

Letters to The Times

Aid for Dutch Advocated

Administration Is Criticized for Not Backing Them in New Guinea

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is a source of real wonderment to me what prompts the Kennedy Administration's action against the Dutch concerning the Indonesian dispute over Papua or Netherlands New Guinea.

Rather than discourage the Dutch in the legitimate defense of their colony, we should aid them as much as we are able against what amounts to a blatant form of Asian imperialism. If need be, we should dispatch elements of the Seventh Fleet to patrol the waters of west New Guinea to discourage Indonesian aggression.

We support today and have supported in the past so many regimes of dubious character and merit, it would seem that we would have no hesitation in giving our wholehearted commitment where the issues are so clear. The inhabitants of Papua are indigenous to this island territory and have no more in common with the Indonesians, either racially or culturally, than, say, the natives of Samoa or Fiji.

These native Papuans are for the most part extremely primitive and backward, without hope of self-rule except under considerable tutelage for many years to come. At best, they want only reasonably prompt independence and self-rule, which the Dutch are not averse to giving them. But they obviously don't desire the rule that President Sukarno is preparing to visit upon them for egocentric and nationalistic purposes.

No Right to Territory

The Indonesians have no more right to western New Guinea than did the Japanese twenty years ago. At that time the Netherlands helped us to dislodge the Japanese from their ill-gotten territory in this area to the full extent of their ability.

What irony that today, in an area of remarkably little economic or colonial value, and while undertaking their quite unprofitable responsibilities to the native population, the Dutch are utterly abandoned by their past brothers-in-arms and present NATO allies. Certainly the Dutch have as much justification for their paternal occupation in Papua as has the United States in Okinawa, if not more.

But in order to keep "friends" with the rather immature and ultranationalistic Government of Sukarno, which is bent on creating its own "Greater East Asia Co-Prospersity Sphere," we turn our backs on principle and old friends. We deny them the right to use our international airports for troops to reinforce their threatened garrisons in Papua. If we can't help, why do we hinder?

Admittedly the Dutch have not always been the most enlightened of colonial rulers, and often in similar controversies they have been in the wrong. But this time, when they are so plainly in the right, why don't we give them our support?

JOHN C. WAGNER.

Denver, Feb. 13, 1962.

Freedom of Speech vs. License

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Since reading your editorial of Feb. 1 on Hitler and the right of George Rockwell to hold a celebration of Hitler's birthday, in the name of free speech, some pertinent thoughts come to mind.

Should a typhoid carrier or one suffering from incipient smallpox or a similar disease have "freedom" to poison the atmosphere, thereby infecting others?

It would seem that there should be a difference between freedom of opinions and dissemination of hatred. Didn't we fight a great war to stamp out such evils?

In Tanganyika I understand they have vowed to expel anyone, be he black, white, European, African or Asian, who spreads race hatred. This might be a good idea.

At any rate, such poison should be discouraged and not encouraged in the name of "freedom of speech."

GRACE BOONE.

Stamford, Conn., Feb. 2, 1962.

'Foolproof' Inspection

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The American decision to seek a "foolproof" inspection system against the "preparation" of bomb tests is a fateful step backward.

First, it is obviously impossible to negotiate such an agreement within the apparent time limit specified. Secondly, such a broad agreement is properly a part of general and complete disarmament.

The Russians have always objected to much inspection for little disarmament. This was responsible for the failure of the talks on preventing surprise attack some time ago.

Thirdly, we ourselves prepared the tunnels for our largely abortive underground tests while the morato-

rium was in effect. Some "preparations" are actually impossible to detect in the midst of legitimate mining and other operations.

One aspect of this change, however, is that it has exposed the bankruptcy of the "You can't detect tests" school of scientists and military men. Their counsel prevailed in 1958 when a test ban agreement based on limited inspection was within sight. The world would be vastly different today if their advice had not been taken.

JOHN E. ULLMANN.

Professor and Chairman, Department of Management, Hofstra College.

Hempstead, N. Y., Feb. 8, 1962.

Changing Divorce Laws

National Failure to Face Basic Questions Charged

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of Feb. 3 assailing New York's "unrealistic, antiquated" divorce law is unexceptionable as far as it goes. Undoubtedly the addition of grounds other than adultery would do much to help those unfortunates who cannot presently afford the trip to and sojourn in Reno, as well as eliminate some of the most flagrant fraud now practiced in order to conjure up cases of adultery.

But the editorial raises more basic questions. Even in states with a more enlightened divorce law than that of New York, the parties must usually go through a lot of hypocritical folderol to transform what is often a straight case of incompatibility into one of "mental cruelty."

At the same time the plaintiff must purport to present herself as a model of unforgiving virtue, lest she be impaled on either of the twin horns of recrimination or condonation.

Moreover, ever since the Supreme Court held that an out-of-state divorce in which the defendant spouse at least enters an appearance (albeit only through an attorney) is valid everywhere, it has become quite customary for persons desiring a quick divorce to journey to one of the divorce havens with a short residence period (until recently Alabama granted such divorces overnight) and a leniently administered divorce law. Thereby they circumvent the more stringent divorce law of their home state, and remove one of the pressures toward that law's reform.

Thus the perjury and unreality, with their consequent disrespect for the law, are by no means confined to New York. All over the United States, with a few notable exceptions, there has been a failure to face directly such questions as whether a divorce proceeding should properly be regarded as just another adversary proceeding grounded on the fault of one of the parties and whether two people whose marriage has irretrievably broken down should be entitled to a divorce.

I do not mean to suggest that these are easy questions. In 1956 the British Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce split nine to nine on the introduction of a new ground of divorce based on the total breakdown of the marriage. And for us, with our Federal system, the problem is further complicated.

But it seems clear that until we address ourselves to some of these fundamental questions there is bound to be a large measure of unreality in this area.

FRANK E. A. SANDER.

Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard

University.

Cambridge, Mass., Feb. 9, 1962.

For Information on Subways

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A. C. Burgess in his letter published Jan. 29 asks why men are not stationed in the subways to give directions to passengers.

We do not have the type of information booths that are used in the department stores, but all of the 35,000 employes of the transit system, and particularly those in daily contact with the public, such as transit policemen, railroad clerks, conductors and platform-men, are instructed and required to give directions to, and assist, any passengers who may need assistance.

In addition, in the last few years the Transit Authority has distributed over 1,500,000 subway maps to passengers, conventions, hotels, schools and to many residents from other states who planned to visit New York City.

Maps have been made available at all subway change booths. They can also be obtained by writing the New York City Transit Authority, 370 Jay Street, Brooklyn 1, N. Y., Public Relations Department.

SYLVESTER V. POINTKOWSKI.

Director of Public Relations, New

York City Transit Authority.

Brooklyn, Feb. 13, 1962.