

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Food Builds A Better World

Nearly half the world's three billion people do not get enough to eat. From 300 to 500 million actually suffer from hunger. This country and many others are trying to do something about it on a major scale.

That explains more than \$11 billion of U.S. Food for Peace shipments to more than 100 countries in the 1955-62 period.

It also explains the new World Food Program and the Freedom from Hunger campaign. The former is sponsored by the United Nations and the affiliated Food and Agricultural Organization. FAO launched the latter campaign.

Our government actively supports all these efforts. To draw further attention from them, we intend to make the most of Freedom from Hunger Week this March and to participate in the World Food Congress scheduled in June.

Perhaps the most interesting idea to emerge from this broadened attempt to feed the hungry is the notion that food should not simply be doled out as relief.

Charles Weitz, FAO co-ordinator of the Freedom from Hunger campaign says "the increasing emphasis on the use of food for

economic development projects adds to efforts which are being made to help people help themselves."

What does this mean?

It means that food shipments to needy nations are more and more often being distributed in the form of wages to persons who are engaged in development projects. Food is, in effect, being used as currency to lubricate the economic machinery in many underdeveloped countries.

If this idea can be applied in a big way, it might be almost as important as the food itself. For long experience has shown that, while people will take what is given them when they need it, they generally feel much better toward themselves and their benefactors if they can somehow earn the assistance. The whole "feed the hungry" enterprise is obviously a wonderful tribute to the spirit of helpfulness in men of good will in many lands — but most particularly in our own.

Agriculture Secretary Freeman manages, however, to make the goal of abolishing hunger seem a lot closer than it is. His praise for the effort would perhaps register more solidly if it were tempered with more vocal recognition of the immensity of the task.

A Single Board Of Education

(Gazette - Times, Corvallis)

In Governor Hatfield's Second Inaugural Address to the Legislative Assembly he recommended, among other things, "A single board of education, enlarged to perhaps 15 members with a single executive..."

This is probably a horrifying idea to those people primarily concerned with higher education, but we can see many definite advantages for over-all education in the State of Oregon.

At the present time we have two completely separate boards governing education in this state. One, the State Board of Education, controls elementary, secondary and the community college program. The State Board of Higher Education controls all other public institutions of higher education.

These two boards compete for a share of the same tax dollar. When each goes before the Legislative Assembly the lawmakers have no way of knowing where cuts would hurt the least. If a common budget were presented this decision would be more easily made because the Board itself would identify the areas. Thus a better rounded program would be available to our youngsters.

Furthermore, there is very little coordination between the present boards. The Board of Education presents a curriculum in our elementary and secondary schools with little

thought of coordinating it with the necessities of higher education. Many students must take courses in college which they should have taken in high school. Many times emphasis in study is in the wrong direction, and far too often the students get programs which will not qualify them for admittance to certain universities.

And there is this community college anomaly which is neither fish nor fowl. Some students are taking liberal arts courses which they think will qualify them for higher education in our State institutions only to later learn their credentials are not acceptable. All these liberal arts programs should be under the SBHE. A glorified manual training program is also presented in our community colleges. This could be made available to more students and at much less cost if it were all coordinated into advanced high school programs within the high schools.

A combined Board would take care of these problems and wastes as well as defining responsibilities in teacher certification and the ever-increasing field of educational television.

Actually, the Board could be split into two sub-Boards so the duties would not be too time consuming with coordination between the two at the executive level as well as at joint meetings of the two sub-Boards.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Congressmen And U.N.

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

I have been taking a quiet poll of Congressional sentiment of the United Nations. I find that those Senators and Representatives with whom I have spoken feel (1) that the U.N. is becoming a pernicious influence in world affairs, (2) that the United States would be wise to withdraw everything but token support, and (3) that the legislators would rather cut out their tongues than express these sentiments on the floor of House or Senate.

There is a basic conviction that the U.N. means us no good, that it has served as a forum for Soviet propaganda and a field for Communist maneuvers. That the U.S. is picking up the largest share of the tab for the U.N. operations is a fact that few forget as they walk the halls of Congress.

The U.N. role in Katanga, in suppressing the rightful aspirations of an independent people to remain out of the clutches of the corrupt and chaotic central Congolese government, has not been forgotten. Neither, for that matter, has Secretary General U. Thant's inability to win the respect of even so small a dictator as Fidel Castro.

In short, they have seen the United Nations used repeatedly as a tool of anti-American forces, increasingly dominated by a combination of Communist and neutralist countries—many of whom fail to pay their dues and assessments.

This antagonism and opposition, however, are expressed only in a scattering of speeches and in

much grumbling in Congressional offices and cloakrooms. Whether they will admit it or not, most legislators here are convinced that any open and concerted move to pull the United States out of the U.N.—or to curtail the activities of this embryonic world government—will result in trouble at the polls. I would venture to say that a sizable majority of the American people do not care a hoot about the U.N. But those who do care have by some mighty fancy sleight-of-hand led our Representatives in the Congress to believe that the U.N. is sacrosanct.

In the past months, however, the situation has begun to change. The defeat of Republican Representative Walter Judd of Minnesota—hailed so gleefully by the Administration—may be a costly loss to those in the White House and at the State Department who include the U.N. in their nightly prayers. Mr. Judd did yeoman work on Capitol Hill to restrain anti-U.N. forces in Congress. Without him, many of the younger legislators who followed his lead have begun to drift into the anti-United Nations camp.

The brazen attempt of UNESCO, an arm of the U.N., to act as a propaganda machine for the Soviet Union may, moreover, be the cause for the first open revolt in Congressional ranks. The United States pays a third of UNESCO's annual \$40 million budget. The USSR pays roughly one-seventh. Yet UNESCO has used its funds to subsidize the writing and publication of a pamphlet which whitewashes the So-

viet record and beats the drums for Communism.

This pamphlet, months old, has suddenly been discovered by the Congress. And some of the more bitter members of that body are asking why the Soviet invasion and annexation of the Baltic republics—not recognized by the U.S.—should be described in the UNESCO pamphlet as a "voluntary restoration" of Soviet rule.

They are also asking why the United Nations should broadcast a publication which denies or glosses over all the facts of Soviet official suppression of minorities—facts that have been thoroughly documented.

Publication of the Soviet-serving pamphlet, written by two Russian stooges, has already led to proposals that President Kennedy demand its repudiation by the Secretary-General. The outcry comes at a time when the United Nations Special Fund announced that it was giving agricultural aid to Cuba under a six-month grant. Having recently told Mr. Thant to go peddle his papers, Fidel Castro is being rewarded by the U.N. he ignored.

It is still too early to say that Congress will vote for U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations. But if the present sentiment continues, appropriations for the U.N. included in the current mammoth Kennedy budget will be drastically pruned.

Other Editors Say . . .

Questionable Bill

(Gazette - Times, Corvallis)

Sen. Walter Pearson has a bill before the Legislature which has support from a majority in both Houses of the Assembly. It would give a legislative committee the power to review agency regulations issued while the Legislature is not in session. Those regulations the committee did not approve would be held in abeyance until the next session.

In the past we have screamed long and loud over abuses by governmental agencies. Many agencies and boards have acted the part of dictators, forcing their regulations on the public for their own convenience or to build up a special protection or privilege for the membership they are supposed to regulate.

This new bill would correct these abuses. But on the other hand, we strenuously object to the legislature's attempt to destroy the traditional American division of power among the legislative, administrative and judicial branches of the government. This bill unquestionably puts the Legislature in the field of administration.

In each of the past few sessions we have seen the Oregon Legislature move more and more in this direction and we don't like it.

They have assumed that they are 90 unofficial members of the State Board of Education, the Highway Commission, the Liquor Control Board and all the rest of the boards and commissions.

The legislative dabbling in this field is comparable in their appointment of a legislative committee to look over the shoulders of the Supreme Court Judges to



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

GOP Leaders Poised To Fight JFK Orders

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent, Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—Republican congressional strategy is gradually taking shape. It should begin to show when Senate and House settle down for a little more work Feb. 18 after a week of GOP oratory in observance of Lincoln's birthday.

Just before this welkin ringing began, GOP congressional leaders of both houses approved two statements lambasting the Kennedy fiscal and foreign policies.

These were adopted at an organization meeting of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership Feb. 7.

This 11-statesmen group may play an increasingly important role in the next two years, up to the time the Republicans nominate their candidate for the presidency and he takes over as head of the party.

In the leadership are Senators Dirksen, Ill.; Kuchel, Calif.; Hickel, Iowa; Saltstall, Mass.; Morton, Ky.; Reps. Halleck, Ind.; Arends, Ill.; Byrnes, Wis.; Ford, Mich.; Brown, Ohio, and Wilson, Calif.

The new members are Sen. Thurston Morton, former GOP national committee chairman, and Rep. Gerald R. Ford, the new House GOP Policy Committee chairman.

Morton and Wilson are Congressional Campaign Committee chairmen. Their groups will finance the staff work for leadership statements, even though this takes some money out of their campaign kitty.

It is noteworthy that Rep. William E. Miller, N.Y., who is also GOP National Committee chairman, does not sit in on this act officially. Neither do Senators Barry Goldwater of Arizona nor John G. Tower of Texas, the two most aggressive attackers of all Kennedy policies.

The two minority leaders, Sen. Everett M. Dirksen and Rep. Charles A. Halleck will continue as principal official spokesmen for the party in Congress and will continue the "Ev and Charlie show" from time to time, with minor changes.

They appeared on a national

television panel show as a curtain raiser and they will be back on the air waves again whenever they have anything to say, which is frequently.

But they will also present guest stars now and then, particularly governors and presidential possibilities whenever they are in Washington. It's good free time, open for the asking.

It has taken over a month to get all this worked out. But as Sen. Norris Cotton, R-N.H., comments, no time has been lost. It has taken the Senate a month to lay the ghost of the liberals from both parties who wanted a rules change to prevent filibustering. And it has taken a month for the President to send Congress his principal messages on State of the Union, budget, economic policy, tax reform, farm, education and health programs. Also a request for a big supplemental appropriation for the rest of this fiscal year. They now give the Republicans something to shoot at.

The leadership statement on foreign policy, released this week, does not try to answer the President's State of the Union foreign policy declarations point by point. The criticisms are more on the President's conduct, or misconduct, of foreign policy in Europe, Cuba and other trouble spots.

Also, the Republicans think they can make more political hay by attacking the President's domestic policies. They say that "The Republican goal in this Congress will be a reduction of federal spending which can lead to a reasonable tax cut."

What this is taken to mean is that the Republicans are shooting for a balanced budget. They will try to reduce government appropriations first. Then they will limit the tax cuts to the "amove" they can slash from the budget.

The Republican congressional leadership offers no substitute program of its own other than that, "The government can help solve unemployment by encouraging industry and investment capital to promote expansion and new ventures. . . . Chronic government deficits will never stimulate American ingenuity, build confidence or create jobs."



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

White House Order Lacks Vital Control

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

A White House scheme to halt free world profiteering in Cuban trade is "so weak and harmless" it cannot do the job.

This is the reaction of Max Harrison, president of the American Maritime Association, to the Administration plan announced with considerable fanfare on Feb. 6.

Under terms of this order, no government—financed (notably foreign air) cargoes would be shipped on foreign flag vessels that have called at a Cuban port since Jan. 1, 1963, "unless the owner of such a ship gives satisfactory assurances that no ship under his control will henceforth be employed in the Cuban trade."

Harrison points to the following loopholes in the law:

1. The Administration order applies only to the ship itself and not all vessels of the same line. It is therefore easy for any owner to continue his trade with Castro as long as he uses one ship for Cuban trade, and another for the transport of U.S. cargoes.

Yugoslav ships, for instance, can continue to carry U.S. aid cargo as long as the Yugoslav government chooses those vessels that have not been engaged in Cuban commerce. This is a comparatively easy matter for the Yugoslavs; their merchant marine consists of 130 ships.

2. The Presidential edict applies only to cargoes shipped from the United States. More than half of all foreign aid cargoes, however, are shipped from one foreign port to another. Thus, the major part of our foreign aid cargo is not affected by the plan.

3. In choosing Jan. 1 as the beginning date, the government gives a clean bill of health to those owners who continue to carry cargo during the entire Cuban crisis. The orders do not affect those owners who carried cargo to and from Cuba at the time Soviet missiles were known to have been trained on the United States.

4. The order clearly limits

accept or reject the Court's interpretation of the laws.

If the Legislature wants to increase its power, and it obviously does, it should adopt the new Constitution and sit in annual session and make laws controlling the things it wants to control. But even then, the laws they make should be left to the courts to interpret and the agencies of the state to administer.

themselves to the Cuban trade and do not in any way touch upon trade with Communist China, North Vietnam or North Korea.

Despite the fact that U.S. flag vessels have for many years been prohibited by law from carrying cargo to and from those Communist lands, foreign vessels that carry goods to them may also carry U.S. foreign aid cargoes.

Harrison says the Executive order does not "constitute a practical and effective way of isolating Cuba. It is fraught with loopholes, full of meaningless words, clearly the product of a bureaucratic whitewash."

Major Congressional voices have been raised against the White House ban. Perhaps the most significant is that of Florida's Rep. Paul Rogers, who has been one of the most diligent foes of Castro Cuba on the Hill.

It was Rogers who last fall forced the House Select Committee on Export Control to investigate free world trading with Cuba. The public attention thus focused on allied shipping to Cuba resulted in several governments agreeing to suspend and/or discourage further use of their flag ships in Cuban trade.

West Germany was the first nation to do so. Greece, even though facing serious unemployment on its docks, followed suit. Turkey recalled several of its ships that were on the high seas en route to Cuba.

Only Great Britain refused to cooperate. Congressman Rogers says the President's edict of Feb. 6 is only a "first step toward banning all free world trade with Cuba."

"We should not," he says, "be content with timid gestures, but should move to fully close all U.S. ports to Cuban traders as soon as possible."

"I urge that the United States close its ports to the flags of all nations which allow any of its vessels to call in Cuba."

Closing U.S. ports would show such nations as Great Britain who continue trading with Cuba that we mean business. The effect of a U.S. port ban would keep, for instance, the Queen Mary out of New York Harbor.

Congressman Rogers points out that far more world trade flows out of U.S. ports than out of Cuban ports. Foreign countries indifferent to our ideological battle with Cuba would be forced to choose between U.S. dollars and Cuban pesos. And there are more dollars.

Shelters

On a local radio news tape Wednesday, Feb. 13, the local Civil Defense officer said in response to questions about protests to spending of funds on fallout shelters, that the program in Klamath Falls was "furnished to the Civil Defense by the federal government, at no cost to the state or county."

Who is he trying to kid?

Mrs. Linda Hurd

Scholarships

Scholarships as scholarships go give many deserving and ambitious students an opportunity heretofore unavailable. Before scholarships became available, students in this category either had to give up their ambitions or work feverishly for finances to further their education.

In most cases after due time they found they just could not hack the grind while others had health breakdowns and only a few trickled through to "home plate." Since scholarships have become so plentiful students in "need" are given the opportunity to fulfill their scholastic ambitions without the heretofore financial problem. This brings me to the point I wish to bring out. Scholarships are based on need, merit is a necessary qualification but it is secondary to need.

Here is the other category of students I wish to mention. The ones that are completely equal scholastically speaking and could qualify equally for as many scholarships except for one fact—need. (No one is complaining on this point, the fact that need is a requirement to obtain almost all scholarships.) This particular group just happens to be the result of parental ambitions for their children's education and welfare that put them in this financial category.

These parents in most cases

through sacrifice, steadfastness, ingenuity and good honest work prepared to meet this financial responsibility for their children, though this need is not a necessity although these students are equally qualified on merit for scholarships.

And now we're attending graduation exercises—this is a large class, over 300 students. The seats are all taken by proud parents, relatives and loved ones of these students. They have come to witness this feat of achievement and in far too many cases the end of formal education.

The graduation exercises take time. After the audience has been seated and entertained by the young talented musicians, enter the graduating class, step by step, in the slow march music and all attired in the traditional cap and gown.

Following speeches by various selected speakers the diplomas are given to the individual graduates. Everything so far has been directly associated with the whole graduating class. Now comes the giving of the many scholarships to the "needy" students.

In a large graduating class this ceremony takes almost equal time as the giving of the diplomas. While these students are actually awarded special recommendations and attention the other equally scholastic student sits unrecognized, unheralded because he did not have the "need" to apply for scholarships.

One group of students simply because of need is held up, commended and praised for its achievements. Again may I state that I am greatly in favor of these scholarships under the circumstances but I do believe they could be given out at a more appropriate time and place than during graduation exercises with a captive audience.

It is neither fair to exploit the charity student or put an unfavorable light on the financially able student by praising one be-

cause of need and ignoring the other because of lack of need. Graduation exercises should be for the entire graduating class. Any recognition given at graduation, in all fairness, should be given on merit alone.

Ralph M. Darmody, 2055 Greensprings Drive.

Arbitrary

There was an example at the Feb. 4 city council meeting of arbitrary decisions made by men rather than decisions made from standards for justice. Two cases of rezoning were before them. Both involved private property and private capital. In both cases those who opposed the rezoning stated they did not want multiple dwellings. One had the pressure of government officials and hired personnel; the other opposition was just every day citizens in the affected area.

Was there a standard such as 31 per cent of the people in the area must oppose the change before the request could be denied? No, only men with arbitrary ideas, making arbitrary decisions. And, sure enough one request was granted and one was denied? This becomes "the brute force of government." When Klamath Falls citizens do not kick at arbitrary decisions the days of justice for all are numbered. I am kidding and I want to be heard on this issue.

Government by men makes possible government by tyrants. Government by law means government in which all citizens can know the standard, obey it and depend on justice when measured by it. American people used to believe in this, stand by it, die for it, because without justice measured by law no man or his property, or his life were safe.

What is happening here in Klamath Falls today?

Irene Tice, 950 Patterson.

In the Heavens

ACROSS

1 Fourth planet from sun

5 Southern university (ab.)

8 Psyche parts

12 Centaur

13 Redcat

14 Roman statesman

15 Fish eggs

16 Soviet river

17 European of a sort

19 Show contempt

20 Printing (ab.)

21 Prominent

22 Dog family (col.)

23 Largest planet

24 Martian (comb. form)

30 Replies

31 Ratite bird

32 Meadow

33 Legal claim

34 Platform

35 To usher from sun

36 Publishers (ab.)

39 Truck

40 Beaches

43 Planet nearest sun

47 Neat

48 Own (Scot.)

49 Son of Seth

50 British clergyman

51 African antelope

52 Split

53 Extantism

54 English letters (suffix)

55 One who (suffix)

DOWN

11201 (Roman)

21 Biblical king

3 Ceremony

4 Zodiac sign

5 Small branch

6 Heavenly body

7 Indian

8—five

9 Plunge

10 Heavenly body

11 Borehole

12 Possessive pronoun

13 Vestibles

21 Chinese money

22 Serene

23 Begging

24 Close

25 Hebrew prophet

26 Hund

27 Exude

28 Hurry

29 Prejudice

30 Literary degree

31 Walters

36 Grasslike plant

37 Part of the face

38 Brilliant planet

40 Red-backed sandpiper

41 Indian buffalo

42 Bear

43 Coal pit

44 One

45 Wander

46 River in Belgium

48 Era

Answer to Previous Puzzle

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50

51 52 53 54 55