Herald and News

Editorial Page

States' Rights And Wrongs

The battle for power between the states and the federal government goes on. Congress and the 47 states with regular legislative sessions in 1963 are being asked to approve three striking proposals which would materially enhance state authority.

Only Virginia, Kentucky, and Mississippi do not convene their legislatures in regular session this year.

The proposals being put before the others would bar the federal courts from acting on state legislative reapportionment, would make it easier for states to initiate amendments to the U.S. Constitution, and would establish a so-called Court of the Union which in major respects would be superior to the U.S. Supreme Court.

These propositions are the product of the General Assembly of the States, a nationwide conclave of legislators and other state officers. They are being proposed as amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

One anonymous expert on state government says no more than three states are likely to endorse the revolutionary court plan. Most probable are Alabama and Florida, with Mississippi a prospective third state if it should call a special session for that purpose.

As for the other proposals, it is anticipated that perhaps 10 may approve the idea of simplifying procedures by which states can initiate constitutional amendments. And just five or six are expected to endorse a ban on U.S. court rulings in state apportionment.

There is no thought that any of the plans will get anywhere in Congress.

When Congress does approve an amendment it must then gain ratification by three-fourths of the states—now 38. For the states to initiate an amendment, two-thirds of the 50 must apply for a constitutional convention. Congress must then summon the convention to consider amendments. Those approved must again have the endorsement of three-fourths of the states.

This cumbersome method never has been used. Under the new plan, whenever two-thirds of the states agree on a specific amendment, it would automatically make the ratification rounds in quest of the same three-fourths vote.

Since congressional approval of the three plans is unlikely, the states this time would have to use the cumbersome machinery to win first-stage approval. And they are presently a long way from the necessary two-thirds majority.

Remotest prospect of all is the revolutionary Court of the Union. In the states' assembly in December, it was dropped just 21 to 20. The other proposals gained heavy majorities.

The proposed new court would consist of the 50 state chief justices. It would have power to decide whether judgments of the Supreme Court affecting rights reserved to the states or the people under the Constitution were properly within Supreme Court jurisdiction.

Observers at the assembly meeting say the three proposals are the work of such staunch conservatives as William Chappell, Florida legislator, and Fred Gulick of the Kansas legislative council.

One observer suggests that many states' votes were cast by individuals "not even representative of their unrepresentative legislatures." That the proposals are under study at all is perhaps stout proof of what militant, energetic "believers" can accomplish.

Thirty-Six Thousand Five Hundred More

(The Wall Street Journal)

Now that members of Congress and interested taxpayers have had time to read the fine print in the Administration's budget for fiscal 1964, it's dawned on them what the President really was saying in his budget message about "management improvement and cost reduction" in Government employment.

What President Kennedy said was that his budget had been prepared "with special attention to employment trends in the Federal Government." And that "requests for additional jobs have been reduced or denied wherever possible." The key phrase there is "requests . . . have been reduced." For the President certainly did not say that the number of Federal employes is going to be reduced. Or even that he proposed to hold the line on Federal jobs. The fine print discloses that the President gave "special attention to employment trends," all right. And those trends, as usual, are ever upward.

For instance, the President asked for an increase of 5,315 employes in the Agriculture Department, which would raise the total to 121,583. For the Commerce Department, where Secretary Hodges has been making such stirring pare-the-payroll talks, an increase of 3,497 is being asked.

Indeed, in only two places is a decrease in the number of employes apparent, and these two cuts total only 78.

Altogether, the President is asking Congress for almost 36,500 more Government employes. It certainly makes for an interesting approach to management improvement and cost reduction.

THESE DAYS . . .

Anti-Communist Dilemma

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

As perhaps the author of this column does not need to tell anyone, he has a host of dedicated anti-Communist friends. They seem discouraged these days, and for reasons that must seem mystifying to the average hopeful American. Here we have Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung trading insults with each other—which ought to please all good anti-Communists. We also have the spectacle of the Soviets backing down in Cuba at least to the extent of making a show of pulling their more dangerous missiles out. This, too, ought to be cause for anti-Communist happiness.

The better things look on the surface, however, the more doleful become the looks on the faces of the anti-Communist hard core. And, though it is hard to explain it, there is good reason for anti-Communist discouragement. The reason has to do with Khrushchev's current addiction to what might be called the sliding tactic. As the Soviet dictator told his East German comrades recently, he still expects to see capitalism "buried." But when the Big Boss of the Kremlin turns his head to the East and addresses the Chinese, he takes a leaf out of Eisenhower's book and says, in effect, that atomic warfare is "unthinkable." This means that Khrushchev is yielding a gambit in the Cold War to our side. But who among us has the nerve to say that atomic war would be quite "thinkable" if the provocation were sufficiently great?

It's all a diplomatic shell game, of course, when Khrushchev solemnly assures us that there's an olive branch concealed under one of his shells. But while the shell game is going on, how can the truly convinced anti-Communist keep his followers in a state of dedicated white heat? Can you imagine King Henry the Fifth of England making his famous battle plea to his army on the eve of St. Crispin's Day if the French had been busy at the moment with a flummery of olive branches and sudden scuttlings to the distant rear of disputed territory? Psychologically, the bold King Henry would have been at a loss for words—and Shakespeare would have had to write a different play.

Just what should anti-Communists be doing in the upcoming era of the sliding tactic? When Khrushchev says he is willing to make a deal on a holiday from nuclear testing that will permit some inspection of Russian atomic installations, can the anti-Communists say, "Don't under any circumstances talk with the man?" When Comrade K. indicates that he has no hard-and-fast date for settlement of the "Berlin problem," have we the nerve to send battering rams against the Berlin wall?

The anti-Communist reply to Khrushchev's sliding tactic in the two matters of Berlin and Cuba would be to step up our own Cold War strategy to a point of intensified intransigeance. For if Comrade K. truly thinks that atomic warfare is "unthinkable," he would not risk any military response if we tore down the Berlin wall or staked the Cuban exiles to sufficient airplane cover to make a successful landing at the Bay of Pigs. But how many Americans are in the mood for such heroism? I've asked many people this question, and find very few who would willingly go beyond our present anti-Soviet commitments as long as Khrushchev is making a show about being amenable to some conciliatory diplomacy.

If the hard core anti-Communists are wrong in thinking that logic has a chance of determining our current foreign policy stance, they are right in worrying about the mood for relaxation that prevails in the country. For under the cover of the sliding tactic the Soviets will assuredly get away with their habitual murder. By refraining from overt action in the Congo, for example, the Russians have succeeded in making Moise Tshombe, hard anti-Communism seem either unimportant or unreasonable—and as a result of this nobody really cries out when the UN does Tshombe in. When the current Congo show is over, we may very well have a weak central government in Leopoldville that will be duck soup for Communist infiltrators.

What can be done to keep Americans wary in the age of the sliding tactic? I wish I knew.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Thursday, Jan. 31, the 31st day of 1963 with 334 to follow.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The morning stars are Venus and Mars.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Those born on this day include Austrian composer Franz Schubert, in 1797.

On this day in history:

In 1865, Robert E. Lee was appointed commander-in-chief of all Confederate Armies by Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederacy.

In 1953, Holland experienced one of its worst floods in history as more than 2,000 persons lost their lives when dikes crumpled, flooding 250,000 acres of land.

In 1958, the first U.S. satellite, Explorer I, was launched into orbit.

Hamming It Up . . .

IN WASHINGTON . . .

Sandpaper Negotiations

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

In the new nuclear test ban negotiations, the Soviet Union has replaced its usual switchblade knife with a piece of sandpaper to wear away the United States position. This metaphor comes from Representative Craig Hosmer of California, the ranking minority member on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Mr. Hosmer has repeatedly warned that President Kennedy's advisers have been willing to retreat steadily in what were considered the Administration's rock-bottom terms for a test ban agreement. He has documented this warning, drawing on knowledge gained in the deliberations of the committee. Now he has dramatized his point by comparing the original American position of 1958 with what the President and his negotiators are willing to concede today. In so doing, he has made obvious the threat to free world security implicit in the frantic desire for a "treaty for treaty's sake" shown by U.S. negotiators.

This is Mr. Hosmer's analysis:

In 1958, scientists urged that a network of 180 internationally manned and controlled seismic stations would be vitally necessary if there was to be no cheating by the Soviet Union. In the current negotiations, the U.S. has abandoned this position and is ready to rely on the "voluntary" submission of derogatory seismic information by the Soviet Union.

Nineteen of these internationally manned seismic stations were to be within the Soviet Union. This has now been dropped in favor of three unmanned and "tamper-prone" stations to cover a territory of 8.5 million square miles covering one-sixth of the world's surface. These unmanned stations would be equipped with an electronic "black box" — about whose effectiveness the scientific community has expressed great doubts. The "black boxes" would be installed and serviced by Soviet personnel and could be moved about the USSR at Soviet will.

The original U.S. plan called for 20 "on-site" inspections of suspicious underground disturbances. The State Department has cooperatively whittled down the number of physical inspections to 10. Comrade Khrushchev caused great rejoicing at Foggy Bottom when he announced that he would be willing to consider two or three "on-site" inspections a year. Test ban negotiators are bargaining over the number, but they start out by giving away half the game.

In 1958, it was the U.S. position that these inspections would be held at the initiative of an international control commission. This, too, has been jettisoned. "Now the discussions revolve around a scheme which contemplates inspections only at the 'invitation' of the suspected cheater, a highly unlikely occurrence," Mr. Hosmer notes.

When the negotiations began, the United States held that inspections were to take place in any suspected test area. We are now debating the Soviet position that inspection teams would not be allowed to enter vast "security areas" of the USSR—the very places where secret nuclear tests are held. Teams, moreover, would be required to travel on Soviet planes whose windows were blacked out, with further restrictions on how they might operate.

In short, what the United States is now attempting to "negotiate" with Nikita Khrushchev's representatives is an inspection system so hamstrung as to be utterly useless. In the name of adequate safeguards against cheating on atomic testing, the United States has stacked the deck against itself. On this basis, the Soviets would be foolish not to garner all the propaganda value of agreement. They give up nothing and at the same time allow Administration spokesmen further to lull the American people into a sense of security.

What would be the result of a treaty which the Soviets can violate with almost no chance of getting caught? "The risk of a surprise Soviet nuclear breakthrough to overwhelming nuclear superiority," Representative Hosmer solemnly warns, "must be precluded unless the United States wishes some day to face a 'surrender or die' ultimatum." This is precisely what all the shouting has been about since the Communists began rubbing down with their negotiating sandpaper the American determination to prevent a nuclear Pearl Harbor.

STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Purely Personal Prejudices: The men who succeed in their own lifetime are generally those who know how to play upon the weaknesses of other men; but those who achieve immortality are the ones who know how to call upon the strengths of other men, not merely for their own time, but for centuries to come.

Speaking of the different sorts of success, it seems to me that reputation is a balloon that must be blown up by others, not by oneself; the man who blows up his own balloon inevitably gives the one extra exhalation of breath that bursts the balloon into fragments.

Much, if not most, of the trouble in personal affairs is caused by people who make difficulties for themselves when they really have no choice.

Once we assuage our conscience by calling something a "necessary evil," it soon begins to look more and more necessary and less and less evil—thus do societies, in every age, justify anything from slavery to atomic - bomb tests.

When politicians ask citizens to make "greater sacrifices" for their country, I am always reminded of Uncle Remus' fine command: "You do de pullin', Sis Cow, an I'll do de gruntin'."

If the conservative vice is narrowness, the liberal vice is self-righteousness; as Anatole France said of a liberal of his day: "He flattered himself on being a man without any prejudices; and this pretension itself is a very great prejudice."

Progress in understanding is so slow for the principal reason that in order to ask the right questions, one must already know a good share of the answers.

It is a public myth that actors must "feel their part" in order to project such feeling to the audience; only the actor who has achieved emotional "distance" from the role can project effectively—for acting is a form of seduction, and as Hazlitt said, "An accomplished coquette excites the passions of others, in proportion as she feels none herself."

The hardest person in the world to bear with equanimity is a prosperous fool.

It is the falsest of metaphors to call marriage "a lottery"; for in a lottery we choose numbers by chance, but in a marriage our choices are determined by our unconscious drives, and the "number" we pick is related to our deep needs for gratification or punishment, or both.

The worst bore is the profound bore, who mistakenly believes that his erudition makes up for his lack of charm.

POTOMAC FEVER

A magazine expert says the Kennedy brothers are the decade's leading cover boys. The only one they missed was the Cuban air cover.

James Meredith may not return to the University of Mississippi. This saddens Army recruiters who had a new slogan: "Join the Army and give it the old college try."

Ode to American fashions: Men in fur hats look slightly ersatz.

Republicans will hold a fund-raising dinner honoring Barry Goldwater. The theme: Fiscal responsibility. The slogan: Cash and Barry.

TV expert Sylvester Weaver says the future job of communications will be to tell everybody at once with the speed of light. The result will be known as instant chaos.

Alterations in White House decor: The Blue Room is now white. The Sun Room is a kindergarten. The Press Room has become the image factory.

FLETCHER KNEBEL

NOTHING SPECIAL

(W. B. S.)

What is more frustrating than a sleepless night?

The eighth annual inventory of U.S. Government property recently filed by the House Government Operations Committee shows real estate holdings valued at $86 billion and personal property appraised at $213 billion, for a total national dollar worth of $299 billion. That is practically equal to the national debt, so, theoretically, the country is solvent. At hand is a document from the Liberty Amendment Committee of Oregon. It urges that the people pass an amendment to the constitution which says, among other things, in Section 1 that "the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

That is a noble and not-so-far-fetched objective. If the government would sell off the personal property which is competing with private industry, it would get that money and more taxes from private sources. Also, it would tend toward re-establishing the sovereignty of the individual 50 states, and add to the economic and personal freedom of taxpayers. There's much more to the proposition than can be covered in the few paragraphs available here—but don't laugh off the idea.

Sign in the window of a paint store: "Husbands Choosing Colors Must Have Note From Wives."

I am receiving copies of the Congressional Record from Al Ullman's office in Washington, and copies of the House and Senate bills introduced into the Oregon Legislature and you readers are welcome to refer to them if you wish.

It is not unusual to read of one of our Klamath Falls policemen getting a rap or two, or otherwise running into a hard time when they try to break up some of the family rows or drinking parties that abound. Along this line is a bit of information that brought out that in a little less than three years, 100 police officers in the United States were killed in the line of duty. Several thousand of them were assaulted, many of them brutally.

It is no surprise that 37 of these killings grew out of police efforts to interrupt burglaries or robberies in progress. Armed men threatened with capture seldom hesitate to use violence to attempt escape.

Of growing alarm, however, is the evidence that officers who try to break up disturbances — family quarrels, rowdy parties, near-riots —are being subjected to mounting peril. Twenty-two policemen lost their lives in such efforts in the past 33 months. The FBI noted recently that 25 officers were killed while either making arrests or transporting prisoners.

Some day, when the opportunity presents, I'm going to ask those in charge the purpose of all of the lights at 11th and Pine. Looks like real uptown stuff, but why so many?

A news story of the organization of a community development corporation in Pendleton aroused — again — the question of why Klamath Falls can't do the same thing. Unfortunately, we seem to have groups who want to pull apart rather than proceed in a constructive, positive manner.

A notable exception to this implied criticism (I'm not being critical; just wondering) is the work of the joint school boards in the county. They are working objectively in attempting to find a common solution to the school problem in the county. They have every reason to be optimistic. If every agency of government, and public-spirited citizens would approach their problems with the same open-mindedness and determination exhibited by the school boards, we'd get some place.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Cabinet Officers To Seek Elective Jobs?

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

At least three members of the President's official family — one a member of his private family —are considering political races of their own.

They are: Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams, and Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

Udall, the Peck's Bad Boy of this Administration, is under heavy pressure to take on Arizona's Sen. Barry Goldwater, up for reelection in 1964. Goldwater, for one, expects Udall to be his Democratic opponent.

A former Congressman, Udall is a proven vote-getter. So, however, is Goldwater, who in 1958 trounced Gov. Ernest McFarland, a former Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate.

Apart from Udall, there are no Democrats who could give Goldwater much of a tussle. The Secretary's younger brother, Morris, "Little Mo," serves the Second District as a Congressman, but is thought to be trading on his brother's name. Representing the Third District is Democrat George Senner, a freshman, unknown throughout most of the far-flung state.

If Udall should resign to make the Senate race, and then lose, it is thought certain he could return to the Administration in some post.

"Soapy" Williams, restless at the State Department, is anxious to get back to Michigan, where he served 12 years, from 1948 to 1960, as the State's Chief Executive. Like many others, Williams expected that he would win appointment as Secretary of Labor or of Health, Education and Welfare for his part in the President's 1960 victory.

His State Department job—in which he oversees all of Africa —has bored Williams and he served notice a fortnight ago that he is ready to go back home and take on Republican Gov. George Romney in 1964. He told the Detroit News he would run—"If the occasion would arise where I would be most able to carry the Democratic banners in Michigan and it was more important to work there than in Africa."

Williams explained: "This would be something maybe the President would decide."

The Chief Executive, it is known, would not be heartbroken to see Williams leave Washington. He would, of course, like to see the Lansing State House occupied once again by a Democrat. And he realizes that Williams' experience in foreign affairs was nonexistent when he took over at foggy bottom, and that he has put his diplomatic foot in his mouth more than once.

Sen. Frank Lausche, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, says that President Kennedy told Williams midway through his first and most disastrous African jaunt: "Come home and leave Africa to the Africans."

The third member of the Administration known to be considering a move is Robert Francis Kennedy, the President's brother and Attorney General. Reports persist that Kennedy has his eye on the Massachusetts Governorship, up again in 1966.

If Robert Kennedy should seek the Democratic nomination for President in 1968 he must show his party's convention delegates a solid vote-getting strength.

There is no major office up for grabs in Massachusetts in 1964, aside from Senator—and Teddy got there first. The Governorship that Bobby is thought to covet is now held by Democrat Endicott "Chub" Peabody, who rode Teddy's coattails to victory last fall.

If Bobby should want the nomination, however, he would probably get it. Sen. Ben Smith, after all, stepped down for Teddy last year and Peabody could probably be persuaded not to seek a second term.

If he were foolish enough to risk a primary fight, Peabody would probably emerge badly battered. The Kennedys, it seems, cannot lose in Massachusetts. If you find that hard to believe, ask Eddie McCormack. He learned the hard way.

Note: Two members of the Administration have so far retired to make political races back home. HEW Secretary Abe Ribicoff won Senate victory in Connecticut. Also elected to the upper house was South Dakota's George McGovern, who served as Food for Peace director.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—Which is the latest country to gain independence from Great Britain?

A—The Island of Jamaica.