

Herald and News

# Editorial Page

## Opposites? Not In Objectives!

The attack on the philosophy that the family constitutes the most important segment of society goes on in all quarters—and is particularly emphasized in Russia and (of all places!) in the United States.

In Russia, when children reach an age of about six weeks, they are taken from their parents and placed in a community nursery. There, a strict regimentation schedule teaches the child independence from family ties. Mothers work for the "state" and are allowed from six weeks to two months off occasionally, to bear children. That is the only time she will be able to claim the child.

Parents may visit the nursery on their day off from work, and often will take the children to the park, or shopping, or to the museum. That is their only regular contact with the "state owned" and state-educated and state-reared children.

It is frightening to contemplate what the attitude and philosophy of these children will develop into as they grow into adults. Certainly, it is contrary to accepted beliefs.

Or is it?

Here in the United States, we are on the way to advocating a similar philosophy — only in reverse.

There is a growing attitude here that children should abandon their aged parents

to a benevolent and all-caring government. The attitude is fostered by government agencies at all levels.

Booklets, pamphlets, and recommendations from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Social Security Administration, and other agencies clearly advocate that children owe nothing to their parents.

A recent report of a Senate sub-committee declared in substance that, because so many parents now live to an advanced age, they cannot be expected to remain "a part of their younger relatives' family."

This must be welcome news to the children of parents in 35 states where they (children) are required by law, if able, to contribute to the support of needy parents. These laws embody one of the first principles of human life—that the family is the basic unit of civilization.

We can express horror at the idea of the Russian communes and the destruction of filial ties. And well we should. At the same time, can we withhold disgust in our thinking of the attitude of the United States in our approach to care of our aged and needy parents? There is a slight difference, of course: there is no law or regulation in the United States that actually decrees separation of families at any level.

## Part Of The Answer

In almost any daily newspaper, almost every day, we read about the sexual deviates whose sadistic activities lead to ravishing and murder of unfortunate victims. It would seem that our American society has almost accepted these heinous crimes as something we can do nothing about.

There have been several instances of varying extent in recent months in Oregon. Most of the crimes have gone unsolved. In those cases where the criminal is captured, it is quite safe to predict what will happen.

If he gets any sentence, it will be for a duration that will let him out to continue his sickening depravity. He probably will even get time off for "good behavior."

Oregon is probably no better or worse than other states of the nation. In a recent article, Holmes Alexander had this to say, in part:

"Moralizing nihilists will say that the criminal is not wicked but 'sick.' Sentimentalists will use the opportunity to inveigh against capital punishment. Many legal dodges will be employed to get a verdict based on insanity pleadings. Any attempt by the bereaved parents or the aroused community to lynch the criminal will be deplored as comparable to the crime itself. Finally, all but persons very close to the tragedy will shrug it off as a thing that 'will happen'—and the whole dreadful affair will fade from general memory."

"There is a good deal wrong with these predictable reactions. The American community, and much of the western world, are the 'sick' ones. We have a scientific and literary culture which increasingly contends that the differences are negligible, if not non-existent, between right and wrong, normality and perversion. The culture of intellectualism also absolves killers, traitors, cheaters and public cowards from any deep personal responsibility. There is at once the nihilistic evasionism which says that nothing can be done to prevent these crimes, and there is the pseudosophistication which says nobody's really to blame."

That just about sums up our attitude, whether we agree with it or not. We happen to agree with it. Our own idea of what should be done is described by some as "primitive."

We would like to see our laws tightened to provide death for those persons convicted of sexual perversion leading to ravishing or murder of their victims. There could be no "extenuating" circumstances. He would simply be put to death. Of course, we would concede one point: his death should be a kindly one. Not packed with the horror and panic that undoubtedly were experienced by his victim at the time of his crime.

We do not claim that this is the whole answer to the problem. But it would serve as a powerful deterrent. It is, at least, part of the answer to a problem which seems otherwise unchallenged.



JIM BISHOP: REPORTER . . .

## Writer Must 'Go It Alone' In Efforts

The writer is a compulsive worker. What he records is partly art, partly craft, and always solitary. The thing he sells comes from inside a size seven-and-a-quarter head. Whether it is a good product or a poor one, it comes from what his eyes see, his ears hear, his nose smells, his mind thinks and his memory records.

There is no other way. A painter works alone but he can, by accident, achieve a notable effect. A writer cannot record a great scene by accident. A bullfighter, too, works alone but if he is good, other men distract his tormentor. A king, a president, a judge, a builder, can consult advisers and precedent. A writer must always lack new paths through the jungle of a mind he has learned to distrust.

If he writes a good book, so much the worse for him because all of his future work will be measured against it.

There are writers whom I will not name who were your favorites a decade ago. They are not dead, nor are they "written out." They have learned that their best is not always good enough. The last two or three books did not sell. Now they sit at the typewriter conditional to fear. They are afraid of the next one.

This is sad, because a writer must be an egocentric before he begins his first work. His goal — no matter how loudly he denies it — is to inflict his opinions upon others. He wears an eye mask of humility because it is becoming. He steals thoughts, ideas and

phrases from friends and he plants them in his mental jungle for future flowering.

His funeral begins on the day of his first big success and it is a gay and everlasting dirge. His cult lights incense at his feet. The odor is heady and he spends more time in the shrine and less at the typewriter. Overnight, he is an important person. He is sought for his opinions on subjects about which he knows nothing—politics, children, religion, science—but he solves all problems glibly. He becomes a public speaker, a hail fellow well drunk, a wanted indier of those whom he does not like.

He wants to write a bigger, better, more profound book than the last one but he is frustrated by blank sheets of paper. He stares at them. They stare back in blindness. There are only 26 letters in the alphabet and he knows that, if he hits the right keys in correct sequence a half million times, he will have another great book. But which keys are the right ones?

What he needs most of all, after success, is confidence. Sometimes he looks for it in a bottle; sometimes in capsules; rarely in church. The more his confidence recedes in the jungle, the more he demands of his friends. He no longer wants criticism. He wants love. He wants devotion. Light another joss stick at the shrine. Make it a big one. Mirror, mirror on the wall, who is the greatest . . .

He makes jolly phone calls to his agent, grins like a hurt pug when he is introduced as the author of something he wrote 10 years ago, borrows from his publishers, winces when his name evinces no flash of recognition, and speaks of trips abroad as though he is thinking of fresh ideas and not running away.

The one thing which will save him is truth, and the writer cannot face this. He can write about it as though he copyrighted the word, but he cannot apply it to himself. He cannot look at himself and say: "I am a small, lucky man." It is impossible because it is a stiletto in the ego, and the ego is what impelled him to inflict his opinions on others from the start.

If he lives through the protracted funeral service, the writer, in time, becomes a bland schizophrenic. In public, he projects the image of the great thinker and the polite listener; in private, he tortures himself with pages and pages of nothing which, in turn, are crushed into worthless balls and hurled against a wall.

It isn't a pretty picture, but it's a fairly accurate one. We have a few writers who have learned to live with themselves. Carl Sandburg is one. Ernest Hemingway is spilling the same wine the third time. John Steinbeck — where is our old hero? Sometimes the writer hacks so many paths that the whole jungle is leveled.

It is shameful to stare at a proud man when he weeps . . .



By THOMAS J. WATSON JR.  
President, International Business Machines Corp.

One of a series of easy-to-read condensations from chapters written by eminent American authorities for book publication by Prentice-Hall with the Report from President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals. Edited by Ray Cromley for Newspaper Enterprise Assn. (Copyright 1960, the American Assembly.)

I would recommend these basic national goals on which we can continue to build a strong nation and a better world:

First—Encourage technological change to improve men's lives, to meet our own increasing industrial needs, to stimulate social and economic progress and

### GOALS FOR AMERICANS

## Encouraging Technology National Responsibility

to face successfully the long-term challenge of international communism.

Within the government one group or agency should be made responsible for developing a national policy to encourage our technological effort.

Specific provisions for applied research and exploratory development should be included in many government-supported projects. There has been a lack of emphasis on these in the past, stemming directly from a "get-it-done" policy: "deliver this equipment with these capabilities on this date." Overall technical progress inevitably suffers and often the final product is outdated before it appears.

The federal government should encourage the updating of our capital equipment. Liberalized depreciation allowances should be

given consideration as a means to this end. Depreciation allowances should be kept under constant review to ensure that useful equipment life for tax purposes is realistic.

Technological change, however, may cause displacement problems in some industries. It may also be a factor in certain "distressed" areas throughout the country. The federal government should allow accelerated plant depreciation to industries which move into these areas.

The minimum disturbance to the economic functioning of the country will come about by moving industry to the people who need jobs. When this is not effective, a "relocation" plan for individuals should be worked out. Depressed areas should be redeveloped in accordance with sound business and economic principles. Private local groups should be responsible for the business plans.

Second—We should share technological knowledge throughout the world so that other people may improve their lives and benefit from the latest developments of science and technology.

It is impossible to win the world-wide political battle simply through alliances and financial or material aid. We must also win the battle for men's minds. But we must win it by offering these minds knowledge, skills and opportunities to learn. One important facet certainly lies in technological progress.

A completely preventable, curable and controllable disease such as malaria remains a grave threat to the lives of over a billion people. Over half of the world's humanity has bare survival income averaging less than \$300 a year per person. In a struggling new country like the Congo, only a handful of people today have university degrees. Unless we solve world problems such as these, the Communists will solve them for us.

In sharing technological programs, industry and private investors are in a unique position to further our political and economic goals. Foreign investment carries with it the capital, human resources and know-how to increase the available technology in a less-developed country. But we cannot rely on private investment alone.

More United States technicians should be sent abroad. The program for exchanging technical assistance must be more effectively coordinated. We must expand our exchange of technical information and more aggressively publicize our very real achievements in aid to these areas.

We must continue to press for more liberal international trade policies at home and abroad. These will broaden the application of technical innovations in the United States and in developing nations. Unimaginative and shortsighted tariff protection of marginal industries will neither strengthen our own economy nor win new markets or new converts to our way of life.

In conclusion and most important, we must remember that technological change is man-made and must be man-controlled. Its total purpose: the benefit of mankind. We cannot afford to let interest and excitement with the process detract from its main purpose, the improvement of man.



YOUR POCKETBOOK

## Sees Curtailment In 'Moonlighting'

By FAYE HENLE  
If you are "moonlighting" — holding down more than one job — beware. With one in 20 of us now indulging, management is beginning to turn the spotlight on "moonlighters." They are fearful lest you:

- Work for a competitor.
- Work at the extra job while they pay you sick leave.
- Perform on the second job in a manner that will discredit your primary employer.
- Become less effective on your primary job.

This from the American Management Assn., which points out that the number of moonlighters in the past 10 years has doubled. They fear that the moonlighter is more accident prone, less productive, more apt to be absent from either job. Though strongly opposed by organized labor, management sees this trend of multiple job-holding continuing as we seek to improve our living standard.

Who "moonlights"?

Some 75 per cent of all male school teachers now hold second jobs, so do 10 per cent of all farmers, 5 per cent of all salesmen. Students are great moonlighters. At the University of Pittsburgh, for instance, 10 per cent of all male students hold jobs at which they work 40 hours or more, while 50 per cent have jobs occupying 20 hours weekly. Of 453 recent University of Detroit graduates, 34 per cent earned all their college expenses while at school. The association even has discovered that 100,000 of us hold three jobs or more!

Big question: If the boss sits on a couple of boards of directors, is he too a moonlighter?

If you are about to retire you should know that the U.S. Labor Department has found that a cou-

ple 65 or over needs a monthly income of between \$220 and \$280 to live comfortably. The average monthly social security payment to such a couple is about \$125.

By comfortable, this is what the Labor Department means: Food costs are calculated on a combination low cost — moderate cost eating plan. They assume the couple will own a TV set, use public transportation, allocate nine per cent of income for medical expense, participate in community activities.

The cost of shelter depends much upon where the couple is located geographically. They say that \$2,641 a year will suffice in Houston, Texas, but \$3,366 would be needed in Chicago. They figure that \$3,044 yearly would be needed for a couple renting an apartment in New York City.

If you have not watched changes in the tax law this year as closely as you might, here are some pointers that might affect you:

Beginning with 1960 tax returns, a taxpayer can deduct all medical expenses for a dependent parent who is 65 or over before the taxable year is ended.

A declaration of estimated tax for 1961 is not required where the taxpayer's estimated tax liability is less than \$40.

You, the taxpayer, must pay the full amount of a tax deficiency before you can sue for an income tax refund in a U.S. District Court.

The Internal Revenue Service will be watching to make sure we all pay taxes on dividend income from securities and interest on bank holdings.

They have also issued new expense reporting requirements for employers and revised their schedules to provide space for additional information for higher paid individuals.



THE DOCTOR SAYS . . .

## No Evidence That Cancer Contagious

By HAROLD T. HYMAN, M.D.

Written for  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.  
"After my husband died of cancer, several months ago," writes a widow of Tyrone, Pa., "my son-in-law visited me with my daughter and their three boys. He kept his family and himself in sleeping bags on the dining room floor every night throughout his visit."

"No doubt he feels that cancer is contagious and wants to protect his family and himself. Is his action one we should all follow even though my husband's room is shut off?"

Dear Lady, there is not the slightest evidence that cancer is contagious. If your son-in-law doubts this statement, let him visit any large hospital that admits patients with malignant disease. He will see that none of the patients with cancer is isolated, that no special precautions are taken by members of the hospital staff, including nurses and doctors.

And, if he inquires, he will learn that there is not a single recorded instance in medical history that would substantiate his false belief.

Not only is there not the slightest reason for you to follow his ridiculous example but there is no reason for you to shut off your husband's room.

I hope I can persuade you to open it to the light of day and treat it as you do any other room in your home.

"I have a kidney that has dropped two and one half vertebrae and would like to know if it's best just to leave it or have an operation to put it back in place? Would it stay in place if it were sewed back?" asks a reader.

A great many women and some men too, who are very lean or who once were obese and later lost a great deal of weight, have what are called "movable or dropped kidneys." Usually the right kidney is considerably more movable and somewhat lower than the left.

The dropped kidney is not harmful and need not be operated on unless the patient suffers from what are called Dietl's crises.

Here is how the Dietl's crisis works. The kidney, as you know, manufactures urine. The urine then flows through the long thin channel of the ureter into the bladder where it is stored until an opportunity for voiding presents itself.

But when the dropped kidney flops over in such a manner as to produce a kink of the ureter, secreted urine gets trapped, producing what is called a hydronephrosis (water in the kidney). Then, when the hydronephrosis gets to a certain size, the pain of the Dietl's crisis leaves no doubt in the patient's mind that something has gone seriously

wrong in the plumbing department.

The only way the crisis can be relieved is by unkninking the ureter. Sometimes the patient can accomplish this by lying flat with the head at a considerably lower level than the legs. Sometimes, an onlooker can help by applying pressure to the lower abdomen. Sometimes, it is necessary to resort to instrumentation or even operation to clear the ureteral channel.

But, whether cleared by positioning, instrumentation or operation, the dropped kidney must be held in place, ever after, by use of a snug corset that is expertly padded to prevent recurrent kinking and crises.

For a copy of Dr. Hyman's leaflet "What About Cancer?" send 10 cents to Dr. Hyman, care Herald and News, Box 489, Dept. B, Radio City Station, New York 19, N.Y.

## Almanac

By United Press International  
Today is Friday, Dec. 16, the 351st day of the year with 15 more in 1960.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning star is Mars. The evening stars are Mars, Jupiter, Saturn and Venus.

On this day in history:

In 1770, German composer and pianist Ludwig van Beethoven was born.

In 1773, 50 patriots disguised as Indians boarded a British vessel at anchor in Boston Harbor and threw 342 chests of tea into the water in the so-called Boston Tea Party.

In 1775, English novelist Jane Austen was born.

In 1893 the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra offered the first performance of Anton Dvorak's "New World Symphony."

In 1944, the Germans launched a great counter-offensive in Belgium . . . the Battle of the Bulge.

Thought for today: English novelist Jane Austen said: "I do not want people to be very agreeable, as it saves me the trouble of liking them a great deal."

—Ferhat Abbas, premier of rebel Algerian government.

WE see after six years of struggle that the United States will do nothing to help us. The policy of the United States is simple and selfish. It is a fight against communism. And in this fight Algeria has an entirely secondary importance.