

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Protecting The Future

The move to change the zone around the budding OTI campus from (R7.5) single family residential to (R5) multiple dwelling is meeting with mounting opposition.

It first came before the city council when Fred Benioff officially requested a change in the zone to permit construction of multiple family dwellings in the area which lies astride the entrance road to the OTI campus.

Several hearings have been held on the issue by the council, and most of the facts have been well studied by them.

It boils down to one most important point, it appears. That point is whether such a move would jeopardize the future development of the OTI campus.

On this score, we have heard from our legislators in Salem who are attempting to secure additional funds to further develop the campus here.

Speaking for all three of them, Senator Harry Boivin said in his letter to Mayor Robert Veatch, "It is very important that nothing be done to complicate or jeopardize the securing of these funds."

He added, "Where we have a project such as the development of a new campus for OTI, we must first consider the benefit to the entire city and county, and be very reluctant to do anything that would present additional problems to our most important economical and cultural asset."

We have had expressions from Dr. Win-

ston Purvine, president of OTI, speaking also on behalf of the State Board of Higher Education, opposing the move and indicating that it was considered a big threat to the future of OTI.

We agree with those who want to encourage private development and industrial growth in our community, but we must also agree that we cannot sacrifice tomorrow's hopes for something less today.

There is every indication that OTI will grow and expand into a much larger educational institution than is currently planned. This is the pattern of today's education.

In this pattern lies an expanding future for this area.

The day may come when OTI officials will request that such a building project be undertaken to fill housing needs that develop, but presently they rigidly oppose this move, and we agree with them.

Mr. Benioff has indicated he did not wish to do anything to jeopardize OTI. We must commend him in this, and suggest that he withdraw his re-zone request in the light of developments which have shown it represents a clear threat to the future of OTI.

Only by rigidly upholding the present zone around the OTI campus can we provide for orderly growth toward a beautiful and fully expanded OTI campus.

To do otherwise would be to sacrifice the future on the altar of today's expediency.

An Expensive Dock Settlement

(The Christian Science Monitor)

The 31-day longshoremen's strike which tied up 600 ships and idled 100,000 men at ports up and down the United States Atlantic and Gulf coasts is estimated to have cost more than \$700,000,000 in lost wages and business.

How much indirect loss was caused in shutdowns and layoffs in industries producing goods for overseas shipment will never be known.

But now that a settlement has been forced by a kind of "compulsory mediation" on the part of the government, the cost of the imposed terms to the shipping industry and to users of shipping will be far from insignificant even compared with the costs of the strike.

The spokesman for the New York Shipping Association calls it a "very, very expensive" settlement. And a look at the terms bears him out.

In the first place, the most emotional issue in the dispute—reduction of work gangs in northern ports from 20 men to 17—had earlier been referred to the Department of Labor for a two-year study. This is probably the best way to handle the matter. But it means that savings by mechanization with which the shipping companies could meet the cost of wage increases are denied them for at least two years.

Meanwhile, President Kennedy has re-

ferred wage issues in the dispute to a special board headed by Senator Wayne Morse, an experienced labor arbitrator but also a pronounced political liberal. The terms recommended by this board, backed by the prospect of a report to Congress if the shutdown continued, involve increased labor costs of 37 cents an hour by the end of a two-year period.

This is, if anything, a shade nearer the 51-cent serious demand of the International Longshoremen's Association than to the 22-cent offer of the employers. It is enough to raise serious question whether the increase is "in the national interest" to which President Kennedy appealed when he appointed the special board.

One of the national interests, as the President and others repeatedly emphasize, is to compete effectively in international trade, so that earnings from exports may reduce the deficit in balance of payments which results from defense and aid costs. This is not served by permitting unchecked continuance of a wage spiral enforced by labor monopoly.

Further, will the example of what the dockworkers have gained by subjecting the nation to their economic power encourage the New York Typographical Union to continue its strike against New York newspapers until one or more of those publications goes out of business? Or encourage the United Steelworkers to reopen their contract with demands that would have far-reaching and depressive effects?

For the Glory of France



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Anti-Americanism Mounts



By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Two years after taking office, the Kennedy Administration is pushing the United States into a new kind of isolationism. There is nothing splendid about it—nor is it based on the Fortress America principle. It is the result of hasty actions, bad diplomacy, and the belief of such leaders as Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy (today the most powerful man in Washington) that heads of state can be pushed around like ward heelers.

Today, what was once a system of alliances, accommodations, and international relationships, carefully constructed by years of

patient work, is being rapidly undermined. In very simple terms, the United States is painting itself into a corner. A quick look at the map of the world proves this contention.

President de Gaulle has been openly slapped in the face by Undersecretary of State George Ball. He is being referred to by our officials in the same kind of sarcastic and ill-tempered terms which, in the early postwar period, led him to seek the hand of Moscow. The State Department may deplore French desire to have an independent nuclear deterrent. But by attacking President de Gaulle in a manner once unknown to diplomacy it is forc-

ing his hand and encouraging anti-Americanism.

Chancellor Adenauer is experienced enough not to let communications from the State Department, which Embassy Row has characterized as "insulting," to drive him out of the Western alliance. But "der Alte" is an old man—and his successors are not prepared to be told off whenever the Administration gets annoyed. There are now strong forces in West Germany which seek a bill of divorce from dominating American politicians.

In their quiet way, the British are up in arms over the arbitrary ultimatum which cut off the Skybolt program. This has been smoothed over by Prime Minister Macmillan, but there is serious trouble behind the scenes at No. 10 Downing Street. The British were offered the Polaris missile on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Now they discover that the offer had strings attached. They believed that they would be expected to pay for the missiles. Now they learn that they must also share the development costs. This may be fair, but it should have been explained.

It may be fortunate for us that the French kept Great Britain out of the Common Market. For once in the European system, the British might well have refused to walk down the one-way street which American diplomacy increasingly demands.

It will be a long time before the Netherlands forgets the U.S. role in negotiations over Dutch withdrawal from their half of New Guinea. Every conceivable form of pressure was brought to bear to force them to relinquish the territory on President Sukarno's terms, even though Indonesia has neither a moral nor an ethnic claim on the area.

Portugal is a small country. But it is strategically located and includes the Azores where the U.S. has an important base. When India, in violation of international law and simple decency, invaded the Portuguese enclave of Goa, the United States delegation at the U.N. refused to take any action on behalf of its ally. Nor has the Administration shown any concern over the open conspiracy by the African nations and the Communists to throw the Portuguese out of Angola. Result: The loss of another friend.

The Nationalist Chinese, as I reported some time back, have been mounting a series of commando and infiltration raids against southern China. These raids have been successful enough to cause consternation in Chinese Communist ranks and to force the Reds to deploy some 250,000 troops along the coast which they need elsewhere to maintain order. The State Department, however, seems to be deeply disturbed by these Nationalist activities—and it has made its feeling known to the Nationalists in no uncertain terms.

These moves by our policy makers have shaken free world faith in the U.S. They have given the anti-American forces good arguments to use against those who have been our friends over the years. And they have won us no supporters among the "uncommitted," or softened up our enemies. In short, the U.S. has pursued the kind of interventionism which adds up to a self-defeating new isolationism.

Federal Government Takes Over Science



By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Fifteen years ago, the Federal Government paid for one-third of the nation's research. Today it pays for one-half. In not a few years it will pay for two-thirds, if present trends continue.

The figures are those of Basil O'Connor, a former associate of Franklin Roosevelt and now president of the March of Dimes National Foundation. In a brilliant address recently, Mr. O'Connor warned against the "perilous partnership" of science and government.

He seconded the words of Alvin Weinberg, director of the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory: "I believe scientists can be overfed and the consequence is that they don't think enough."

Overfed scientists, with millions of tax dollars at their disposal, are a positive threat to excellence, says O'Connor.

"Of course, no one is advocating that scientists should be made to build their linear accelerators out of matchsticks, or reinvent the electron microscope. But the opposite extreme breeds its own dangers. An oversupply of money not only tempts scientists to spend rather than think, it also requires them to administer rather than experiment."

The National Institutes of Health (NIH), a federal agency founded a decade ago, annually is forced by Congress to take more money than it needs. Since 1953, Congressional appropriations for NIH have averaged about 25 per cent above the budget request and 33 per cent above the previous year.

In fiscal 1962, for example, President Kennedy asked for \$881 million for NIH, up \$34 million from fiscal 1961. The House increased this to \$941 million and the Senate to \$938 million. A "compromise" of \$936 million—\$133 million more than the Administration wanted—was finally agreed upon.

Last year, NIH came out badly. Congress gave it only \$100 million more than the Administration asked.

The President this year has requested \$925.6 million. Congress is thought certain to push this over the billion mark, despite the fact that NIH Director James Shannon has called for a moratorium on

increased appropriations. The reason: The NIH has not had time to evaluate its own program.

Wisconsin Senator Bill Proxmire last year led a fight to pare NIH appropriations back to what the Administration asked. He was beaten soundly, but knows why. He says:

"It is a tough decision for any Senator to make. One can sometimes be put in the position of voting, I suppose, 'in favor of cancer' or 'in favor of heart disease.' No politician wishes to be put in that position."

"But if we are going to mean it when we say that we believe in eliminating unnecessary expense, certainly when experts like Basil O'Connor on the one hand and others who are actually in charge of the spending programs themselves urge us to limit our spending, we should follow their advice."

Note: One week after O'Connor's indictment of federal science policy, Aaron Rosenthal, controller of the government's National Science Foundation, admitted that \$200,000 in grants had been "misused" by one organization receiving government largesse.

The group was the American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS) which receives upward of \$2.5 million a year in grants and contracts to sponsor scientific conferences and seminars; to develop curricular for teaching biology in high schools; and to translate foreign science periodicals.

Rosenthal claims the AIBS should repay the government the following monies, totaling \$331,000:

1. A total of \$173,000 "which they received in income from the sale of publications produced under NSF grants."

2. A total of \$398,000 in overhead charges.

3. A total of \$28,000 which the AIBS group earned by investing federal funds in securities and bonds.

4. A total of \$50,000 for inflated travel and entertainment expenses.

In addition, says Rosenthal, there is evidence the AIBS diverted at least \$250,000 in grants to projects not approved by the government.

Letters To The Editor

Reply

I wish to comment on the article that appeared in your paper on Page 1, Jan. 25, 1963, in regard to Government Planned Zoning.

As to the effects of planning, I believe these plans were put forth by man; so I say, any man can be wrong in his belief some of the time. Don Johnson, as an assistant director of planning at the University of Oregon, can even be wrong some of the time; and Mr. Johnson would have us to believe that we, as private citizens, regardless of our own ability to think for ourselves, are not able to function without someone to guide our every step.

As to our background in history, I have a fair knowledge, as I majored in same. Yes, our forefathers banded together and built compounds. Not to control someone's activities, but to obtain safety. Yes, Mr. Johnson, Rome did the very same; but what has Rome to do with Klamath County? It is too bad that Government Planning didn't stay in Rome. You speak of 1,500 cities that have zoning by 1962.

Yes, Mr. Johnson, if Klamath County was all in the city limits, I might agree, but not unless the majority wanted it. You say that zoning the suburban areas is somewhat newer. What you didn't say, Mr. Johnson, was that the suburban areas couldn't be declared slum property and sold for slum prices until the area is zoned. Yes, I can also see why the realtors would be in favor of zoning. It would be a great favor for me if I were in the real estate business.

Mr. Johnson says the planning here is solid and reasonable. It so happens, I do not agree with Mr. Johnson. I own property here in Klamath County. Does Mr. Johnson? I would rather do what I want to with my property than to have Mr. Johnson run it for me. In fact, Mr. Johnson thinks we can't survive unless we have our future guided and controlled economically and be guided for government activities.

Mr. Johnson's citing advantages of Government Planning.

1. If a man builds a wood yard next to my new place, I would buy wood from him. But this is a poor example and so was Mr. Johnson's.

2. If it means selling my friends and neighbors down the river to please the government, then I think it time to make some changes in government.

3. Mr. Johnson names several counties that have zoning. But somehow, he forgets to mention how they like being zoned. I wonder why?

4. Mr. Johnson says planning can't correct mistakes of the past. My answer to Mr. Johnson is that if the past has been a mistake, thank God for our heavenly mistakes, for I consider my most cherished gift is my Constitutional Rights, and I don't consider that a mistake. So much for Mr. Johnson.

In the same article Mr. Ken Blackman also had several comments. To begin with, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Blackman's salary is being paid by the government and unless I have been misled, the people are the government and government is for the people and by the people.

I believe that means the majority of the people, not a special few. If that is true, then Mr. Blackman's expression of being accused of everything from rape to riot, then I think we, the people, owe him an apology. In fact, if I were him, I would resign.

There are a great many, including myself, that think the money that is being spent for his salary could be put to a better use. Mr. Blackman, as the old saying goes, if the shoe doesn't fit, don't wear it; but if it does, you can't blame anyone but yourself. You asked for the job, I didn't.

Mr. Blackman said there are pros and cons in the zoning laws. I can't for the life of me find a definition for pro and con in Webster's. Can you Mr. Blackman? I didn't see it as pros and cons in the zoning booklet. Mr. Blackman, I agree with one statement you make in this article and that is that some sacrifices would have to be made.

The form of sacrifices that would take place would all be from the little man, that already has given too much. What are you sacrificing, Mr. Blackman?

Mr. Blackman says government zoning is good for the community more so than the individual. Mr. Blackman, does it not take individuals to make a community? Or does it have to be a group banded together to watch what one another does, or to have someone sit in an office and dictate? Not for me, thank you.

Now that we have had the four hearings and it is so self evident by the majority, why should it be necessary to vote at all. In fact, it seems that it would be giving someone the right to vote away our independent rights. I am sure if Mr. Blackman is eligible to vote, he would be one of the first to vote my rights away. If it is not dropped, I can't keep from wondering who the next brain washer will be. All you people that are concerned with government planning, don't swallow a lot of soft soap. Because, it is coming. I wonder how

many before the governor arrives. Mr. Editor, I feel it my duty to write this letter to you as I was the first person to speak against this planned government zoning at the first meeting at the courthouse, of the first meetings just concluded. I like to think it was my duty to say what I really believe in. I aim to give my all to remain free from unconstitutional government controls of any and all kinds. If Mr. Johnson or Mr. Blackman or anyone else thinks they can confuse me and a great many others about this government zoning, think twice, gentlemen.

In closing, I am thankful I am able to write this letter without fear of punishment. Thank God. Let's keep it that way. Freedom of Speech for all.

Marvin Furlow,
Route 3, Box 444.

Decline

Our planners are right on schedule with the second phase of their scheduled determination to zone and control Klamath County. The present phase being used is brain washing. The Shove It Down Our Throat plan has met with hearty opposition. Now comes the Carrot To Lead The Jackass Into The Fold routine. We are thought to be jackasses you know.

What may we expect next? Shall we be subjected to a long line of experts at brain washing? Or shall we skip the long list and have the top man in next and let it over with? They are scheduled to appear here to give us the full treatment. Not you and I, the little men, but the organized groups such as the Kiwanians who have so recently been treated to Mr. Johnson. To my knowledge Mr. Johnson owns no property here in Klamath County, contributes nothing to the economy here. However he feels duty bound to prescribe for us and our future.

We may need to build some block-houses such as those built by the early settlers. These may be needed to ward off this new onslaught on our freedoms, our constitutional rights.

Planning way back in history was mentioned by Mr. Johnson. The streets in the old city of Boston were laid out by following the trails made by cows traveling to good grazing day after day. The early method of travel was by horse back. These riders followed the cow trails. As wagons came into use they too used the old cow trails and widened them by use. Even today motor vehicles use many of the old cow trails in Boston, Dorchester and Cambridge. Yes! Mr. Johnson there were planners in the early history of America.

The early settlers in this country found it necessary to plan and build defensive block-houses to protect the people from the Indians they had betrayed. From the English King that tried to rule the every movement of the subjects of his kingdom, even to their religion. The planners were the people who lived here then. All the planning we need here now can best be done by each individual living here now. Planning as he has the means and initiative to improve our community by improving his property.

The early settlers planned for a new Free Country. The plans materialized into this Great Free Country of ours. Zoning was not one of the parts of that planning. Now enemies of freedom, promoters of ideology, appear among us and attempt to take our freedoms from us.

We should give a long thought to the peril we are faced with. We really should not be subjected to a vote on this planning question. The Constitution on the United States of America, among other things, guarantees there shall be no forcible seizure of private property or rights concerning our private property.

Have you read the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire? That extremely regulated country fell into oblivion, strangled by its own governmental regulations.

Frank Braman,
3605 Harlan Drive.

Enough

Agreed! We needed a stop light on 11th and Pine; but eight lights! Wouldn't four have done just as well. It seems like they could have found someplace, like Shasta Way and South Sixth, to put the other four.

Mrs. Rena DeBortoli,
1843 Oregon Avenue.

POTOMAC FEVER

The new Kennedy tax program takes all the fun out of life. What greater joy hath man than the bright blooms of mid-April—coupled with a last-minute discovery of a new tax deduction?

At long last, the New Frontier has got the country moving again—jiggling and stomping on the street corners to keep warm.

Humor: A fellow is dedicating a new book to the Supreme Court. Title: "Why Johnny Can't Pray."

FLETCHER KNEBEL

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Death Penalty

This letter I hope may help overcome a great problem that faces our country today.

George Yerokovich writes of the death of his brother. Whenever something of this nature happens, we always seem to look for revenge (legal murder).

I remember a day in April 1937 in Klamath Falls when three young children were asleep—not knowing that their father had been gotten out of bed and was beaten and shot to death by three other people. One was found guilty, and was sent to prison for a few years.

I'm glad that no one else died because of this deed. I sleep good at nights, although I doubt that the murderer does.

You see, I was one of those children of the dead man—my father.

Let's not commit murder, too. Do away with the death penalty.

Jess F. Emert,
3645 Harlan.

Found

I do not know which one of the six dogs I chased out of my fenced in back yard last week lost his little brown leather harness, but his owner may have it if he will call for it, as I don't have any use for it, and I know they are quite expensive.

Mrs. Elsie Barker,
2300 Orchard Ave.

