

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Zoning Hassle Needs Clarification - IV

While there is strong evidence of opposition to the proposed county zoning ordinance, we shall persist in our conclusion that the circumstances call for the matter to be submitted to an election so that all property owners affected can have their say. This need not be a special election, as there is no obvious need for haste. The issue can be settled at any one of the forthcoming general elections in the county.

The evidence apparent from the two hearings held by the Planning Commission indicates that dissenters, for the most part, are opposed to the entire principle of zoning. Most statements carried this overtone even when the speaker pointed out specific reasons for opposing one or more elements of the proposed ordinance. We would have no wish to quarrel with this position.

However, in this article of comment on the zoning hassle, we are hopeful of clearing up a few remaining areas of murky issues.

to undergo considerable abuse and even ridicule in these sessions, and we are hopeful that those who attend future hearings will find it possible to extend the common courtesies that should be a part of the proceedings.

4. It has been stated that zoning will be put into effect for a three-year trial period. Actually, only the County Court has the authority to impose zoning on a trial basis. The Court has made no commitment on this issue at this time.

5. One writer stated that zoning will prevent her from having a horse or garden, and that she would be required to keep weeds down on her property. It has been repeatedly stated that zoning will not remove farm animals, and zoning does not in any way affect planting of gardens. While we would think that pride of ownership and good citizenship would prompt most people to keep their property trim and neat, we can find no provision in the ordinance that pertains to weeds and their cutting or removal.

6. There are no restrictions in the ordinance pertaining to trees, and fence restrictions apply only on the front yard and side yard abutting the streets. There are no fence restrictions in the S-A or S-R zones. Guest houses are permitted under provisions of the ordinance.

7. There are no zoning restrictions on household or domestic pets.

Some have wondered just why the Planning Commission ever got started on this study, and the inference is that they are a bunch of busy-bodies who have little else to do. This is decidedly unfair to a group of hard working, conscientious citizens. They were asked by the County Court to make the study, using whatever professional and technical assistance could be provided with the limited funds available. The funds, incidentally, are provided on a participating basis, with the federal government providing half of the total cost. The remainder was split on a 50-50 basis between the city of Klamath Falls and Klamath County. It should be noted that the portion provided by the city was for planning in the city, only. The city did not participate in the portion of the study confined to the suburban and rural areas.

Initial action taken by the County Court came about by submission of petitions and other types of requests from the suburban area asking for the protection of zoning.

Initial action taken by the County Court came about by submission of petitions and other types of requests from the suburban area asking for the protection of zoning.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Future Conflict A Dream?

By RALPH DE TOLEDANO
A story, imported from Communist Warsaw, is making the rounds of Washington. Comrade Khrushchev is walking down the street leading a goat. He meets Mao Tse-tung.
"What are you doing with that pig?" Mao asks.
"You dumb Chinaman," Nikita screams. "Can't you see that this is a goat?"
"Who was talking to you?" Mao answers.
This sour little joke expresses far more clearly than the recent multi-thousand-word editorial in the Red China "People's Daily" the nature of the rift between

Peiping and Moscow. The Sino-Soviet crossfire is dressed up in the fancy language of Marxist-Leninist rhetoric. The entire vocabulary of Communist polemics is invoked—but like the flowers that bloom in the spring, trala, it has nothing to do with the case.
As the senior partner in the Communist alliance, Comrade Khrushchev can talk about the "nuclear teeth" of the American "paper tiger" and call for "sound political compromises," "realism," and "sober" thought.
The Chinese Reds can warn that the Kremlin line will make Soviet Communism "the servant

of the bourgeoisie" which can only be "cast aside by the proletariat" for its "revisionism."
But this is an old, old war among the Reds. The same terms can be speared out of the lengthy arguments between Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky when they were engaged in their own family fight. The disagreement between Nikita Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung is one of means, not ends. Both are determined to bury us under tons of propaganda and the rubble of nuclear explosions. And each dictator would like to be the one who writes the terms of what they consider an "inevitable" American surrender.
Some pundits, however, see in every exchange of verbal cream puffs between Red China and the Soviet Union the signs of a life and death struggle between two brands of Communism. This is a comforting thought. It relieves American policy makers from coming to hard conclusions. It says, in effect: "Relax, boys. We don't have to worry about Communism. Let's just wait for the Russians and the Chinese to destroy each other."
This was precisely the attitude of some law enforcement officers when rival gangs across the nation were shooting each other up for control of the rackets. When the mobsters had finished "negotiating" with Tommy guns, they had laid the groundwork for a national crime syndicate which is still plaguing American cities and destroying respect for law.
Stalin won his battle with Trotsky. But if it had been the other way around, the end result for the non-Communist world would have been precisely the same. Those who think otherwise are bemused by the fancy language of Communist ideologues. They forget that Marxism is not really a system but a will to power. The rest is ideological window dressing.
At the present time, State Department "experts" are studying every outburst from Moscow or Peiping as if it were Revelation. But the fact remains that when the chips are down the Chinese and the Russians will join together in common defense or common onslaught on the West. Comrade Khrushchev may get his Chinese colleagues to trim their sails to his propaganda line. Or the misnamed "anti-party" group in the Kremlin may force Khrushchev to adopt Peiping's wilder slogans.
In cold war terms, however, this means nothing to the West. The two parties to the dispute want the same thing: Time to gather their forces together for the big push which they believe will destroy freedom and deliver humanity into their hands.
Victory for civilization will not come because of the sticks and stones the leaders of the Communist world throw at each other. Only by pushing the Reds to the wall, economically, politically, and psychologically will the West triumph. Both Nikita Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung would like us to believe that the contradictions and the bad tempers of Communism will force it to its knees. But they know that wars, whether hot or cold, are won by an effective offense. No nation or group of nations has ever triumphed with a strong defense — or because the enemy got into a crappable argument.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . . ADA Seeks Liberal Laws From Congress

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA) — "Every time I feel depressed," says Dr. John P. Roche, new national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, "I go out and read National Review to find out how important we in ADA really are."
National Review is William F. Buckley Jr.'s weekly guide for right-wingers. It looks upon ADA as a kind of Communist cell that runs the government. ADA thinks it's not that important. ADA has written letters to President Kennedy telling him what he ought to do. But he hasn't taken their free advice and hasn't even answered their letters. Fewer than 50 ADAers have been identified in the Kennedy administration, although they are well dispersed in key jobs.
"We have about 50,000 members—we're very selective," says Roche, with tongue in cheek. "Liberals are rambunctious types. They're not good organization men. That's what makes them so enjoyable."
The question of how much influence ADA really has is made timely once more by the organization's annual message to the President telling him what he should be for.
Roche, who delivered this message to a small press conference, was elected ADA national chairman last year. He is a Brooklyn boy, a Hofstra A. B. and Cornell Ph.D., Fulbright Fellow and tramp professor at Lall-dozen institutions of higher learning. This year he is visiting professor of political science at University of Chicago.
Roche says he has no idea how many members of ADA are also members of the next Congress, although his letterhead lists five senators and one representative who are members of his national board and executive committee. The senators are Clark of Pennsylvania, Humphrey and McCarthy of Minnesota, Morse and Neuberger of Oregon. The congressman is Jimmy Roosevelt of California.
Roche thinks there were several more ADAers elected to the new Congress and he believes

there is a net addition of about five liberals to the House. "Also," says Dr. Roche, "there are a lot of people in Congress who are not members of ADA. And if the Republicans want to knock off ultra-conservative Democrats in the South, that's all right with us."
All things considered, Roche thinks the new Congress will do right by the ADA program—if the President will just cooperate and exercise the right kind of leadership.
That's the No. 1 problem from the ADA point of view. President Kennedy was never an ADAer. He knocked off ADA's favorite, Hubert Humphrey, in the West Virginia primary and boasted after he was elected that he was a conservative.
"Conservatism comes two ways," says Roche. "You can have a conservative program or you can have a conservative personality. Kennedy has a program that is 180 degrees to the left of Barry Goldwater and John Tower. But Kennedy boards his personality like a French peasant boards his gold. He doesn't fight for all the things he believes in the way he fought for his new trade program. In that battle he used his prestige and he won a tremendous victory."
The things that ADA thinks the President ought to fight for this year include, as a minimum:
"Specific civil rights legislation, tax reductions and reform, establishment of a department of urban affairs, medical care for the aged under Social Security, federal aid to school construction and teachers' salaries, a sweeping attack on the corrosive blight of unemployment, open and energetic support for changes in the rules of the House and Senate."
"I am not disappointed in President Kennedy's performance on these issues in the last Congress," Roche explains, "because I didn't expect too much. I have known Kennedy politically for a number of years. There was an argument over a choice between Kennedy and Nixon in 1960."
"But you take your breaks in politics where you find them, and I don't suffer from the paralysis of perfectionism."



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS
Speaking of words and names, as I was the other day, reminded me that a few months ago the Harris menage was looking through Roger Price's amusing book, "What Not To Name the Baby."
Price made the observation, which has often occurred to me but which I have never seen in print before, that different forms of the same name apply to very different sorts of persons.
We have, for instance, a number of friends named Arthur. One of them is called Art by his friends, another is called Artie, and still another is called only Arthur. Nobody who knows them would dream of calling Art Artie or Artie Arthur.
The same is true of Edwards. Some are always Ed, others are invariably Eddie, and yet others are nothing but Edward. There are Stans and Stanleys, Walters and Wallies, Jims and Jimmies, Richards, Richies and Dicks.
It is more than habit or custom that decrees such different forms of the same name; it is, in fact, a sense of the personality one is addressing oneself to—Artie and Arthur, for example, are quite proper personalities, and people recognize this in referring to them.
(Parenthetically, only casual acquaintances call me Syd; all my close friends have always called me Sydney, or worse things, but never Syd; yet another Sydney I happen to know is always called Syd by his family and friends.)
Girls' names, it seems are not quite so flexible, but much the same psychological rules apply to them. I know four women named Patricia. One is called Pat, the second Patsie, the third Patsy, and the last only Patricia.
And who would deny that Florence is a very different woman from Flo? Or that the dozen versions of Elizabeth—Liz, Beth, Betty, Betsy, Libby, Bully, and so on—do not in some real way denote a distinction of personality? How we treat a person's name tells a good deal about that person and our reaction to the ambience he moves in.
One of the funniest segments in an Elaine May and Mike Nichols recording is the part in which a

brush and ignorant radio interviewer keeps referring to "Al" Schweitzer. I am sure that no one in his adult lifetime has referred to Dr. Albert Schweitzer as "Al," any more than I can conceive of Dr. Freud being addressed as "Siggy," even by his intimates. And, reversely, he seems impossibly right for the homespun prairie personality of Dwight Eisenhower.

Top news stories of 1962—No. 1: The bed-time prayer of the little girl in Pittsburgh, "Dear Lord, I'll need Your best support to slip this past the Supreme Court."
No. 2: The anonymous guest who fell into Bob Kennedy's swimming pool in a swimming suit.
No. 3: Harold Stassen's heart-warming decision not to run for any public office during the calendar year.
No. 4: The Harvard sophomore who had to transfer to Ohio State because he flunked picketing.
No. 5: The outraged homeowner who called the zoning board and demanded that the new freeway be taken out of his neighbor's front yard and put through his.
No. 6: The steel-maker who drew a White House rebuke for trying to reduce prices without a government permit.

POTOMAC FEVER

FLETCHER KNEBEL
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Q—Who was the first U.S. citizen to be canonized?
A—Mother Francis Xavier Cabrini in 1946.
Q—How far back does written history of China date?
A—To about 1500 B.C.

THESE DAYS . . . Capital Fluidity Restored

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

The 7,500 employees of the Kaiser Steel Corporation, a big West Coast producer, are scheduled to vote today, Jan. 11, on a union contract that is built around profit-sharing features. Since the proposed agreement has the support of the United Steelworkers of America, it will presumably be accepted. If the contract does go through, labor relations in this country are bound to take a new turn, and in my opinion it will be considerably for the better.

The provisions of the Kaiser contract are complex. But the heart of the program consists of certain easily understood variables. Instead of getting fixed raises in hourly pay, the Kaiser workers will receive approximately thirty-three per cent of a savings fund that is to be built up out of the monetary gains that are likely to come as a reflex of improved methods of steel making. The Kaiser company will fix a standard base rate for the cost of producing an ingot ton of steel. Anything that can be shaved from that cost, either by the installation of new equipment or by increased individual labor-hour efficiency, will be shared with the workers. Other provisions in the Kaiser contract are designed to reassure the United Steelworkers of America that "automation" won't be introduced at a rate that will lead to layoffs and firings. If a worker does lose his job to an improved machine, he will be assigned a priority number in an employment pool, anyone cooling his heels for protracted periods in the pool will be guaranteed a year's full pay.

Inasmuch as Kaiser Steel, along with Inland Steel of Chicago, "broke the line" last year by refusing to accept the leadership of United States Steel in the matter of a price rise, the older steel companies are inclined to look askance on anything that Kaiser proposes. The older companies have a long tradition of loyalty to the steel makers' "club," which

is one reason why the anti-trust division of the department of justice is inclined to question their habit of trying to concert their moves. But the "club," in this case, will have to reckon with Kaiser's move toward profit-sharing simply because it is more sensible economically to accept variable costs than it is to tie oneself up with fixed costs.

In the automobile country, the older concerns regard the American Motors Corporation, producer of the Rambler car, much as the old-line steel companies regard Kaiser. They dislike the Rambler men because the recently resigned president of American Motors, George Romney, "knocked the product" of the industry in general by talking about "gas guzzling dinosaurs." As a reflex of this dislike, the older motor men have had little good to say of the American Motors profit-sharing union contract, which has been running for a year. Yet it cannot be argued that a mandatory hourly pay increase in automobile wages is better for a company's health than a contingent pay increase. Should times turn bad and there are no profits to share, American Motors will be in a better position than those companies which allowed Walter Reuther's automobile workers to impose fixed pay increases on them.

Two hundred years ago the first liberal economist, Adam Smith, warned business men that they could absorb only a certain amount of rigidity. In the easy days after World War II, when the rest of the world was struggling to get back into production, wage rises could be financed out of inflationary price increases. But now that foreign steel—and foreign cars—are moving into the U.S. in increased quantities at relatively low prices, the United States can no longer keep its business system fixed by inflation. Whole industries have their backs to the wall. The New York newspapers see no way to absorb

the demands of the printers. The railroads, fighting off receiverships, are appalled at the idea of negotiating contracts designed to preserve featherbedding conditions. And the new middle class of consumers is tired to death of the annual increase in the cost of living that has been generated by the familiar wage-price spiral of the forties and the fifties.

Thus a new way of finding fluidity will inevitably be imposed on management and labor alike. The profit sharing — or "progress" sharing — union contract is the only possible way of satisfying labor and the consumer without saddling industry with fixed costs that in depression periods can kill off marginal companies like flies.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Friday, Jan. 11, the 11th day of 1963 with 354 to follow. The moon is approaching its last quarter.
The morning stars are Mars and Venus.
The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.
Those born on this day include American statesman Alexander Hamilton, in 1757.
On this day in history:
In 1783, the Continental Congress convened in New York City.
In 1801, Alabama seceded from the Union.
In 1933, flier Amelia Earhart Putnam took off from Wheeler Field, Honolulu, bound for the United States, in an attempt to become the first woman to make a solo flight across the Pacific Ocean.
In 1943, Great Britain and the United States signed treaties with China relinquishing extraterritorial and other special rights in that country.
A thought for the day — Vice President of the United States Thomas Riley Marshall said: "What this country needs is a good five-cent cigar."



WASHINGTON REPORT . . . Slave Labor Camps Abound In Russia

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
It was eight years ago that Nikita Khrushchev announced, with considerable fanfare, that Soviet slave labor camps would be abolished.
Within the next several years, self-styled expert after self-styled expert visited the Soviet Union, and came back to dutifully report that Premier Khrushchev was indeed a man of his word.
W. Averil Harriman, unemployed after losing the New York governorship, made a quickie jaunt across the Soviet Union, and wrote in the New York Times that slave labor was no more. Samuel Loebowitz, a New York judge, made the same observation after visiting a model prison near Moscow.
What is the situation today? Dr. Bela Fabian, a former member of the Hungarian Parliament, a one-time inmate of Communist and Nazi prisons, says:
"Not only have the promises of Nikita Khrushchev failed to materialize, as so many other Soviet promises, but, since Khrushchev came to power, the number of concentration camps and political prisoners has increased."
A decade ago there were 3.2 million residents of Kazakh Soviet Republic in Central Russia. Today there are 30 million, drafted by the Soviet Government to farm the so-called virgin lands.
When tens of thousands rioted last year against low pay, long hours and poor food, Soviet troops were called in to mow down hundreds of draftees.
More than 60,000 Hungarians, captured during the Revolution of 1956, have been shipped in box cars to Siberia. Citizens of Byelorussia of the Ukraine, of Moslem "republics" on the Iranian border, are among those too who have been drafted to work on the virgin lands.
A Soviet diplomat, who defected in 1959, confirms Dr. Fabian's analysis. Alexander Kaznacheyev says that "millions of people are in Communist concentration camps."
Even Soviet officials admit that workers are often drafted for certain tasks. Dr. A. Borsdady, first Deputy Minister of Labor Reserve, put it this way:
"One of our difficulties is not in finding jobs for the men but men for the jobs. We are constantly opening new fields of industry in remote areas, particularly new diamond fields recently discovered in one of the coldest parts of the USSR. We are over-

coming this particular problem of recruitment by drafting men to these areas."
Note: A Congressional report in 1946 said of Red slave labor camps: "The Government makes every effort to conceal the existence of these camps. No foreigner or correspondent is ever permitted to see them."
The situation has not changed. Four years ago, my assistant, Bill Schulz, wrote the Soviet Ambassador, Mikhail Menshikov:
"As a professional newsman I note with interest the statement of one who is not a newsman, Averil Harriman, that an investigation of his discloses no slave labor camps in your country. In view of conflicting opinion on this subject I would like to ask permission to make a personal investigation of 'corrective labor' in the Soviet Union."
"To guarantee freedom of investigation, I would like assurances that I might travel freely, without the 'aid' of any Intourist guides. I would like also to know if I might bring my own interpreter and one recognized expert, perhaps John Noble, an American citizen. Mr. Noble was imprisoned in the Vorkuta camp for 10 years after World War II. He would be glad, I am sure, to discover that there are no such camps today."
"Smiling Mike" Menshikov did not think the letter funny. He informed Mr. Schulz that no visas could be issued to those characterized as "politically undesirable."
Two weeks ago, Mr. Schulz dispatched a similar letter to the new Ambassador, Anatoly Dobrynin. He has not yet received an answer.

"Smiling Mike" Menshikov did not think the letter funny. He informed Mr. Schulz that no visas could be issued to those characterized as "politically undesirable."
Two weeks ago, Mr. Schulz dispatched a similar letter to the new Ambassador, Anatoly Dobrynin. He has not yet received an answer.

"Smiling Mike" Menshikov did not think the letter funny. He informed Mr. Schulz that no visas could be issued to those characterized as "politically undesirable."
Two weeks ago, Mr. Schulz dispatched a similar letter to the new Ambassador, Anatoly Dobrynin. He has not yet received an answer.

"Smiling Mike" Menshikov did not think the letter funny. He informed Mr. Schulz that no visas could be issued to those characterized as "politically undesirable."
Two weeks ago, Mr. Schulz dispatched a similar letter to the new Ambassador, Anatoly Dobrynin. He has not yet received an answer.

THEY SAY . . .

If parents took care of children when they were in the high chair, the children would never get to the electric chair.
—Acting Justice Benjamin Gassman, New York state Supreme court.
The press goes first—and what comes next? Well, the legitimate courts are superseded in every autocracy by puppet judges and tribunals. Thus freedom passes.
—Don Shoemaker, editor, Miami Herald, to Nat'l Assn. of Municipal Judges.