

Horse sense



By ERNEST V. JOINER

IN THE MAIL the other day I received a copy of a letter written to a newspaper by George Monical of Pontiac, IL. He opined that there is very little difference between the governments of 1776 and 1975, and wonders what we are celebrating 200 years of. He has a point, England never treated us the way Washington has. By comparison, the tyranny of King George III was the soul of compassion. King George never forced his subjects to labor from January to May just to pay their taxes. Wouldn't it be better to be governed by a known and responsible monarch than by the hundreds of anonymous, unelected, irresponsible and faceless agencies. I would rather have one of King George's troops quartered in my home than have my privacy violated by the CIA, IRS and FBI; my mail opened, my cables read, my phone tapped and my bedroom bugged. I would rather face the Officers of the King than be subject to the terror tactics of the Internal Revenue Service. King George III toyed ever so gently with restricting the freedom of the press, speech and assembly. But SB 1 now being debated in the U.S. Senate would restrict free assembly, free speech and free press in all areas dealing with the federal government

(crown?) The pitifully small taxes demanded by the king, which so enraged the colonists, is chickenfeed compared to those we unwhimperingly pay today.

THE COLONISTS complained in the Declaration of Independence that the king had cut off our trade with parts of the world; Washington now tells us with which countries we may trade and under what conditions and what we shall trade. They complained they were deprived of the right of trial by jury; every day Americans face trial by bureaucrats in county, state and federal agencies. Colonists said that taxes were imposed on them without their consent; and what else is new? Colonists objected to establishment or arbitrary government in a neighboring province; Washington imposes a 5th level of government, arbitrarily, without our consent, known as regional government. The king was charged with warring against the people; Washington wars against the people. There was no redress of grievances resulting from the arbitrary actions of the king; there is no redress of arbitrary action by the bureaus that govern us, either. The colonists "chafed under tariff barriers and trade restrictions," as to this day. The colonists never had to pay a fee and get a permit to build an outhouse in the country, or to take one down. They never had to get permission from the king to build homes, and the king never told his colonial subjects how those homes should be built, or how high the fence around them had to be. The king never told a farmer what he could plant, how much he could plant, or where. The king never freed our children from honest work so they could become delinquents, revolutionaries and dummies. The king didn't force a person to support a horde of deadbeats against his will. A man could make as much money as his hard work and ingenuity permitted. He could educate his children and bring them up as he saw fit. He wasn't told when he could buy a drink; that he had to join a union in order to work, or

starve, or be forced to buy a permit to catch a fish or shoot a duck. If the American people go so worked up over some petty restrictions and interference in their lives by King George III, why is it that they are so happy with present-day Washington that they want to touch off a year-long celebration in 1976 to observe the "end of tyranny" by George III?

HOW WAS YOUR Alice Doesn't Day? I didn't hear the rattle of chains stricken from the ankles of the underprivileged sex. But I did hear about the woman who took Alice Day off only to return to her desk the next morning to find this note. "Alice Doesn't work here any more." Perhaps one of the reasons why professional libbers haven't overcome the inequality they believe exists between men and women is because they believe more in Alice Doesn't than they do in Alice Tries Harder. One who walks off the job in such an instance would be considered too emotionally unstable and too ignorant of the guiding principles of free enterprise and private initiative to hold a job with this newspaper, and certainly not in an executive capacity. Alice probably believes in fair play. If so, she might consider granting men the same right to be silly by supporting a Willie Won't or Abbie Ain't Day. She already knows, as we all do, how important women are in today's world. Willie Won't Day would provide her with an insight as to the equal importance of men in the scheme of things. On Willie Won't Day men could adjourn to the bar for one day and leave their affairs untended, right down to not signing any paychecks! Come on, Alice. You already live longer than Willie and own or control the bulk of American wealth. At the same time you enjoy the protection of laws (man made) as an endangered species! Believe me, Alice, men are on your side. They'd love to live as long as you do and get cut into a more equal share of the wealth.

Mayor of Hardman

DEAR MISTER EDITOR:

Ed Doolittle come to the meeting at the country store Saturday night with another fistful of clippings, and the first one he peeled off and waved before the fellers reported where the federal Government is spending \$102,000 to study drunk fish, and another \$90,000 to make drunks out of rats. The only good Ed said he could see in the research was that the booze drunk by the fish and rats won't get drunk by some two-leg rat out to get stewed to the gills.

The piece said Senator William Proxmire had given the alcoholic fish his "Golden Fleece of the Month" award for the worst waste of taxpayers money. Ed said the good Senator ought to know one when it sees one, but for his money, he'd vote for the Army Corps of Engineers. Ed had saw by the paper where the Army now wants farmers to have to take out permits to plow. It ain't the Army's fault, Ed said, cause the courts has ordered the Corps of Engineers to come up with rules for draining and dredging around inland waters. Knowing the Army and their rules, Ed said, natural they went all the way with the job and come up with regulations covering everything from running a dragline in the river channel to hilling up a acre of corn.

General speaking, the fellers was agreed with Ed that a heap of our Government services is more of a burden. Clem Webster said he has been follerin the Department of Agriculture's reserch to come up with what country ham is, and he has decided that before them USDA boys make up their minds pork will be so high everybody will have forgot what it is. They started out, Clem reported, by drawing up "standards of identity" so they can tell what "country" and "ham" mean. After that, as far as they got was to rule that a hog don't have to be raised in the country to have country hams, and that folks who like to age their country hams a year or so can do it as long as the meat stays fit to eat. Clem said he didn't know what that reserch cost, but Sen. Proxmire might want to try some with his grits and breakfast steak, now that bacon is to high to reach.

Actual, broke in Bug Hookum, it ain't just the Government agencies that has crazy ideas. Bug said he saw where this college in Dallas has a class on how to gamble on racehorses, and he said he won't be surprised next to find out you can go to college and git credit fer crap shooting and cheating at poker without hiding under the football stands to do it. The teachers must of give up on learning younguns to read and write, and settled fer showing em how to make a living using the right numbers.

Ever onct in a while, these little services backfire. Did you see the other day where that bank in Omaha was giving customers coffee and donuts ever morning? The cafe next door set up a booth to lend money at coffee break, and they put out a big cookie jar fer a safe deposit box.

Yours truly,
MAYOR ROY



KATHRYN THE GREAT
WEATHERS THE STORMS

By LESTER KINSOLVING

For famed faith healer Kathryn Kuhlman, the past few months have been a sea of troubles. First there was a mountainous embarrassment regarding one of her most effective gimmicks: public testimony as to the validity of her assorted miracles of healing from fundamentalists M.D.s.

But one M.D. named William Nolen managed to get names and addresses of 25 people who were "miraculously healed" by Kathryn in Minneapolis. Among Dr. Nolen's published findings was one lady with Hodgkins disease who had been announced by Kathryn as cured of lung cancer. Another woman, with a cancerous vertebrae, threw off her brace and followed Kathryn's joyful command to run across the stage. The following day, he reported, her vertebrae collapsed. Four months later, she was dead.

Dr. Nolen's disastrous disclosures were followed by an internal eruption as Kathryn's personal administrator, Paul Bartholomew, filed a \$430,500 law suit for breach of contract. Kathryn fired both Bartholomew (who said he had been earning \$2,500 a week in commissions) as well as her pianist, Dino Kartsonakis.

Kartsonakis charged that Miss Kuhlman's announced income of \$25,000 a year was implemented by a "walk-in vault" in her suburban Pittsburgh home, where, he said, she keeps one million dollars worth of jewelry, along with another one million dollars in art works.

"As God as my judge that isn't true!" Kathryn told this column during a telephone interview. "You're perfectly free to visit and inspect my home."

Miss Kuhlman confirmed reports that she settled out of court with Bartholomew, "for much less than he had asked for. I found he was in the process of writing a book entitled 'The Late Great Kate' I am very much alive!"

Indeed she is—with a willpower like case-hardened steel and an absolutely devastating charm.

"You reporters seem to know absolutely everything," she giggled, "but I love you just the same!"

This despite my having described much of her methodology as pure corn and a delivery of a cross between Liberace's maiden aunt and Johnny Carson's announcer.

At the same time there is no denying that there is at least one miracle at every Kathryn Kuhlman service: that a 61-year-old female by that name can preach, pray, lead hymns, lay on hands and lead cheers for God—for five hours, non-stop. Such miraculous energy can be contagious, and exhilarating.

I also found her refreshingly honest, when, in 1970, I asked her if the name Burroughs A. Waltrip meant anything to her. Her great blue eyes widened as she gasped, "How did you know?"

Waltrip, a handsome, hellfire and brimstone Evangelist, left a wife and two children in Austin, Texas, in order to elope in 1938 with a gorgeous young reheaded Evangelist who, at age 25, headed the booming Denver Revival Tabernacle.

"He was the best looking guy God ever made!" recalls Kathryn. But she soon gave up this romance after the scandal of marrying a divorced man wrecked her church.

"I remember in 1938 in the train station in Los Angeles, he said 'If you get on that train, you'll never see me again,'" she recalls. "I never have."

Sibling Rivalry

By Terry D. Hirni, ACSW

This is the fourth article on Family Therapy and common problems found in working with families in therapy. This discussion will be on "sibling rivalry."

In every family, sibling rivalry exists in some form. Sibling rivalry is the relationship and interactions between the children in the family, as they attempt to get attention from the parent or parents. Children are born with the motivation for being the favorite child of the parents. How a parent responds to this motivation has tremendous effect on how a child feels about himself—his self-esteem. Then this effect on the child will play a big part in how the child responds to himself, people around him, and his environment. Sibling rivalry is also the way in which a child learns to handle competitive situations.

There are several ways a child might respond to the sibling rivalry: (1) He may feel good about himself because he is treated as the favorite child. (2) He may feel good about himself because he is treated equally. (3) He may feel bad about himself because he sees himself as undesirable, so he totally withdraws, or (4) He may feel bad about himself because he sees himself as being treated worse than other children.

In the first situation, where a child feels good about himself because he or she is treated as the favorite child, this happens most frequently with the oldest child or oldest son. The reason is usually that this child, being the oldest, gets the most responsibilities and privileges. Because he gets more responsibilities and privileges, this child may interpret this as his being more competent and better in the eyes of his parents. To further this particular feeling, this child may constantly put his brothers and sisters down to make himself look better in the eyes of his parents. If the parents fall into this trap, it will reinforce this child's feelings. To expand this idea, when the child leaves the home situation he will probably use the same techniques to try to obtain the number one role in school, on the job, politics, clubs, or whatever he or she gets involved in. In family therapy, this type of child is usually very resistive to therapy because they have "got it made" in the family and don't want to give up anything.

The second response—feels good about himself because he is treated equally—is probably the most desirable situation, but is extremely difficult for parents to accomplish. This equal treatment toward the children would involve (1) equal time, (2) equal affection, and (3) equal responsibilities and privileges according to age. The equal time and equal affection are probably the easiest to accomplish, even though they can be very difficult. But how can parents give equal responsibilities and privileges at a certain age when each child matures at a different age level? Adults can understand this, but children usually can't understand abstract concepts like this. Also, in the equal treatment parents have to guard against favoring one child in an argument between children. This is a technique a child frequently uses to try to put another child down and get on the right side of his parents. If a parent sets himself up as the arbitrator, usually this will increase the fighting between the children. When the child knows he will have to handle his own battles with his brother or sister, he or she is less likely to become involved in arguments or fights.

The third situation—feels bad about himself because he sees himself as undesirable, so he totally withdraws—is not very common, but is very destructive to the child who feels this way. This child feels that he is not acceptable to his parents or siblings and creates his own little fantasy world in which he is accepted. The cause of this child's reaction may be due to: (1) fear of other siblings, (2) fear of parents or parents, or (3) fear of both siblings and parent or parents. This child may feel his brothers and sisters are so much better than he is, and that his parents think this also, that the competition is more than he can bear; hence, he withdraws partially or totally.

The fourth case—feels bad about himself because he sees himself as treated worse than other children—is probably one of the most common problems. If the child perceives himself as not having equal treatment, this sibling quickly deduces that "there must be something wrong with me since my parents don't treat me in the same way or give me as much attention, love, responsibility, and privileges as the other children." The parents in fact may be treating the children as equally as possible, but the child may not perceive the situation this way. If this is the case, Johnny may try to get more attention through acting out behaviors such as stealing, heavy use of drugs, or other rebellious activities. Another way Johnny could act to get the special attention is by always doing everything his parents want him to do—"Mr. Goody-Two-Shoes." In this way, Johnny thinks he'll be accepted then by his parents and then will receive an equivalent response from his parents. A not too common example of this with a female child is an incestuous relationship with her father in an attempt to become accepted by him.

Again, in family therapy each member becomes more aware of why he is responding in such a way so he may gain more control of his actions. If parents are treating their children unequally, they can become aware of this and learn techniques to resolve this situation. If the child feels he is being treated unequally, the parents and child learn why, and both gain a better understanding of the responses of the other person. Family therapy is quite complicated and complex, but if each member invests himself in the process, in the long run he can gain a great deal from it.



"Because I Wanted To.
I'm The President, You Know..."

FROM THE CORNER

By ERNIE CERESA

Many newspapers seem upset about placing the death penalty on the ballot for the next general election in Oregon. Some believe putting a convicted killer to death is both inhumane and costly. They believe in a rehabilitation program for the convicted felon. While their intentions are good, rehabilitation is not the solution.

Recently a convicted killer was released from prison after serving 18 years for murder. Within three weeks of his parole from prison he killed his mother and father. Yet, his parole board claimed he was a model prisoner and had been rehabilitated. Had he been executed his parents would be alive today.

In past years when a person stole a horse or some cattle he was promptly hanged for his crime. While his death may not have deterred anyone else it surely prevented him from any further crime.

In a recent issue of this newspaper an article appeared where the district attorney was going to prosecute a juvenile, age 17, for committing 9 Class C and Class B felonies and 1 Class A felony. He asked to have the juvenile remanded to justice court, however, the outcome is still pending. If this youngster is tried in juvenile court his sentence will be hardly worth the court cost and the judges time.

The Legislative Interim Committee on the Judiciary is presently working on new legislation to prevent juveniles from appearing in justice court for their crimes.

District Attorney Dennis Doherty submitted the following to the committee:

If this draft remains intact, a juvenile can only be transferred to adult court when he has committed a (1) Class A felony, or (2) a class B or C felony if he has previously been adjudicated twice for felonies. How about a juvenile who has committed six misdemeanor thefts and, after being before the juvenile court six times, commits a First Degree Theft or a Second Degree Burglary? He can't be transferred until he has committed two more of those crimes, despite the fact that his six prior experiences in juvenile court have not led to his rehabilitation.

I have a case involving two juveniles pending at this time. Over a six month period of time they committed 9 Class B and C felonies and 1 Class A misdemeanor in this county. In addition, one of the juveniles has implicated himself in several other felonies in other counties. The 10 Morrow County crimes in which they are implicated involve reported

losses of \$5400 and evidence of continuing felonious delinquency and utter disregard for the rights of other citizens. One of the two juveniles will be 18 in six weeks. The other juvenile, though younger, has been a ward of the juvenile court. The offenses were solved at the same time and petitions were filed contemporaneously. Thus, there is not a Class A felony involved and there are not two previously adjudicated felonies to form a basis for transfer. Under this proposed draft, neither juvenile could be transferred to adult court. Now, what in the world can the juvenile court do for either juvenile at this point, and where is the sense of a law which says that the older juvenile, at least, cannot be transferred to adult court?

The draft provides that "statements made by a child prior to or during a transfer hearing... shall not be admissible at subsequent criminal prosecutions." This is patently absurd and stupid. This language is so broad that it would preclude any confessions, or any lies for that matter, obtained from the juvenile in the course of a legitimate investigation. If the juvenile testified under oath or by affidavit and could be proven to have lied, this language would prevent a perjury or false swearing prosecution. If the concern set forth in the commentary to this section are legitimate, then disallow all statements of the juvenile except those bearing directly upon the criminal act alleged.

In a recent issue of "Fresh Tracks" a publication of the American Humane Association there appears the story of the death of a trained horse during the filming of a new motion picture. The death of the horse drew criticism from the AHA. According to the film's executive producer, Jack Grossberg, the horse died accidentally while swimming in the Yellowstone River near Billings, MT, when it hit a car body with one hoof and suffered a heart attack.

The AHA responded to the death saying, "If the river bottom had been checked, action could have been moved left or right a few feet and the accident prevented."

Another article says, "Humane Societies work a great deal out of necessity, in the area of animal control." It is my understanding that the Humane Society and Animal Control are two separate bodies and the Humane Society was formed solely for the prevention of cruelty to animals and children.

THE GAZETTE-TIMES

WORROW COUNTY'S NEWSPAPER
Box 337, Heppner, Ore. 97836
Subscription rate: \$6 per year in Oregon, \$7 elsewhere
Ernest V. Joiner, Publisher

Published every Thursday and entered as a second-class matter at the post office at Heppner, Oregon, under the act of March 3, 1879. Second-class postage paid at Heppner, Oregon.