

Medford Mail Tribune
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.

Subscription Rates
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. 10.00
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. 5.00

Flight o' Time
Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO
Dec. 15, 1953 (Tuesday)
Miss Sally Harris, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lester Harris, 707 S. Oakdale Ave., freshman student at Oregon State College, is now a member of the Rook Rally squad at OSC.

20 YEARS AGO
Dec. 15, 1943 (Wednesday)
Second Lt. Thomas A. Helman, Flying Fortress pilot, slightly wounded in raid over Bremen, Germany.

30 YEARS AGO
Dec. 15, 1923 (Friday)
John J. Murphy, born in Ashland in 1860 and a lifelong resident of Jackson county, dies after a brief illness.

40 YEARS AGO
Dec. 15, 1923 (Saturday)
District Attorney Newton W. Borden investigating alleged "County peonage case."

50 YEARS AGO
Dec. 15, 1913 (Monday)
Rogue valley automobile owners meet in attempt to have state automobile licensing declared illegal.

What's Your I.Q.?
Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

1. In which city of Louisiana is Tulane University?
2. The Milky Way is a cloud of meteors: true or false?

3. Identify the German breed of dog that is noted for its short legs, long body and ability to enter badger holes.
4. Name the capital of California.
5. Was it the 13th, 14th, or 15th Amendment that abolished slavery?

6. The human body is made up of seven elements: carbon is one, can you name four others?
7. Who was President of the U. S. when the Panama Canal Zone was acquired?
8. What is the largest city in area in the United States?
9. Cirrostratus, Cirrocumulus, Altostratus, and Stratus are all types of what?
10. Are icebergs ever formed from salt water?

Defense and the Economy

We are now witnessing a classic example of the meaning of Martin Luther's comment that it all depends on whose ox is gored.
It is easy—very easy indeed—to call for economy in government, stopping wasteful spending, and the elimination of needless programs. It is a popular tune.

But let an economy movement eliminate something in which such economy-minded people are interested, and listen to the howls of anguish.

THE Defense Department has announced the elimination or the cutting down of 33 military installations in many parts of the country. The objective is to save a portion of the overwhelming military budget.

But the move is now assailed in the halls of Congress and elsewhere as "false economy," and hands are wrung at the adverse effect it will have on the local business scene.

Oregonians, by and large, can sit smugly and watch other people's military installations close, for we have few in the state. But the anguish is real for those who have lost a job or must accept a transfer.

THIS is one reason we have always taken a dim view of the complaints that Oregon has not received its "fair share" of military and defense spending. It provides a quick shot in the arm for the economy, but it is not a good base on which to base a long-range plan for the future.

A splendid example is Seattle, home of the giant Boeing company. The saying goes that when Boeing sneezes, Seattle runs a fever. And it is true that when Boeing loses a big contract, or is involved in a labor dispute, the effect is immediately felt throughout the city.

This in turn is one of the reasons we haven't been able to get very excited about the Boardman deal with Boeing. It may (or may not) turn out to be important to the state, and particularly the northeast corner. But if it does become an important part of the economy, and then, due to the vagaries of military needs, closes, the results could be painful.

THE closure of the military installations, and the fluctuations of Seattle's economy as Boeing's fortunes fluctuate, (and both represent only a tiny portion of overall defense expenditures,) are but graphic reminders of how much of the nation's economy is based on defense spending.

There are economists who will argue that the United States cannot afford an end to the cold war, simply because it would so jolt the economy that a serious depression would ensue.

We don't wholly agree with that, but we do believe that any major reduction in the defense budget would require a massive effort by the federal government to ease the economic shock.

ONE of the uncomfortable realizations about the cold war is that so many hundreds of thousands of people have what amounts to a vested interest in its continuing.

Workers in defense industries, career military men, stockholders and officials of the thousands of firms with defense-related contracts—all would feel the blow should there be any marked reduction in international tensions and a resulting drastic cut in defense spending.

Federal officials, including Congressmen, are fully aware of this fact, although many are reluctant to admit it. But their realization is fully evidenced in the cries of "false economy" when a military installation—vital to the economy of a specific area, even if not vital to national defense—is phased out. — E. A.

Succession Proposals

In considering the line of succession to the Presidency, as many people are these days, it is interesting to note that one proposal for revising it is a Constitutional amendment providing for a second vice president.

Our women's editor thinks this is a good idea. She also thinks it would be fine to have a woman as second vice president.

The vice presidency has often been described as being the most inconsequential office in the federal government. If this is so, what would the second vice presidency be like?

ANOTHER proposal which has some merit, and also the advantage of not requiring the lengthy procedure of amending the Constitution, is for Congress, upon the death of a President and the assumption of that office by the vice president, to designate immediately an official who would be next in line.

Probably he could not be designated as vice president, because the Constitution prescribes the way in which a vice president is chosen. But Congress is empowered to provide for the further succession, and in advance. It could create an office not entitled vice president for the express purpose of providing a possible successor.

Whatever solution is devised, one hopes it is put into effect soon. — E. A.

P. S. — Incidentally, the 22nd Amendment to the Constitution does not prohibit Lyndon Johnson from serving two full terms, after this unexpired term, should he be elected. It would have done so if the unexpired portion of the term had exceeded two years. — E. A.

"Onward! — Help! I've Been Stabbed!"



Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann
(C) 1963 The Washington Post

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION
Speaker McCormack, who now stands next in line to the President, is naturally enough diffident about discussing the problem of the Presidential succession.

There is another radical defect in the present law. In our system of government, it has happened many times that one or both of the houses of Congress is controlled by the opposition party.

There should never be such a premium on the assassination of a President offered to criminal lunatics or conspirators to brood upon. The very thing that has sustained the country since Nov. 22 has been the continuity of the Presidency, the undisputed accession of a completely-qualified man.

There is a way, undoubtedly an organic part of the intent of the Constitution, in which real deference can be paid to the principle of election.

It would be quite feasible, and perhaps desirable, to provide that, when the line of succession reaches the secretary of state or the other Cabinet officers, the man who takes over the office shall be only the acting President until a new election can be held at mid-term or at the end of the four-year term.

I think, myself, that this ancient formula should also apply to the Vice President when he succeeds. It would not affect President Johnson, who must face the voters in less than 12 months.

If we arouse ourselves enough to deal firmly with the problem of the succession, we should proceed at once to repair the other great hole in our system, which is what to do when a President is incapacitated, as were Garfield and Wilson and, for a time, Eisenhower. Nobody will, I think, propose that the speaker of the House should, on that constitutionally he could, serve also as the acting President.

DEFENDERS of the 1947 law appeal to the principle of election on the mystical ground that, because Mr. McCormack has been elected repeatedly from the 8th District of Massachusetts, he has become thereby anointed and qualified for President. Applied to the concrete facts, the "principle" is nonsense, and it has no relation whatever to any real choice of the President by the will of the people.

There are several very grave objections to the present law. One is that, because the congressional system operates by seniority and whatnot, it has provided a successor who is unprepared and unqualified to succeed. Nobody has ever given five minutes' thought to the qualifications of the man who may be the next President of the United States.

Under the old law, where the next in line would be the secretary of state, the fact that he might become President would become a great consideration in his appointment and his confirmation by the Senate. The reality of this was proved in 1945 when President Truman's accession left Secretary Stettinius as the next in line.

Though Edward Stettinius was a nice man, he was manifestly unqualified to be President, and a great agitation arose at once which brought about his replacement as secretary of state by a man of vast experience in gov-

ernment, James Byrnes of South Carolina.

THE WHOLE of the two hours between 6:30 and 8:30 a.m. are reserved for reading—about one-quarter for the newspapers and the rest for the day's docket—and for pondering the former notes about things-to-be-done tomorrow that President Johnson has the odd habit of writing to himself.

WHAT IS more interesting still is the fact that the continuity of the Johnson White House with the Kennedy White House really seems to be assured at last. The symbol of this remarkable fact is the resumption of his former duties as the President's appointments secretary by Kenneth O'Donnell, who gave his entire life to safeguarding President Kennedy's political interests, and is now charged with doing the same thing for President Johnson.

This continuity, it must be added, was by no means assured when the hopeful announcement was made that all President Kennedy's key staff members would continue on the job.

Every one of the men who served Kennedy was—and still is—like someone who has suffered a battlefield amputation. Although they said they would continue on the job, there were hard days when it seemed extremely doubtful whether this man or that man could really manage to do so.

THE ACHIEVEMENT of continuity in the White House is in fact one of those very rare

political events that are distinguished from the common run by the creditable roles played by everyone concerned. Shabbiness and pettiness are generally to be found somewhere, in every political process; but for once they have been absent.

The new President, who has rarely been considered a humble man, has had the humility and good sense to see that he needed the trained Kennedy staff members to extend his grasp and reach. He has also had the human sympathy to deal correctly with these men in their amputated conditions.

With sympathy, it has also been admitted, President Johnson has mingled astuteness. His irresistible rally cry to the human legacy of political specialists was the grim remark: "It would be a poor memorial to President Kennedy to see Richard M. Nixon in this house."

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop
(c) New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

JOHNSON'S WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON—After a time of great pain and uncertainty, President Johnson's White House is beginning to assume its own shape and character.

To begin with, one should not be misled by the impression of ceaseless, almost compulsive bustle that has been conveyed by the new President's office round of conferences, telephone calls, and ceremonial greetings.

A good many people may have gooseflesh at the thought, but it is nonetheless a fact that he starts work at 6:20 a.m. His young Texas aide and friend, Jack Valenti, wakes him for his morning tea and simultaneously hands him the morning papers and the new day's docket of official memoranda and other documents.

THE WHOLE of the two hours between 6:30 and 8:30 a.m. are reserved for reading—about one-quarter for the newspapers and the rest for the day's docket—and for pondering the former notes about things-to-be-done tomorrow that President Johnson has the odd habit of writing to himself.

At the day's end, however, the pace slackens when it is time for 20 minutes or half-hour of exercise in the White House pool, which the doctors have insisted on. Staff members are invited to the brink, so to say, and current problems are informally discussed while the President—not exactly a new Johnny Weissmuller—obediently wallows along as the doctors require.

Dinner, often with a few friends, ends about 10 p.m., and that leaves times for another hour or more of quiet reading before the day's work ends in sleep. The schedule is only interesting because it leaves so much more time for study and reflection than might be guessed from the Johnsonian frenzy of the more public part of the day but for this reason it is very interesting indeed.

OUR most famous kidnapping case, of course, was that of the infant son of Charles and Anne Morrow Lindbergh in 1932. But there was no ransom then. The kidnapers became frightened and murdered the child.

IT IS probably that of Richard the Lion Hearted, of England. He was on his way back from the Holy Land, where in the Third Crusade he and Saladin had performed miracles of chivalry in the fighting.

A truce was finally arranged, and Richard started for home. His ship was wrecked in the Adriatic Sea, and he tried to make his way home overland through Germany. He was captured by his mortal enemy, the Duke of Austria, and turned over to the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry VI, who held him for ransom.

THE ransom demanded? It was 150,000 marks.

HOW much is a mark? Well, the mark was an old European unit of weight for gold and silver. It was equal to eight ounces of either. At the present price of gold, a gold

mark would have been worth \$200. At that rate, 150,000 gold marks would have amounted to \$448 million.

AT ANY rate—the ransom paid by the British people to get their king back amounted to somewhere in the neighborhood of \$450 million—assuming that the value of the gold mark was anywhere in the neighborhood of the value ascribed to it by the historians.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

Justice by Publicity Is Not Justice

By ERIC SEVAREID
(Distributed 1963, By The Mail Tribune, Inc.)
(All Rights Reserved)

It was hatred concentrated to the point of paranoia that killed President Kennedy. About such a state of mind very little can be done; individuals like Oswald will always be with us.

But it was sheer disrespect for the legal rights and processes which make civilized life possible that killed the President's killer, and about this condition much can be done.

The events in Dallas revealed in a blinding flash the degree of venom that has been poisoning the American society. They also revealed for all to comprehend the alarming degree of carelessness and callousness with which police, prosecutors and all the information media

have for a long time and in many cities handled everything that is implied in that precious phrase "due process of law."

Justice by publicity is not justice. We have reached the point where most of the ablest lawyers in the country refuse to

GREAT IDEAS... From the Great Books

By Mortimer J. Adler
(c) 1963, Publishers Newspaper Syndicate

ELECTRONIC REVOLUTION
Dear Dr. Adler: Do the great books provide the answer to automation? How will the average individual be able to share in the unlimited material wealth our technology will be able to produce?

Quinten Topp
1963 Pearl St.
Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio

Dear Mr. Topp: "Automation" is something more than a new name for the automatic operations which have played an increasingly important role in manufacturing since the Industrial Revolution.

The new electronic revolution seems to fulfill the age-long dream of a time when all menial and routine tasks would be done by machinery. In a certain sense, Aristotle foresaw the possibility of a situation in which "every tool could perform its own work when ordered, or by seeing what to do in advance."

His words roughly describe the self-powered, self-controlled, and self-adjusting processes of our new technology.

Yet automation has brought much unhappiness to many people. It has "disemployed" hundreds of thousands of men. That they are "disemployed" means not merely that they personally are out of work, but that their jobs and skills are no longer necessary to produce goods and services. Increased production has been accompanied by key pro-

cesses in certain industries. It may well be true, as some corporation executives assure us, that "in the long run, automation will create new industries and new jobs, so that in the future everyone who wants to work will have a job. Yet now, in the short run, the hundreds of thousands of workers who are disemployed every year through automation are paying the price of automation and humiliation for the increased efficiency of our industrial system. The glittering network of automatic controls which have helped to produce our "affluent" society have heaped suffering and degradation upon the disemployed who have been deprived of their formerly useful role in that society.

The phenomenon of disemployment through automation raises significant issues for the philosophy of work. Participation in the work process hitherto has been essential for the psychic, as well as the economic, well-being of mature men in modern society. Thinkers such as Ruskin, Tolstoy, and Gandhi held that "bread labor"—working for a living—is essential to human dignity. And Paul Goodman, the author of "Growing Up Absurd," has recently pointed to the lack of socially useful work as one of the factors in the demoralization of present-day youth.

Yet technological developments have removed us farther and farther away from working on the soil or any kind of manual activity, aside from sports and do-it-yourself projects. If the dreams of automation's extreme enthusiasts come true, we will see a time when most work is done by automatic electronic devices, with little or no human assistance. We will then see whether all-out automation will result in a permanent decrease of morale and human dignity.

Perhaps the classic philosophers of work are mistaken, and it is not necessary to take part in productive operations in order to live a fully human existence. Work, according to Aristotle, is only a means of providing us with our subsistence, so that we can pursue leisure activities. And these, as I have so often pointed out, consist in thought, learning, and communal service—the activities which fulfill us as human beings.

If his theory about the relation of work and leisure is true, then automation could provide a greater opportunity than ever before to partake in humanly meaningful activities. Our problem would then be to devise a new system of distribution, which would enable everyone to enjoy a decent standard of living, without having to work a good part of the waking day. Up to now, aside from the lucky few who have lived off their wealth, men have had a living from their wages and salaries. Perhaps the problem of widespread disemployment might be solved by making every man a part-time capitalist, with part of his income derived from capital shares and part from a job—as suggested by Louis Kelso and myself in "The Capitalist Manifesto."

of Germany. At every great castle, he would stop and SING, hoping that his voice would be recognized by Richard. He finally stopped and sang before the castle of Durrenstein.

Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

It's an interesting tale. Richard heard him and recognized his voice and SANG BACK. Blondel recognized Richard's voice—and so the mystery of where he was incarcerated was solved. From there on, it was merely a case of negotiation, backed up by the threat of war if some kind of deal wasn't made.

ONE more question: How did they find Richard of the Lion Heart—who had been carefully hidden away by his captor?

Justice by publicity is not justice. We have reached the point where most of the ablest lawyers in the country refuse to take criminal cases for fear of taint by publicity, as we were once in the condition where most of the best lawyers were afraid to take loyalty cases. The late Senator McCarthy did not invent guilt by accusation, we were getting there on our own, but he helped condition this society to the strange and frightening process.

What the Dallas police did in the case of Oswald any number of other police in other cities have done in the cases of hundreds of other suspects. Even the FBI which, by the uncanny inversions of publicity, has become more sacrosanct than our highest court, has declared men guilty before any trial was held. It has been common practice for police at all levels to announce confessions which ought not be revealed outside a courtroom.

What ought to be our most august law making body, the United States Senate, has felt unembarrassedly free to provide a national platform so that the cheapest of cheap crooks could broadcast accusations

against men not yet tried and found guilty. The news media have simply gone along in most cases. Indeed, we have under the spectacle of microphones and cameras thrust at a suspect freshly caught and handcuffed with the demanding question, "Why did you do it?"

A certain number of lunatics at large is something any society has to endure. But a spreading disrespect for the legal procedures without which the substance of law, and therefore of order, cannot be protected is not endurable and need not continue. This wretched condition is not a helpless matter of human nature. It is a matter formal codes of conduct. The organizations of police men, prosecutors, lawyers, and journalists have their own codes, written or understood. They have only to live by them.

Since Biblical times and before wise men have seen and acknowledged that power and money are corruptors. The 20th century has added a third factor to the list—publicity.

Justice by publicity is not justice. We have reached the point where most of the ablest lawyers in the country refuse to

take criminal cases for fear of taint by publicity, as we were once in the condition where most of the best lawyers were afraid to take loyalty cases. The late Senator McCarthy did not invent guilt by accusation, we were getting there on our own, but he helped condition this society to the strange and frightening process.

What the Dallas police did in the case of Oswald any number of other police in other cities have done in the cases of hundreds of other suspects. Even the FBI which, by the uncanny inversions of publicity, has become more sacrosanct than our highest court, has declared men guilty before any trial was held. It has been common practice for police at all levels to announce confessions which ought not be revealed outside a courtroom.

What ought to be our most august law making body, the United States Senate, has felt unembarrassedly free to provide a national platform so that the cheapest of cheap crooks could broadcast accusations

against men not yet tried and found guilty. The news media have simply gone along in most cases. Indeed, we have under the spectacle of microphones and cameras thrust at a suspect freshly caught and handcuffed with the demanding question, "Why did you do it?"

A certain number of lunatics at large is something any society has to endure. But a spreading disrespect for the legal procedures without which the substance of law, and therefore of order, cannot be protected is not endurable and need not continue. This wretched condition is not a helpless matter of human nature. It is a matter formal codes of conduct. The organizations of police men, prosecutors, lawyers, and journalists have their own codes, written or understood. They have only to live by them.

Since Biblical times and before wise men have seen and acknowledged that power and money are corruptors. The 20th century has added a third factor to the list—publicity.

Justice by publicity is not justice. We have reached the point where most of the ablest lawyers in the country refuse to

take criminal cases for fear of taint by publicity, as we were once in the condition where most of the best lawyers were afraid to take loyalty cases. The late Senator McCarthy did not invent guilt by accusation, we were getting there on our own, but he helped condition this society to the strange and frightening process.

What the Dallas police did in the case of Oswald any number of other police in other cities have done in the cases of hundreds of other suspects. Even the FBI which, by the uncanny inversions of publicity, has become more sacrosanct than our highest court, has declared men guilty before any trial was held. It has been common practice for police at all levels to announce confessions which ought not be revealed outside a courtroom.

What ought to be our most august law making body, the United States Senate, has felt unembarrassedly free to provide a national platform so that the cheapest of cheap crooks could broadcast accusations

against men not yet tried and found guilty. The news media have simply gone along in most cases. Indeed, we have under the spectacle of microphones and cameras thrust at a suspect freshly caught and handcuffed with the demanding question, "Why did you do it?"

A certain number of lunatics at large is something any society has to endure. But a spreading disrespect for the legal procedures without which the substance of law, and therefore of order, cannot be protected is not endurable and need not continue. This wretched condition is not a helpless matter of human nature. It is a matter formal codes of conduct. The organizations of police men, prosecutors, lawyers, and journalists have their own codes, written or understood. They have only to live by them.

Since Biblical times and before wise men have seen and acknowledged that power and money are corruptors. The 20th century has added a third factor to the list—publicity.

Justice by publicity is not justice. We have reached the point where most of the ablest lawyers in the country refuse to

take criminal cases for fear of taint by publicity, as we were once in the condition where most of the best lawyers were afraid to take loyalty cases. The late Senator McCarthy did not invent guilt by accusation, we were getting there on our own, but he helped condition this society to the strange and frightening process.

What the Dallas police did in the case of Oswald any number of other police in other cities have done in the cases of hundreds of other suspects. Even the FBI which, by the uncanny inversions of publicity, has become more sacrosanct than our highest court, has declared men guilty before any trial was held. It has been common practice for police at all levels to announce confessions which ought not be revealed outside a courtroom.

What ought to be our most august law making body, the United States Senate, has felt unembarrassedly free to provide a national platform so that the cheapest of cheap crooks could broadcast accusations

against men not yet tried and found guilty. The news media have simply gone along in most cases. Indeed, we have under the spectacle of microphones and cameras thrust at a suspect freshly caught and handcuffed with the demanding question, "Why did you do it?"

A certain number of lunatics at large is something any society has to endure. But a spreading disrespect for the legal procedures without which the substance of law, and therefore of order, cannot be protected is not endurable and need not continue. This wretched condition is not a helpless matter of human nature. It is a matter formal codes of conduct. The organizations of police men, prosecutors, lawyers, and journalists have their own codes, written or understood. They have only to live by them.

Since Biblical times and before wise men have seen and acknowledged that power and money are corruptors. The 20th century has added a third factor to the list—publicity.

Justice by publicity is not justice. We have reached the point where most of the ablest lawyers in the country refuse to

take criminal cases for fear of taint by publicity, as we were once in the condition where most of the best lawyers were afraid to take loyalty cases. The late Senator McCarthy did not invent guilt by accusation, we were getting there on our own, but he helped condition this society to the strange and frightening process.

What the Dallas police did in the case of Oswald any number of other police in other cities have done in the cases of hundreds of other suspects. Even the FBI which, by the uncanny inversions of publicity, has become more sacrosanct than our highest court, has declared men guilty before any trial was held. It has been common practice for police at all levels to announce confessions which ought not be revealed outside a courtroom.