

Editorial Page

Bureaucracy In Business

"Bureaucracy" is an epithet usually reserved for talking about the government.

Lately, however, many businessmen have become aware that the word, with all its ramifications of inefficiency and waste and red tape, is a pretty fair description of the present state of many American companies.

Almost imperceptibly over recent years, while attention has been focused on increasing the productivity of blue collar personnel, the number of white collar workers has crept upward, resulting in top-heavy corporate bureaucracies.

The Wall Street Journal reports that since 1947, the number of white collar workers employed by manufacturers has climbed over 65 per cent, while over the same period total production force has shrunk by 7 per cent. In 1947, white collar payrolls were 25 per cent of the total manufacturing payroll; they now constitute 35 per cent.

To remedy the situation, management is attacking it in the most forthright manner possible—clearing out the dead wood.

Most famous example is the belt-tightening operation carried out by Chrysler Corp. in 1961. Nearly 20 per cent of its 36,000 white collar employees were fired. This, along with other economy measures, lowered the com-

pany's break-even point on sales from a million cars and trucks to 750,000.

The process is being repeated in many other concerns, though not usually so drastically. The American Management Assn. has launched a program to aid companies to eliminate white collar inefficiency. Some 200 firms are participating by exchanging information on the number of people they employ in various categories.

This minor revolution in business is facilitated by the absence of unionism among white collar workers. Heretofore, while sharing in financial gains won by the unions, white collar workers have been considered part of management and have generally been immune to layoffs. This long thwarted the AFL-CIO's announced goal of proselyting in white collar pastures.

The thorniest issue in the labor field today is the attempt by companies to eliminate no longer needed workers. Strife in the steel industry, on the railroads and currently in the maritime industry reflects blue collar resistance to this.

It remains to be seen whether the same process in the area of management will lead to any significant movement toward collective bargaining among white collar people.

Broad Program Proposed

(The Sacramento Bee)

Governor Edmund G. Brown's inaugural address presents to the legislature a broad program for California, some phases of which will be received with acclaim, others with reservations.

The governor proposes to bring his program into being without imposing new taxes or increasing old ones. How he hopes to achieve this seeming bit of financial legerdemain must await more detailed plans and the submission of his formal budget to the legislature later this month.

In any event, Brown has laid down the pattern of his concept of dealing with the problems of California in its first year as the most populous state and the problems which will multiply as it continues to be the most rapidly growing state in the Union.

The governor wisely places stress on overall planning, on a state, urban, rural and regional basis to cope with the problems of growth and astutely urges a revenue study commission to examine California's tax structure. These should be musts on the legislative agenda.

One of the items of interest to all taxpayers is the governor's proposal that the state assume more of the burden of the cost of education, lightening the load on the property owners. This is in line with the recommendations of many educators that the cost be

restored to the 50-50 split between the state and property owners. At present the latter bear more than 60 per cent.

The governor also pledged his support to protecting the state's resources, ranging from its precious water supplies to the preservation of its scenic beauty including strict controls on billboards.

Brown correctly appealed to the legislature for a reexamination of the criminal code, which has not had a major revision for 35 years, and called for stricter penalties for the sale of dangerous drugs.

Certain to provoke controversy is the governor's proposal for abolition of or a moratorium on capital punishment except to protect penal institution staffs and inmates. Here the governor fouls off a pitch. For if he believes the death penalty is a restraint upon life takers killing prison personnel or fellow convicts, why is it not also deterrent to the killing of men, women and children in their homes and on the streets?

The governor's inaugural address covered almost the whole gamut of state affairs. It will stir controversies and debates in the legislature. Some phases will drop by the wayside. Californians only can hope that out of the legislative mill will come a program measuring up to what the governor picturesquely described as a beachhead on the future.

THESE DAYS . . .

Olive Branch For Acheson

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

When they are talking about foreign affairs, conservatives and old-fashioned liberals are fond of citing the warnings of President Washington against letting ancient partisan friendships sway decisions in international policy. The ally of yesterday, so the Father of Our Country advised us, may be the enemy of tomorrow. And the converse is also true: the enemy of yesterday may be the friend of tomorrow.

President Washington's warning that international grudges may outlive their usefulness should also be extended to the domestic scene. For example, there is the deep-seated grudge which conservatives and old-fashioned liberals hold against ex-Secretary of State Dean Acheson. How we hated him back in the early 1950s! In those days we considered that it was Acheson who had invited the Korean War by making an injudicious speech in which he had placed South Korea outside of our defense perimeter in Asia.

Well, to my mind, that particular Acheson speech will always live as an example of grievously mistaken statecraft. But no man is perfect, and every public figure is entitled to forgiveness for an early error in the light of subsequent performance. The time has come, I think, for the grudge-bearing conservatives and the dedicated anti-Communists to reassess their attitude toward Dean Acheson.

In his own urbane way, which

some people dislike because it often seems to contain a suggestion of superciliousness, Acheson has been standing up against the "soft" in the matter of our policy toward Soviet Russia ever since he tangled with George F. Kennan in 1950. Kennan was then arguing for "disengagement" in Europe, suggesting that the Cold War might be liquidated if Russian and American forces were simultaneously to be pulled out of Germany. Said Acheson at the time: "When you are engaged all across the Arctic Circle, when you are engaged in every country of the uncommitted world in which we have economic operations, to move troops apart in Europe means nothing at all. . . it seems to me Mr. Kennan withdraws from the whole conception of the United States leading the world."

In that same year of 1950 Acheson opposed the propaganda for a summit conference of the U.S., President and the Soviet dictator. A President's judgment, he said, "should not be caught up in the ebb and flow of the struggle in the negotiating chamber." True enough, Acheson was still underestimating the importance of Asia in 1950. But he has continued to battle for the idea that the unification of Germany, when it comes, must be on terms that will extend freedom to the east, and not slavery to the west.

Acheson has no official position in the Kennedy Administration, but his unofficial relation-

ship with the President is a force for strength when it comes to opposing Soviet machinations in Europe. In his recent speeches Acheson has emerged as the strongest contemporary supporter of a beefed-up NATO. Against the supine pragmatism that would regard the division of Germany into free and slave sectors as something destined for perpetuity, Acheson has insisted that the Western nations must stand for something far more positive than the mere right of West Berlin "to remain beleaguered but unsubdued." The immediate implication of Acheson's position is that NATO should be provided with both the will and the force to prevent any Soviet action designed to block access routes to Berlin. A more far-reaching implication is that a well-armed and a firmly-committed NATO might enable the West to take a diplomatic offensive that could lead to the dismantling of the Berlin wall.

Acheson has said that the business of the United States is "to bring some kind of a workable system out of the remains of what is left of the Nineteenth Century world." That is good conservative or old-fashioned liberal doctrine. So let's not cherish our old grudge against Acheson because of an ancient blunder. If and when he makes new mistakes, we can always tell him off. Meanwhile he should be commended for being a force for bravery and sanity in the matter of standing up to Khrushchev in the battle for central Europe.

"That Man's Here Again!"



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Costly Kennedy Mistake

By RALPH de TOLEDO

When Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy was helping to raise ransom money for the Cuban Bay of Pigs prisoners, he told the head of a pharmaceutical firm, "My brother made a mistake." He was referring to the Presidential decision which cut off the air cover necessary to make the invasion of Fidel Castro's island a success.

This revealing remark I got from Representative Craig Hosmer of California, who has been busy doing some arithmetic. What he has sought to learn, did that "mistake" cost the American taxpayer in dollars? As he quickly points out, the "monetary price tag" does not include the suffer-

ing to men caught between gunfire and the deep blue sea. Neither does it take into account the bill which must be paid in fear and degradation by the free world. Mr. Hosmer was simply looking for direct cash outlays.

Because the President listened to Ambassador Stevenson and adviser Arthur Schlesinger Jr., the American people have been stuck with a preliminary bill for \$349.4 million, with more to come. The Cuban adventure could have been ended quickly and decisively had Mr. Kennedy been ready to live up to the promises he made to the brave men who invaded the Communist bastion in the Antilles.

In his tally sheet, Representative Hosmer lists 20 items—including \$66,000 for positioning the USS Joseph P. Kennedy Jr. so that it could be the first naval vessel to order a Soviet freighter to heave to. Perhaps \$66,000 is not too much to allow a President for a sentimental gesture—but we could use the money. In any case, it is a piddling sum when compared to the millions which were spent when the President "discovered" that Dictator Khrushchev was doing what he does naturally to him by planting offensive missiles in Cuba.

Mobilization of the Army, Navy, and Air Force—just in case the Communists tried to get tough about the blockade—nickied the Pentagon for \$35 million. Fleet activities cost \$32 million, which might have been spent somewhat more productively. Reinforcing the Navy's base at Guantanamo and evacuating dependents came to more than \$20 million. The mobilization and demobilization of reserve units cost three and one another \$25 million. The ransom . . . \$53 million, with another \$35 million lost in federal and state taxes when the blackmail payments were made deductible. The Bay of Pigs operation ate into the Treasury at a rate of \$20 million. Since all of this added to the national debt, chalk up another \$10 million for interest on the Kennedy mistake.

There are other small and large items, of which \$6.5 million go to the Central Intelligence Agency for keeping tabs on Fidel's activities.

Aerial surveillance of Cuba, at a minimum estimate, costs the Air Force some \$3.3 million a year—and this, we assume, will continue indefinitely.

No matter how you look at it, one-third of a billion dollars for what the President's brother concedes was a "mistake" ain't hay. That it could have been avoided makes it even worse. But it will be money well spent if the President and his advisers have learned a lesson. It would have cost less than \$100 million to give the Bay of Pigs invasion adequate support. Castro would by now be a small black spot on the pages of history. Today, it would cost close to a billion dollars, according to expert estimates, to dislodge Fidel and his Communist armies from Cuba. What if it were six months from now is anybody's guess.

The price of timidity or indecision is a high one. The price of wishful thinking is even higher. Yet the President's advisory continue to counsel "patience" and half measures. The blockade of Cuba was called off before Comrades Khrushchev and Castro had complied with the President's major condition: inspection. Now we have nothing more than their word that the IRBMs are off the island and not stored away in convenient caves. For the next crisis, we may be confronted by the same weapons.

In making his co-accounting report on the "mistake," Representative Hosmer refers to Castro's Cuba as a "cancer." Surgery is needed to rid the Western Hemisphere of this spreading evil. Will we be told by the Attorney General a year from today that his brother made another error in not pushing his advantage?

FLETCHER KNEBEL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

A friend of mine who did not succeed in getting a famous actress to attend one of her soirees during the holidays was vastly disappointed. "I was so hoping to have my friends meet her while in town," she said.

I murmured some politely evasive regret, but privately I could sympathize with the actress. She simply did not care to be used—as we ordinarily and thoughtlessly use such people—as a trophy or a door prize to attract party guests.

Some years ago, when he was performing in New York, Sir John Gielgud candidly told a reporter, "It's alarming, when you go at this rate, to be invited out."

Asked why, he explained: "People want you to scintillate immediately and put on another show, when what you want is them to talk to you. But they're too shy and you're afraid of being indiscreet or too colloquial or in some way letting down the side."

Marie Tempest once remarked that "Actors should be like dolls; they should be put in tissue paper and a cardboard box after a performance and not brought out again until the following night, just before the curtain goes up again."

Most performers are disappointing in meet in person—not because they are dull or stupid, but simply because people expect so much of them, and they overreact, either by becoming withdrawn and cold or going to the other extreme and behaving in an exhibitionistic fashion. Few celebrities of any sort can maintain a public equilibrium midway between the chilly and the frantic.

Psychologically, the problem is that the social lion wants two opposite things at the same time: he wants to be recognized and respected for his talents, but he also wants to be treated like an ordinary human being and resents it when people who have not met him come up with preconceived notions of what he is "really" like.

This ambivalence on the part of the celebrity accounts, I think, for the strained feelings at so



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Railroads Face Year Of Reforms And Crises

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Railroad management and railway labor agree on one thing, at any rate: 1963 is going to be a year of crisis for America's transportation system.

Responsibility for doing something about it is being put up to government by both sides, but with different formulas.

In the most far-reaching statement on this subject yet issued by a railway labor union official, President Louis J. Wagner of the Order of Conductors and Brakemen has just declared that while:

"We prefer to deal with private ownership . . . if management cannot run the railroads in the public interest and unless there is drastic change in labor-management policies, we will be forced to answer, 'Yes!' to the question, 'Should we have public ownership of the railroads?'"

Nationalization of American railroads has been discussed academically ever since the government took over the roads for unified operation in World War I, but it has never been considered seriously. Europe's costly experience with nationalized railroads in more socialized economies is the best argument against it.

Though the railway labor lobby is powerful in Washington, it is doubtful if public ownership of American railroads could ever pass Congress unless there should be a complete breakdown of the U.S. transportation system.

Such a possibility is foreseen, however, by no less an authority than David I. Mackie, chairman of the Eastern Railroad President's Conference. Unless the U.S. transportation system can be pulled together and given unified direction, he believes there is not the slightest doubt it will soon begin to fall apart, piece by piece.

This crisis can be avoided, says Mackie in the January Reader's Digest, only by putting transportation's legal framework in order. The first step he advocates is President Kennedy's sweeping transportation reorganization plan, sent to Congress last April.

Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation Clarence D. Martin has given assurance that

this program, on which Congress took no action last session, will be presented to the new Congress practically unchanged.

The situation and the conditions which the President's program would reform are described by Mackie as a dozen federal agencies and 100 state commissions, juggling bits of the transportation system among themselves.

"Nowhere among the tens of thousands of public officials involved is there one person whose job it is to look after the overall efficiency of the system."

Kennedy called it "a chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation."

Railway labor and management have their own relations with each other to put in order, as well as their relations with government.

"Government intervention, court rulings and management practices have resulted in a snarl of red tape," says Vice President John W. O'Brien of the Sheet Metal Workers Union.

"Issues which must be settled in 1963 include railroad mergers, the work rules dispute with the operating unions and extended job stabilization to ease automation's impact."

In connection with this last-mentioned issue, a presidential fact-finding board has just recommended that Southern Pacific Railway clerks who lose their jobs as a result of automation should have a share of the savings. The clerks, in a dispute going back to 1958, had asked full pay for five years if laid off by automation.

The rules dispute with the operating unions is still pending. Railway brotherhood chiefs are seeking reversal of a U.S. Court of Appeals decision that railroads have the right to overhaul their work rules to take advantage of labor-saving practices made possible by automation.

In another case, a U.S. District Court has dismissed the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen's effort to have the railroads strike insurance agreement declared illegal.

The big showdown comes next May when the 11 nonoperating employee unions, with 450,000 members, open negotiations with the Class I railroads for a new wage agreement.

Letters To The Editor

Freedom

County zoning as proposed takes in too much territory, and will impose more government and more expense upon us. It will be an extension of police power, while the restrictive powers already laid upon us by governmental agencies hamper and diminish our initiative.

Unlike many California communities, our suburban area is not loaded with the wealthy, nor will it ever be. The common man predominates here, and we love our homes, and do not want to be taxed out of them. Real estate taxes are admittedly high, and one way or another we will have to pay extra for the added load of controls, regimentation, and zoning inspectors.

The creation and approved location of any new streets, parkstrips or alleys, as well as all sewage disposals, and size of lots being platted, is already well controlled in the county, and has been for several years by the County Court and inspectors on the job at present. They are doing a good job. The city of Klamath Falls has had an official planning commission in effect ever since 1934 under the Oregon Enabling Act. We appreciate the hard work they do, but can we honestly say that more progress has been made inside the city than out during these 29 years? Most anything reasonable can be worked out by private negotiation out here, and without extension of police power.

Nationally we are over 300 billions in debt, while commitments continue to grow. During the last 30 years especially, there has been an increase in these ever creeping controls, that threaten to bind us hand and foot. One control calls for another as each new bureaucracy is formed. It is a vicious circle and can destroy our basic rights. It is our constitutional right to vote on whether we are to submit to additional controls. We think that we still have a government of the people, by the people, for the people, but it may be that we are forfeiting our rights by default. It is our duty to work as best we can at the local level toward getting our government out of the red mess it is in, and decide at the polls whether we are to part with some more of our precious freedom. My vote is NO.

Everett Dennis Realtor

Well, to make a long story short, if they want to enforce the law they can. The people voted it in and I believe they knew what they wanted.

Sam Matthews, 1829 Washburn Way

playing of the handicapped during the past year.

The Herald and News has rendered over the years a great deal of public service in drawing attention to the valuable source of workers which the handicapped provide. The handicapped have definitely proven their worth as consistently productive workers. All they need is a chance to prove it.

We thank you again for your cooperation and service and wish you continued progress during the year 1963.

Robert A. Mitchell, Chairman
Klamath Falls Employee
The Handicapped Committee,
Enforcement

After being awakened throughout the night several times by dogs barking, I was a bit amused the next morning in reading the council report in regard to the enforcement of the dog leash law.

"It cannot be enforced for one reason or another" sounds a little weak talk to me. Other laws can be enforced. It makes one wonder who has dogs that they don't want to take care of.

I believe the pound master can at least pick up dogs without a license on "You catch him and tie him up." doesn't sound exactly right to me.

Well, to make a long story short, if they want to enforce the law they can. The people voted it in and I believe they knew what they wanted.

Sam Matthews, 1829 Washburn Way

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Tuesday, Jan. 15, the 14th day of 1963 with 350 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The morning stars are Venus and Mars.

The evening stars are Mars, Jupiter and Saturn.

On this day in history
In 1831, the first practical locomotive built in America—"The Best Friend of Charleston"—made its maiden run over the Charleston and Hamburg Railroad in South Carolina.

In 1919, the pianist, Ignace Jan Paderewski, became the first premier of the Republic of Poland.

In 1922, the Irish Free State was born.

A thought for the day—it is written in the Gospel of Matthew: "All they that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

Thanks

We take this means to express our appreciation on your publication of items concerning the em-