70 per cent of our entire federal budget, I think it is high time the people and their representatives in Washington put a halt to this senseless escalation of questionable expenditures.

In the final analysis, it will be up to the taxpayer to pressure his congressman to hold the line and cut back on these defense expenditures.

Until some counter-measures are enacted, the taxpayer will find himself becoming more and more an economic slave to the tremendous power of the industrial and military complex.

FREDERICK E. TRYENS
14 Highland Drive
Glen Riddle

Nixon His Gain in Delegates Is at Rocky's Expense

By BRUCE BISSAT

WASHINGTON — Newspaper Enterprise Association's third nationwide Republican delegate count shows that from-running Richard M. Nixon is getting a strong new flow of votes toward him which, at this late stage of the race, presidential challenger Nelson Rockefeller will be hard pressed to reverse.

With less than a month to go before the GOP national convention opens Aug. 5 in Miami Beach, Nixon now has an indicated total of 731 votes — or 86 more than the 645 needed to make him his party's 1968 presidential nominee.

New York Gov. Rockefeller, by contrast, is shown in NEA's newest survey, completed at the end of June, to have some 370 delegate votes — roughly 300 short of what he needs to win.

The significance of the new figures is that, first, they give Nixon important new momentum at the very moment Rockefeller is making a maximum effort with the delegates and with the public, both in person and through costly advertising programs, to cut into Nixon's long-indicated huge lead.

Secondly, Nixon's gains of 44 delegates since the last poll, which showed him at 720, have come at the direct expense of Rockefeller, whose own total in late May stood at a somewhat more beaming 414.

It is bad enough for a challenger to be standing still so close to decision time. To be losing ground is to court the flood tide and be finally engulfed.

ROCKEFELLER stands at the turning point. Unless he and his media advertising campaign catch on very quickly and this is reflected in stunning advances for him in the national public opinion polls, he will have little chance to reverse the heading Nixon trends.

Nixon's May-June gains have come from various sources. An extra 10 votes were squeezed out of Mississippi when support for Gov. Ronald Reagan was virtually snuffed out.

Maryland's Gov. Spivey Agnew, angered at a rocky for leaving him out on a limb in March, turned around Nixon and today could deliver 22 of those 26 votes Rockefeller's.

A MONTH AGO, Nixon forces may have become concerned at evidence, such as NEA's second GOP delegate count, that the former vice president, with all his indicated immense lead, was showing almost no new forward speed.

Pressure has been applied at state conventions throughout recent weeks. In Colorado, Washington, Montana, New Mexico and other spots, maximum Nixon strength was extracted and Rocky was correspondingly sliced out of the action.

Nixon, in other words, has been getting even more delegates out of areas where he was already very strong.

WORSE STILL from Rockefeller's viewpoint, he has not been able to get and hold all the strength previous counts suggested should be his. Having fallen back earlier in promising Minnesota, he now has lost mid-season gains in Iowa and Illinois.

When Gov. Raymond Shafer of Pennsylvania declared for Nixon at Tulsa in mid-June, it became plain that Rocky's one-time 39-5 edge in that 64-member delegation had sagged to 26-14.

He faded off a point or two in place after place even as he was campaigning his hardest and looking more delegates in the eye than he had ever done in his life.

THIS REPORTER'S cross-country telephone survey of the 50 states disclosed where that where Rockefeller appeared he usually did well, made a good impression on delegates when cloistered with them, but changed

few votes his way. Sometimes, persuasive private polls have been produced to indicate that Rockefeller would run much better than Nixon against the chief Democratic prospects in particular states like Minnesota or Connecticut.

But these seem to have had limited effect.

The broader national polls show Rocky with slimmer advantage over Nixon when measured against the Democrats.

When the margin of error and the undecided factor are thrown into the balance, puzzled politicians wonder how much real difference exists in the voting pull of the two contenders.

IT IS WIDELY agreed among politicians and observers and only a very sharp national poll superiority for Rockefeller over Nixon in the remaining weeks before Miami Beach could seriously affect the developing swing to Nixon.

Since Rocky's personal campaigning appears to have produced no such result, his managers now are banking either on a smashing impact from his advertising campaign or some unforeseen event (most hopefully a grave error of some sort by Nixon) to reverse the delegate currents and put Rockefeller on a high course to the 1968 nomination.

But his chances are very, very dim.



With a smile of Christian charity, great Nixon's visage shown: He stilled the mighty tumult. He made the game go on.

Republicans See Big Gain in Governorships

By PAUL HOPE

WASHINGTON—The attention focused on the presidential election is obscuring the prospect of the Republican Party picking up a significant number of governorships this year.

Republican strategists say they are shooting for party control of 30 states, but actually expect more than that. They already hold 26.

Republicans made their big breakthrough at the statehouse in 1966, in a comeback following the disastrous elections of 1964. In 1966, the party made a net gain of 8 governorships, increasing its strength from 17 to 25. Another was added last year in Kentucky.

THE STATISTICS that bring smiles to the faces of Republicans this year where there is widespread dissatisfaction with the national Democratic administration are these: 21 governorships to be filled, of which 13 are held by Republicans, and only 8 by Democrats.

As things now stand, the Republicans are likely to lose few, if any, of those they hold. The party seems to have a good shot at 7 of the Democratic states and a marginally better chance at the other six.

Republican governors already are installed in 7 of the 10 biggest states and the chances are good for picking up at least one more of these this year.

THIS GOP state list includes the office in New York, California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Massachusetts and Florida — none of which are up for election this year.

The two big states where elections will be held are Illinois and Texas. The other of the first 10 — New Jersey — will be up in 1969.

The prize plum this year is Illinois, where the GOP has nominated one of its best vote getters, Richard B. Ogilvie, 46-year-old director of the Cook County Board of Commissioners.

OGILVIE has beaten the vaunted Democratic machine of Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley twice, first in 1962, when he won the Cook County (Chicago) sheriff's office, and again in 1966, when he won the board presidency.

His Democratic opponent will be Gov. Samuel H. Shapiro, who inherited the office a few weeks ago when former Gov. Otto Kerner resigned to accept a federal judgeship.

Not only did the Democratic maneuvering smack of a deal, but Daley added to his troubles by deliberately shunning aside two men who might have made stronger candidates than Shapiro — Sargent Shriver and Adlai Stevenson III.

REPUBLICAN chances in Texas are not good, but there may be a possibility of an upset. The Democrats had a divisive primary to choose a successor for Democratic Gov. John Connally, but Texas is always a hard state for the Republicans.

The eight Republican states where elections will be held are Arizona, Arkansas, Montana, New Mexico, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Washington and Wisconsin. Incumbents are expected to run for reelection in all but South Dakota.

GOP strategists feel uneasy only about Gov. Tim Wabcock of Montana and Gov. David F. Cargo of New Mexico, both of whom have had some political troubles.

BESIDES Illinois, the Democratic states in which Republicans seem to have a good shot are: Delaware, where Gov. Charles Terry has not been particularly impressive since he won election day; Indiana, where the Democrats have just nominated Lt. Gov. Robert L. Rock in a bitterly fought convention to run for the post now held by Gov. Roger D. Branigan; Iowa, where the popular Democratic Gov. Harold Hughes is moving out to run for the Senate.

Also, New Hampshire, where Gov. John W. King also has decided to run for the Senate; Vermont, where Gov. Philip D. Hoff, the first Democrat to win in 101 years when he took the governorship in 1961, will not run for reelection; and West Virginia, where there has been a fraud scandal involving some former Democratic officials and where the Republicans have put up the popular Rep. Arch A. Moore Jr.

If the Republicans feel they also will have an excellent chance of taking North Dakota if Democratic Gov. William Guy Miller Jr. resigns, they decide to run for the Senate.

Aside from Texas, the toughest ones for the GOP seem to be Kansas, Missouri, and North Carolina.