

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Our Right To Know

Reverberations are still being felt over the government's handling of the news in the Cuban crisis.

The issue involves one of the basic tenets of a democratic system: the people's right to know what their government is doing and, ultimately, to approve or disapprove.

While no one demands the uncontrolled release of news—particularly military news during a national emergency—that might be of benefit to an enemy or cause a disastrous reaction among the public, there are fears that a new philosophy is developing in Washington that advocates not only withholding but manipulating news to achieve desired results.

A Defense Department official has, in fact, stated that the government has a right not only to withhold information but even to release false information if it will aid the national security.

This question of "right" is a difficult one. A government probably has the "right" to do many things—even to sacrifice half the population to save the other half from destruction.

In dire emergency, there is no time to inform the public on matters that require top-level, split-second decision: there is no time

to debate and discuss and arrive at a national consensus.

Governments and government officials, however, are often wrong, and the label "emergency," like "secret" or "classified," has an insidious way of coming to be used as a screen to deflect the searchlight of legitimate public questioning.

In a democracy, the people's representatives or executives have a solemn duty to guard against any encroachment upon the people's right to know. That this is not always easy is no reason to slip into the opposite extreme of deciding it is better if the people know nothing or know only something that is not true.

World War II amply demonstrated that American news media were capable of voluntary censorship and co-operation with the government in information involving the national security. Certainly they are not now to be made into messenger boys of official propaganda.

A nation is most secure whose people are most fully informed and aware of the realities their leaders must deal with.

A nation ceases to be free when its people are considered by their leaders as untrustworthy, immature and something to be manipulated.

The Rules Changers

(The Christian Science Monitor)

New Frontiersmen in the American Congress now are preparing to test whether in fact their side won or lost the last election.

The test will be particularly crucial in the House, where much of President Kennedy's "must" legislation of the last Congress was staved off by a strong conservative coalition.

Liberal strategy centers once again on loosening the conservative hold on the House Rules Committee—the routing center for all bills coming to the floor for a vote.

In 1961 followers of the President succeeded in increasing the size of the Rules group from 12 to 15 members. But despite this aid, the House voted down a majority of the President's basic bills.

The liberals now contend that while those votes reflected the uncertain division of the country after a close presidential election in 1960, the 1962 midterm election endorsed the President's program.

This assertion remains strictly conjectural.

But the liberals logically claim that they will only have a chance to test whether Congress has heard the nation speaking with a different voice if the full Congress gets to vote on Kennedy bills.

So they propose to attempt three things as soon as Congress opens in January:

1. Increase membership of the Rules Committee to 15 again.

2. Establish a 21-day discharge rule that would force the Rules Committee to send up for a floor vote after that period any measure already approved by another House committee.

3. Establish a similar 7-day discharge rule to prevent delay of bills already passed by both houses but awaiting action by a joint Senate-House conference committee.

We do not believe there is anything sacred about the rules or size of the Rules Committee. But we are concerned about changing so many cautions and stop signs to green lights at once.

The two discharge rules make sense. There is no reason why measures duly investigated and approved by specialized committees should not at least reach the floor for general debate and voting; or why measures approved by a majority of both houses should then be pocket-vetted by a tiny minority of the legislators.

But, given some such safeguards against indefinite sidetracking, there seems to be no reason for the New Frontiersmen to seek to pack the committee in their favor as well. Success in that effort would mean they could vote measures to the floor more hastily, or place upon them special rules regarding their amendability.

The democratic system is not served by cutting all the checks and balances in order to level a roadblock.

THESE DAYS . . .

Scapegoats Take Blame

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

This is the time for resolutions and stocktaking. I haven't been able to do the job of writing a daily column for long enough to know what I should make resolutions about. But in taking stock for the future I find, amid a welter of perils, one thing that is vastly encouraging: we have a President who is willing to admit mistakes. In looking back on the Bay of Pigs catastrophe, when air cover was withheld from the brave Cubans who stormed the beach only to fall into Castro's clutches, President Kennedy has confessed that he personally pulled a boob.

This, unless I have been asleep at certain important junctures during the past half century, is something that is absolutely unprecedented.

The standard high level procedure has been to admit nothing and, when things have obviously gone wrong, to pick out a convenient scapegoat and let him go to the sacrificial block.

Nobody in high places, for example, has confessed to making a mistake at Yalta. Nobody has stepped forward to take the blame for the physical isolation of West Berlin from the rest of the Free World. Nobody has accepted responsibility for confusing the Chinese Communists with the southern agrarians who put Thomas Jefferson into the White House in 1801. The list might be extended almost to infinity, but it is only charitable to limit it to a few examples.

While we are on the subject,

however, it would be fair to recall that some of the sacrificial goats are still in the land of the living. It is still not too late for tendering the sort of apologies to them that might make their declining days a little happier than they are otherwise likely to be.

There is old Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, for example. He lives in Groton, Conn., not far from the Electric Boat Company shipyards in which the atomic submarines are outfitted. Amid the bustle of preparations for a possible naval war of the future, he broods upon naval campaigns of the past which he was compelled, as a sacrificial goat, to sit out.

Yet what did Admiral Kimmel, victim of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, do to deserve the role of goat? Far more was known in Washington than at Kimmel's post in Hawaii about the impending plans of the Japanese during that first ominous week of December in 1941. The admiral's superiors, from Commander-in-Chief Roosevelt and Admiral Harold Stark on down, knew on Dec. 6 from a cracked Japanese code message that war was coming somehow, somewhere, the next day, but no move was made to warn Pearl Harbor.

Unwilling to shoulder the blame for passiveness themselves, the Washington authorities foisted everything off on Kimmel and on the Army commander in Hawaii, Lt. Gen. Walter Short. General Short is now dead, and no apol-

ogy can reach him, but Kimmel is very much alive — and still waiting vindication from those who might offer it to him.

Another sacrificial victim who still walks the earth is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. He was removed from his Pacific command for having the temerity—and the foresight—to insist that the Chinese Communists were committed to riding an imperialist tide that could easily engulf the whole world. But nobody has apologized to him, or otherwise moved to remove the single official blot on his otherwise immaculate name.

The business of insisting on justice for sacrificial goats is an unprofitable one, for nobody likes to listen to a catalogue of reproaches that echoes that ancient refrain of "I told you so." It is far better when the author of a mistake speaks up and absolves the sacrificial goat on his own.

After the Bay of Pigs disaster, certain changes were made in the Central Intelligence Agency. Some C.I.A. people who had favored a "hard" approach to Castro disappeared from familiar haunts along the Potomac—and the natural conclusion was that they were being punished for advocating that air cover be extended to the Cuban invaders. If ancient precedent had continued to prevail, the injustice to the "hards" in the C.I.A. would never have been corrected. However, the miracle has happened: President Kennedy has inferentially confessed that the C.I.A. "hards" were right after all.

Sir Arthur Sullivan dismissed his music for the Savoy operetta as airy nothings, and hoped that his fame would rest on his more ambitious works; but he has reached immortality only as the



Letters To The Editor

Provisions

To the interested citizens of this community and also to those not too concerned. County zoning will directly or indirectly affect all.

The citizens of Springfield, Ore., due to lack of knowledge, lack of proper information had actually voted for a zoning program (urban renewal). It took about 2 years to get rid of it.

These are some of the reasons why the people of Springfield had voted it out in 1961. They didn't feel that it was right and just to have orderly, well kept properties declared blighted and deteriorated, and property owners being forced to sell their property not for a public purpose, but to Private Developers. They didn't feel it was just to take from innocent citizens their homes and force them to leave property they had owned and lived on for 25 or more years and at a price set by the court, in many cases less

than half what it was worth. They didn't feel it was just to have unlimited authority given to "inspectors" to order changes such as more windows, more rooms, larger rooms or hallways, changes in location of bathrooms and lavatories, houses painted, roofed, etc.

In a recent Portland, Ore., newspaper this was one of their news items, "County Zoning Violators to Face Legal Action." "Hard Core" objectors who resist county zoning ordinances were warned of possible legal action. The planning commission has a file of 100 to 150 "known violators." Mostly the violations consist of failure to obtain a building permit or construction that does not meet building or zoning ordinances. Continuing offenses may result in a fine of \$100 per day, up to a total of \$1,000. Non-continuing offenses could result in a \$500 fine." Is this what we want in our community?

In the "Blue Book" Revised

Draft on Klamath County Zoning Ordinances, prepared for the Klamath County Planning Commission by the Bureau of Municipal Research and Service, April 1961, it seems that it all depends on how our "neighborhood police protectors" will interpret the ordinances.

Do you feel you want to be ordered not only how, where and when you can put your buildings, fences etc., but also the kind of material you have to use, disregarding the fact that it may be completely out of your purchasing power?

I've been told, as others have been told, that in an S-A zone (Suburban Agriculture) and S-R zone (Suburban Residential) you may have your animals. Zoning will have no ill effects on the 4-H program. By the way, there are 486 enthusiastic youngsters enrolled in animal projects. Many have more than one animal exhibit.

Check out for yourself the requirements pertinent to these zones. (Page 9 of the previously mentioned "Blue Book.")

1. The front yard shall be a minimum of 30 feet. For buildings containing a conditional use the setback shall be a minimum of 40 feet. For buildings housing fowl, rabbits, cows, horses or other domestic animals the front yard shall be a minimum of 70 feet.

2. The side yard shall be a minimum of 10 feet. For buildings containing a conditional use the side yard shall be a minimum of 30 feet on the side abutting a street and 25 feet on the side abutting a lot.

So figure it out for yourself that in order to comply with the "Blue Book" setback requirements, front yard minimums, etc., your animals will be eliminated not because you won't be allowed to have them, but because due to the "squeeze method" of setback requirements, you simply won't have room for them!

We, the citizens of Klamath County, have the advantage of knowing some of the hardships, hectic and tense moments that another community has gone through, and one other has it to bear. So let us use this knowledge to make sure it doesn't happen to our community!

Ann Frel, 7209 Crest.

STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

The proper way to compliment a woman is not on what she has or is, but on what she has not or wants to be. The beautiful woman wants to be assured that she is bright, and the bright woman that she is attractive. For everyone has a desire to be, in a certain way, somebody else.

This, of course, is as true of men as of women—although men pretend not to be so susceptible to flattery. There is no point in telling a man that he is good in something about which he knows he is good; he will simply regard you as a fool.

But tell the minister that his sermon was logical and well-reasoned as a legal brief, and he will pull up and respond, "You know, I did think of taking up the law once."

When General Wolfe was about to conquer Quebec, he sighed that he would gladly have given up all his military victories if only he could have written Gray's "Elegy." Likewise, Frederick the Great scorned those who praised his martial feats; he wanted to be a French literary man rather than a Prussian general—or, at any rate, a part of him wanted to be, and deeply desired assurance that he could have been.

Goethe took his literary genius for granted, on the other hand, and yearned for immortality as a scientific innovator—he foolishly thought that his "theory of light and colors" would outlast his poetry, and wasted a great deal of time in defending his trivial discoveries.

Isaac Newton, on the other hand, thought that his profound scientific work was less important than his research into Biblical history, which any schoolboy could have formulated. The latter has been totally forgotten by now, while Newton's scientific explanations remain a landmark of Western civilization.

Sir Arthur Sullivan dismissed his music for the Savoy operetta as airy nothings, and hoped that his fame would rest on his more ambitious works; but he has reached immortality only as the

POTOMAC FEVER

JFK is the magician of the year: First man to win the Orange Bowl outstanding player award without leaving the bench for a game last 20 months earlier.

Businessman's interpretation of Internal Revenue Boss Caplin's new expense account rules: If two executives can figure out over lunch how to get Caplin fired, they can both deduct the meal.

Well, at least the calendar people are optimistic about the future. They not only run the 1963 calendar all the way through Dec. 31, but they even put a little 1964 calendar on the back page.

Reviewing his holiday bills, one fellow says it isn't the running into debt that hurts, but the running into creditors.

The missile each armed service pines for is one powerful enough to demolish its sister services' budget demands.

United Nations planes strafe a Natanga air base in the Congo. One thing about our side. We never quit just because we're not sure why we started.

FLETCHER KNEBEL



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

School For Foreign Policy Training Set

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA) — President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk have made a complete reversal on past foreign policy in putting their O.K. on a National Academy of Foreign Affairs. The big idea is that it will train personnel from all government departments in the conduct of foreign policy.

Such an idea has been kicking around Washington for years but it has always been rejected. Trying to establish a government foreign policy trade school, it was felt, would narrow the outlook of diplomats. It would set up too rigid a curriculum and put too many fixed ideas into official training. It was considered better to send rising government officials for postgraduate research and training in existing universities.

The new enthusiasm for doing the twist on this past policy and establishing a National Academy of Foreign Affairs comes from three principal sources.

A presidential advisory panel headed by Vice President James A. Perkins of the Carnegie Corp. has recommended it. A Committee on Personnel for the New Diplomacy, headed by former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, has recommended it as one point in a much broader report on foreign service reorganization requested by Rusk. Incidentally, Perkins was a member of the Herter committee, too.

But the principal impetus for this comes from a heterogeneous group of 12 senators and seven congressmen from left, right and center. For three years they have been advocating establishment of a "U.S. Freedom Academy" to educate government officials and private citizens on international communism and how to combat it.

Their idea was to create a U.S. counterpart to the Russian political warfare schools. In short, it was to train government officials how to fight the cold war and win it.

One of the prime movers of this idea was Alan Grant Jr. of Orlando, Fla. Through the Council on

Communist Aggression, which has considerable labor and liberal backing, Grant interested Rep. Walter Judd, R-Minn., in the idea. He interested Sen. Karl Mundt, R-S.D., and he got Sen. Paul Douglas, D-Ill., to co-sponsor it. Dodd, D-Conn.; Goldwater, R-Ariz.; Case, R-N.J., and others.

They got their Freedom Academy bill through the Senate at the end of 1960, but it died in the House. It got no place in the last Congress, but it will come alive in the next one. A Gallup poll shows 69 per cent support, 14 per cent opposed.

So Kennedy has assigned Rusk to prepare legislation and he has assigned Under Secretary for Administration William H. Orrick Jr., formerly an assistant attorney general, Yale whiz kid and Stanford lawyer, to organize an interdepartmental group to work it out.

The administration idea is to set it up on a somewhat broader basis than the Mundt-Douglas Freedom Academy bill. The National Academy of Foreign Affairs would not do away with the War College, Annapolis, West Point or the Air Force academies. It would not even replace the State Department Foreign Service Institute or other specialist schools which have been training government officials for overseas service for some years.

It is Congress which will really write the ticket on this. While Congress is considering this idea, they might also take a look at a leaf from the book of Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver. He has found that a lot of his two-year volunteers would make good State Department material.

There may be the germ of an idea here for one course in the new national academy. Perhaps the way to learn to be a good diplomat is to go get the feet wet and the hands calloused by association with the common people of the underdeveloped countries of the world, instead of trying to learn how to combat communism in a lecture room or out of a book. This would be in the best tradition of the "Ugly American."



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Commies Infiltrate Peace Organizations

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
Members of the House Un-American Activities Committee may be proud. Their recent investigation into so-called peace groups was eminently successful, if the anguished cries of assorted leftists from New York to Moscow are any indication.

Soon after Radio Moscow broadcast a withering blast at American "witchhunters," members of Congress began receiving mail from back home. Investigation showed that many of those who wired Washington to protest about the hearings were Communist Party members.

With disclosure that various peace groups had been heavily infiltrated by Communist agents, the committee was subject to a new barrage of left-wing protests.

I. F. Stone, a veteran Communist fronter who edits a four-page Washington Newsletter, set the tone: The HUAC investigation was "the dirtiest such affair since the days of McCarthy."

The National Guardian, described by a Congressional Committee as "the virtual official propaganda arm of Soviet Russia," made the hearings its major story. The "Un-Americans' attack" was a vicious smear against peace-loving women, the publication reported in a story that began on page one and rambled on to page eight.

"The Militant" is a fanatically left-wing rag, published "in the interests of the working people" in New York. "HUAC witchhunters" were roasted in a page one "Militant" story that praised peace leaders for defying the committee.

The "Weekly People," published by the Socialist Labor Party, saw the HUAC hearings as an attack by "the vested interests" upon the peace movement.

Note: Committee investigators discovered that Communist functionaries were following the order of party boss Gus Hall when they infiltrated certain peace groups. Less than two years ago, on Jan. 20, 1961, Hall told the U.S. Communist Party's National Committee:

"It is necessary to widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people. . . ."

"It is imperative to bring every-one—men, women, youth and yes,

even children—into the struggle. . . . It is essential to give full support to the existing peace bodies, to their movements and the struggles they initiate, to building and strengthening their organizations.

"It is also necessary to recognize the need for additional peace organizations . . . above all, Communists will intensify their work for peace and their efforts to build up peace organizations."

That many Communists had followed those instructions to the letter was clearly demonstrated by the committee. That the committee then came under frontal attack was not unexpected.

Texas' John Tower, slated several months ago to become chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee, will not get the job.

The reason: Northern liberals objected to Tower, a Southerner. The main job of the committee chairman is to raise funds, and only one Senator raised more money for his party last year than did Tower: the outgoing chairman, Barry Goldwater.

Kentucky's Thruston Morton, a former GOP National Chairman, can have the position. Re-elected by a comfortable majority in 1962, he knows party leaders and workers across the country.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Friday, Jan. 4, the fourth day of 1963 with 361 to follow.

The moon is approaching its full phase.

The morning stars are Mars and Venus.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Those born on this day include Sir Isaac Newton, discoverer of the law of gravity, in 1642.

On this day in history: In 1854, Sen. Stephen A. Douglas introduced into the Senate a bill containing proposals for the organization of the Nebraska Territory.

In 1885, Dr. William W. Grant of Davenport, Iowa, performed the first appendectomy in medical history with the patient making a complete recovery.

In 1890, Utah became the 43rd state to be admitted into the Union.

A thought for the day: American humorist James Thurber said: "Early to rise and early to bed makes a male healthy and wealthy and dead."