

Herald and News

Editorial Page

We've Crossed The Line

Next July 9, with a bit more than half the year gone, the corporations of this country—the myriad enterprises which provide us with the great bulk of our goods and services, as well as most of our employment of people—will start working for their owners.

What, one may ask, will they be doing for the six-months-plus preceding that date? The answer is provided by a cursory glance at a federal income tax form. The profits tax on any corporation of any size is a neat 52 per cent. And this does not include the swarm of other taxes a corporation is burdened with—state income taxes, property taxes, excise and sales taxes, license taxes, transaction taxes and even, in some instances, municipal income taxes.

Columnist Henry J. Taylor writes: "Muslims' corporate state took 40 per cent of any profits. Hitler took 44 per cent. Both

these exploiters were pikers compared to Washington's 52 per cent bite.

"Surely one definition of socialism is the line beyond which a government gets more than the owners. We've crossed that line, even excluding state, county and community taxes on corporations. In this sense, we're not going socialist. We've gone. Thus taxpayers are people who don't need a Civil Service examination to work for the Government."

This is the price we pay for two enormously different things. One is war, hot and cold—past, present, and to come. The other is a Welfare State. The enormous tax for war, it seems, must continue to be paid—we have no choice in this. But the Welfare State—coddling us, attempting to shield us against our own follies and wastes, substituting political decision for individual responsibility and pride—is something we simply cannot afford.

The President's Case Against The UN

(The Wall Street Journal)

Urging Congress to approve the purchase of \$100 million of United Nations bonds, President Kennedy says that decision "poses a test of this nation's good faith in supporting the peace-keeping efforts" of the World organization.

"Good faith" indeed. The U.S. has long since shown good faith and then some. It is other nations that are delinquent in their UN financial assessments, not the U.S., which has in fact been paying more than its share of the costs.

As for the UN's "peace-keeping efforts," we wish the President would take a closer look at what is going on. If he did, he might not be so quick to applaud such notable examples of those efforts as the Congo and Indonesia, while dismissing criticism of the UN from highly responsible sources.

The recent Dutch-Indonesian agreement on West New Guinea, Mr. Kennedy noted approvingly at his news conference, was carried out under the auspices of UN Acting Secretary General Thant. It is hard to believe that anyone could seriously cite this settlement as a reason for further U.S. support of the UN. For it was simply a surrender to Indonesian aggression.

Indonesia's President Sukarno has no more claim to West New Guinea than Hitler did to Czechoslovakia, but he has been preparing an invasion with heavy Soviet military aid. The Dutch, for their part, were not trying to hold on to the primitive colony; they wanted a plebiscite in which the natives could decide their own future.

But the U.S. and the UN did everything they could to force the Netherlands to turn the area over to Indonesia next May, with a "plebiscite" to be held after some years of Indonesian rule. As the Dutch premier bitterly observed, "The Netherlands could not count on the support of its allies, and for that reason we had to sign." The bitterness is especially understandable since it was also the U.S. that pressured Holland in the first place to de-

liver Indonesia to the tender mercies of its Communist-loving dictator.

An equally unfortunate reason for bailing out the UN is its "peace-keeping" in the Congo. It's not only that the UN waged a vicious war against the secessionist province of Katanga; right now it is trying to put economic pressure on Katanga's Tshombe to join the central government on its terms. If that doesn't work, the UN authorities do not exclude further resort to armed force.

Yet Tshombe has repeatedly indicated his willingness to become a part of a Congo federation on what sound like reasonable terms, including sharing some of his revenues with the practically insolvent central government. Quite plainly the UN doesn't like this a bit; apparently it would prefer to break Tshombe once and for all. And President Kennedy significantly failed to answer a reporter's direct question whether he would guarantee that any bond purchases would not be used for military action against Katanga.

At the same time Mr. Kennedy implied that he takes a dim view of Herbert Hoover's proposal to create a Council of Free Nations in view of the chaotic conditions in the UN. Mr. Hoover's idea is not to destroy the UN but to weld a greater unity of the nations genuinely interested in opposing the Communists, whose presence in the UN helps to render it either ineffective or dangerous. In short, what is more important for the U.S.: Supporting UN mythology or strengthening freedom?

The point here is not whether Mr. Hoover is right in his specific recommendations. It is that there is a disquieting unwillingness in our Government even to attempt to view the UN realistically.

And the President, with the very examples he cites in praise of the UN, has unwittingly presented an excellent case for Congress to refrain from this additional bond support—at least until U.S. officials change their attitudes or the UN changes its reprehensible ways.

'Dropouts Anonymous' Working

(The Christian Science Monitor)

By JOSEPHINE RIPLEY

There is in Galveston, Tex., a project known as "Dropouts Anonymous."

It works on the principle of Alcoholics Anonymous, only in this case it is school dropouts helping other dropouts, that is, "kids helping other kids," as Hendrik Lindt, its organizer, put it.

The plan was brought to official attention here when Mr. Lindt, a research instructor at the University of Texas medical branch in Galveston, described this unique club at a recent conference in Washington.

He later talked to authorities at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. So impressed were they with the success of this project that Mr. Lindt was urged to apply for a research grant to continue and expand this work.

Since the domestic peace corps. If approved, would work along these lines, it was felt that "Dropouts Anonymous" could become a valuable pilot project for the home front curriculum.

The President, so far as is known, has not been informed of the experiment, but he has repeatedly expressed concern over the serious problem of delinquency and school dropouts.

Mr. Lindt is enthusiastic at the success of this first D.A. club which was launched less than a year ago, with the approval of local school authorities, and the financial support of two interested citizens.

The group is a small one, including two unwed mothers, three former dope takers, two boys with

juvenile terms, and other delinquents. Ages range from 16 to 24.

Members who have been helped either to return to school or to find a job develop a kind of missionary zeal. Mr. Lindt told the Monitor, in their effort to help the others find an equally satisfactory solution to their problems.

There is no attempt to force "strayed sheep" back into school. It is apparent that for some a job rather than more schooling is the best answer.

Mr. Lindt relates these success stories: A former dropout, now working in an X-ray laboratory, with the title of X-ray technician—and a white uniform. His friends, greatly impressed, call him "Dr. Kidlace," and he loves the kid.

Now another club member has been encouraged to train for this type of work, still another is training to become a barber; two are trying to finish high school by going to night classes; a young unwed mother has gone back to school after having been helped to make arrangements for the care of her child.

Return to school is generally advocated in the case of young unmarried mothers as part of the rehabilitation process. In the District of Columbia special classes have been set up for these delinquents in an effort to help them back to normal, law-abiding lives.

Of his first class, Mr. Lindt says only three failed to benefit from the experience. While he is present at all meetings, which occur once a week, he does not participate in the discussions. But joining with the group, and encouraging frank discussion of problems, are other teen-agers

from the school who want to help. Some of these are school athletes to whom the dropouts look with respect, or school members who have had problems of their own which give them an understanding of their less fortunate colleagues.

Discussions are not always harmonious, says Mr. Lindt. Members sometimes walk out in a huff, but they usually return for the next meeting. Mr. Lindt himself stays in the background, does the chores, dresses in slacks rather than a suit because he has found that delinquents resent "men in suits."

By calling the group a club, Mr. Lindt gets away from any suggestion of a clinic. It makes members feel more at ease, less wary of attempting to speak out. The club room is a private building away from school premises.

It is furnished with a pool table and a record player. Soft drinks are provided and sometimes carfare. Total amount spent so far is \$170, provided by a local lawyer and a member of the City Council who have taken an interest in the experiment.

Mr. Lindt feels his own experience as a "dropout" has given him a special understanding of their problems. As a Jew, he was forced to drop out of the University of Berlin during the Hitler regime. He recalls that "useless feeling" of staying at home while other boys went to school or to work.

His experience with a chapter of Alcoholics Anonymous gave him the idea of applying the same system of people helping other people. Or in this case, "kids helping other kids," as he says.



Other Editors Say . . .

JUSTIFIED OR UNJUSTIFIED

(Sacramento Bee)

It was a revelation, welcome in one respect, to hear leading American scientists tell the government that in at least one area of the national life bigger appropriations are not the answer. In another respect, the reason was most disturbing.

This was the situation: The Kennedy administration had urged, at the suggestion of the president's science advisory committee, that increased federal appropriations be granted to finance scholarships for science and engineering majors, both in critically short supply.

Up steps Dr. W. Albert Noyes Jr., a chemist and professor at the University of Rochester in New York. He headed a group of advisers to the house of representatives committee on science and astronautics and he told the committee there are more scholarships available in these fields than there are competent students to use them.

Then Noyes observed that no direct government action if confined merely to financing scholarships, would produce the army of scientists and engineers so badly needed in this increasingly technical age. Almost laconically he said we may have to wait for a bigger supply of good students, or, better put, students good enough to use the scholarships to national advantage.

Either Noyes and the scientists who serve with him on the advisory board justifiably have a low opinion of the qualifications of today's graduates or the opinion is unjustified. It prompts one to cogitate.

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

It is a truism by now that what we call "time" is relative to the position and speed of the observer. In handling children, we have to recognize also that "time" is relative to the age and experience of the observer. There is an important psychological dimension to time.

When a child promises to come in the house at the end of ten minutes, and is still out after an hour, this is usually not willful disobedience. Children cannot be judged on the same time-scale as adults, for their reveries and dawdling are geared to a different clock than ours. Twenty minutes spent in tying a shoelace may pass like a second when the fantasy of the spaceship is more compelling than the reality of the school bus.

At the age of five, my boy wanted to know if I had lived in the era of the cavemen, and seemed disappointed that I had never met any personally. At the age of six, he knew that a great time gulf existed between the cavemen and me, but he still wanted to know if I had ever met Abraham Lincoln.

To a child, a father in his 40s might as well be 150 years old. The difference between a father and a grandfather, which seems so pronounced to us, is nothing at all to a child.

Years, decades and centuries are all blurred in the short focus of the child's mind. What happened two years ago might have been yesterday, and next Friday is a million years away.

Understanding the relativity of time, in this psychological dimension, is absolutely essential if we are to cope with the world of children. It is a long and laborious process for them to acquire the time-sense of adulthood—and some people, it is true, never seem to acquire it.

The habitually unprompted, the inept planners, and last-minuteers, are really clinging to emotional vestiges of their childhood, and are unconsciously reliving the past, reluctant to break with their fantasies.

On the other hand, those persons with an over-acute sense of time (and I happen to be one of them) have perhaps relinquished too much of their childhood capacity for taking the present as it comes and enjoying it. They are forever planning ahead, living in the next hour, the next day, the next month, and the present is swallowed up by the future.

If the habitually unprompted are self-indulgent, the compulsively prompt are self-punishing; and it certainly seems to be true that the person who is late for an engagement is generally more charming than the one who gets there early. This is what makes the punctual person so angry. He feels that people who are late have no right to be so pleasant. Maybe this is what we resent in our dawdling children.

Almanac

THE ALMANAC

By United Press International
Today is Friday, Feb. 22, the 53rd day of 1963 with 312 to follow. This is Washington's birthday.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The morning star is Venus. The evening stars are Mars and Jupiter.

Those born on this day include George Washington, first President of the United States, in 1732; Edna St. Vincent Millay, poetess, in 1892.

On this day in history:
In 1620, colonists of the Massachusetts Bay colony landed their first "popped corn" as friendly Indians shared their first Thanksgiving dinner.

In 1819, Florida was ceded to the U.S. in a treaty with Spain. In 1931, about 100 women of Miami, Fla., organized a "Carnegie Nation Brigade" to fight against bootleggers, speakeasies, and gamblers.

A thought for the day—French philosopher and author Voltaire said: "It is better to risk saving a guilty person than to condemn an innocent one."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What U.S. policy was set forth in the Monroe Doctrine?
A—It guaranteed all the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere against European interference for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny. Also the American continents were henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by European powers.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Mental Diseases Are Tremendous Burden

By PETER EDSON

WASHINGTON (NEA) — President Kennedy's new program to attack the problems of mental health and mental retardation probably will be severely criticized by the thoughtless.

Scrimp: The New Frontier is driving everybody crazy and now the administration wants millions of dollars to care for them. The states are handling this now. Keep big government out.

But the economic cost and waste of mental illness and the humanitarian aspect of the President's special message to Congress requesting that something more be done about them are so great they deserve the fullest sympathetic attention.

What's more, Congress in the past has been so lavish in its support of medical research that this new one is apt to pass, for this is a No. 1 neglected health problem, right along with heart disease, arthritis and cancer.

Behind the President's message are two years of research.

In 1961 a joint commission on mental illness and health reported on the inadequacy of existing institutions to handle the problem. It found that a fifth of the 279 state institutions are fire hazards. Three-fourths of them were opened over 40 years ago.

The 10-year goal of the President's program is to cut in half the number of mental patients—now nearly 600,000 occupying a half of all available hospital beds.

Since 11 states now are reported to be releasing two out of three schizophrenics—the largest classification of the mentally ill—within six to nine months treatment, this goal would seem to be attainable. Average confinement is now 11 years.

Last October the President's panel on mental retardation reported some five million mildly mentally retarded children and adults in America. Another 400,000 are so retarded they require constant care. Half are kept in public institutions.

Over 126,000 mentally retarded children will be born this year. At least half of these cases would be prevented by improved prenatal

and post partum hygiene and education for mothers.

The cost of mental illness and retardation to the nation is now put at \$1.8 billion. It is both too much and not enough.

The cost of the President's new five-year program to treat and cure mental illnesses is almost impossible to estimate from his message or from supplementary data furnished by Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It is conceded, however, that the cost could run to hundreds of millions of dollars more each year until the number of mental patients can be reduced.

Figures may be clarified when the administration sends to Congress draft legislation on four new bills to carry out the President's program. About \$80 million is included in the President's budget message for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 on mental health programs already authorized.

For first-year operations of the new programs, \$13.3 million will be requested. Of this, \$6 million would be for incentive grants to the states to construct three—later to be increased to 10—mental retardation centers. The appropriation request would be increased to \$30 million for the third year.

For planning comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, grants of \$10.5 million will be asked the first year. This would include a \$10 million increase as first step to doubling within seven years the \$50 million now authorized for child health and crippled children's services.

For expansion of vocational rehabilitation services for the mentally ill and retarded, \$3.8 million would be asked on top of existing grants of \$88 million to the states for all vocational training.

These three programs are only starters. For the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1964, requests would be made for the construction of several hundred community health centers to treat mental illnesses. Some would be additional wings on existing institutions; others would cost up to \$3 million apiece.



THE GLOBAL VIEW

Showdown Nears For Communist Leaders

By LEON DENNEN

UNITED NATIONS (NEA) — President de Gaulle's rejection of Britain's entry into the European Common Market is overshadowing a more important development—an approaching showdown in the Red bloc.

United Nations specialists are studying the latest exchanges between Nikita Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung which indicate that Red China's invasion of India brought relations between Moscow and Peking to the breaking point.

Premier Khrushchev's complaints against Mao were aired recently in a confidential document addressed to the Red governments of East Europe, North Viet Nam and North Korea.

Moscow's document, according to U.N. sources, challenged point-by-point accusations against Khrushchev made in a circular letter which Mao sent to the same governments last December.

The Chinese, in their letter, challenged the Soviet premier's view that India's Prime Minister Nehru is a "neutral." The Indian government, they claimed, "takes orders from the United States."

Khrushchev replied in his document that it took years of negotiations and much patience to establish close relations between Russia and India. China's "unprovoked aggression" against India thus "put the U.S.S.R. in a very difficult situation."

It was a situation, the Soviet premier complained, in which Russia's ally, China, "invaded a country with which the U.S.S.R. was linked by firm bonds of friendship and economic collaboration."

Khrushchev is also reported to have stated:

Russia "wanted to prevent India from being forced to turn for military aid to the United States which was waiting for just such an opportunity. The Chinese, who call themselves Communists, provided this opportunity when they attacked India."

In an obvious reference to Krishna Menon, India's former defense minister fired by Prime Minister Nehru after the Chinese invasion, Khrushchev said:

In addition, "we lost one of our trustworthy friends among India's leaders—and all because he relied on our help."

Khrushchev again urged Mao Tse-tung to resolve his differences with Nehru through peaceful talks. "Why don't the Chinese comrades understand that in case of another attack India will be swamped with American and British military aid?" he asked.

However, instead of accepting Moscow's peace proposal Mao Tse-tung is reported to be intensifying

his efforts to form his own Red bloc.

Governments and Red parties of Asia, Africa and Latin America are subjected to increased pressure from the Chinese to follow Peking's "revolutionary brinkmanship" and not Moscow's current soft policy.

China's People's Daily printed an account of the recent Red enclave in East Berlin in which Khrushchev was denounced by name for his "open and crude attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other fraternal parties which adhere to Marxism-Leninism." This was the first time in the Russian-Chinese quarrel that the Soviet premier was subjected by name to public condemnation as a "revisionist."

Moscow's Pravda retaliated by printing on its front page Khrushchev's "warm greetings" to Prime Minister Nehru in which the Soviet premier said among other things: "The relations of close friendship and collaboration that exist between our countries correspond to the best interests of the Soviet and Indian people."

This was another first in the struggle between the Red giants. In the view of U.N. specialists, it is unprecedented in the history of communism that Marxist-Leninist Russia should openly encourage a "capitalist" nation engaged in a military conflict with a "fraternal" Red country.

How much further, they ask, can Khrushchev and Mao go in denouncing each other without touching off a major break?

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Purchase

I protested at the Feb. 4 city council the lack of protection at school events and public meetings.

I protested the destruction to private property.

Did the council say they would investigate and increase the police force if necessary? No!

Instead they are spending \$8,000 of the taxpayers' money for land acquisition.

Every citizen who heard the Crime Prevention Committee's report should get behind it and demand this \$8,000 be spent on police protection, not land.

Let's support our police, get more of them, pay them better, and get a better name for Klamath Falls.

H. C. Beal