

Herald and News
Editorial Page

Proposed Constitution Needs Support

We are hopeful that the House and Senate committees charged with studying the proposed Oregon Constitution Revision report will resist efforts to make many substantial changes in the suggested document.

The proposed Constitution, while certainly not perfect, does go a long way in remedying most of the imperfections of the present Constitution—something more than 105 years old.

Two principal points at issue in the legislative committee deliberations involve the executive department and judicial department changes proposed by the Revision Commission.

The Commission report recommends that the executive department be organized under a single elected official—the governor. Presently, three elected officials comprise the executive—the governor, the treasurer and the secretary of state.

While there seems to be considerable public resistance to the idea of a single elected state official, we feel that there is considerable merit in the Commission's recommendation. Briefly, the arguments in favor are that the single executive would not be sharing executive authority; he would be quickly and "visibly responsible"; he would not be facing the threat of political rivalry by elected subordinates while he was in office.

Merely by removing reference of the offices from the Constitution does not mean that the state would have to get along without the services of, say, the secretary of state, the treasurer, the attorney general, the labor commissioner, and so on. Undoubtedly, similar posts would be maintained under an appointive system.

The nature of public resistance to the

proposal, as we understand it, is that it would permit the governor to establish a political dictatorship. As far as that goes, it would be possible under the present system. The check on such a situation, of course, is the general election where the voters could turn out a governor who proved too politically ruthless.

If this public resistance is too great, we can see no great harm that would come from a compromise under which the voters would elect two state officials who would run in tandem—both from the same political party. Presumably this would be the governor and the secretary of state.

Another point of controversy is the manner of selection of judges in the various levels of state courts. Now, they are supposedly elected. Under the Revised Constitution, they would be appointed by the governor, and "stand" for election every six years.

Actually, right now, most judges assume their judicial role through appointment, and they seek reelection when the next balloting comes along. Sometimes they have opposition. There is nothing so sacred in the Commission's recommendation here that it cannot be changed to make the situation more palatable to the legislature and the people.

There are other minor provisions in the Commission's report (such as the proposed annual sessions and apportionment) that can be modified by the legislature committees now at work on the report.

The important thing, here, we think, is that the legislature complete its work on the Report in time for it to be approved by the full legislature so it can be sent to the people for a vote.

It would not be consistent with the high purpose of this legislative assembly if our lawmakers did not bring this report to a vote of the people.

We've Had Plenty

More than slightly disturbing in recent months, has been the tendency in the Klamath area (and particularly in Klamath Falls) by a few detractors to tear down and discredit the structure of orderly government.

We would maintain steadfastly, the right and the responsibility of groups and individuals to make honest criticism of government agencies and officers. However, when that prerogative turns to maliciousness and vindictiveness—that's something else.

To question decisions of public bodies is one matter—but to question the motives of individuals on those bodies (mostly non-salaried) is another matter. Loose charges and irresponsible statements regarding the personal philosophies and actions of members of those bodies are not to be condoned by responsible

citizens. If a personal attack is being made, the attacker should have the facts to substantiate his or her charges before loose talk is permitted to destroy the character and the effectiveness of the person or persons involved.

We all know the results of gossip and what it will do to the unfortunate persons involved—on both sides of the fence. Not so well known, or as easily recognized, is what character assassination and unwarranted attacks on school boards, city councils, county government and other local agencies can do to a community. Purposefulness, initiative and good government are destroyed. Anarchy—in one form or another—results.

We do not need any more of it in Klamath Falls.

IN WASHINGTON . . .
A Reporter's Notebook

Senate Cloakroom: Richard Nixon has been telling friends that he intends to blast the Administration for its harassment of the Cuban exiles, its use of legal force to prevent preparations for an uprising in Cuba, and its "informing" to other countries to prevent exile raids from out-of-U.S. bases. But the feeling among those who take a strong anti-Castro line and hope to push President Kennedy into keeping his promises of support for Cuba's freedom fighters is, "What's the use?" They are still discouraged by Senator Everett Dirksen's prompt endorsement of the President's criticism of exile hit-run raids on the island. "It used to be," one Senate staff man said, "that like we always pulling the rug out from under the Republican Party. Now Ev has taken over the job."

Embassy Row: For the first time, reports from usually reliable sources indicate that Soviet military units in Cuba have been thrown into battle against the growing anti-Castro guerrilla movement. It is estimated that these anti-Communist forces in Escambray and elsewhere on the island now exceed 4,000—a larger number than Fidel Castro had with him in the Sierra Maestra at the time that adulatory U.S. correspondents were predicting his imminent victory. The Castro regime has resorted to the use of Soviet troops, it is said, because it cannot rely on its own militia unless there are backstopping Russian troops. The Soviets are now in Cuba in military uniforms, but they are not identified.

Organization of American States: A nagging question among Latin American diplomats: Can they extinguish the fires of resentment which have begun to separate President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela and President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic? Publication in Caracas of a confidential report by the Venezuelan Charge d'Affaires in Santo Domingo to his Foreign Office chief underscores the feud. The Venezuelan diplomat charges that Bosch, like Castro, has "skillfully exploited the misery and ignorance of the Dominican people" and that the Bosch regime is infiltrated by Communists. It is being recalled that Betancourt was one of Fidel Castro's supporters, then turned on him when Castro began attempting to undermine the Venezuelan government. Bosch was also a member of the Betancourt group (it also includes Governor Luis Munoz Marin of Puerto Rico). But those who believed that Bosch would bring moderate government and sound policies to the Dominican Republic are now taking some worried second looks.

House Cloakroom: Congress is debating a Domestic Peace Corps. But while the legislators talk, the Executive Branch is acting. Representative John W. Wyder (R, New York) complains that the Administration, without waiting for Congressional approval, established its own Domestic Peace Corps. It already has an office, a staff of 25, and is screening applicants. When you phone this office, a voice answers: "Domestic Peace Corps." This, of course, is

in addition to the \$250,000 DPC set up on a pilot basis in Harlem, New York's Negro section, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—again without a Congressional by-your-leave or any appropriation. Obviously, HEW has plenty of cash to spare.

Post Office Department: Rumors persist that Postmaster General Day is resigning to run for public office. What effect this will have on the Kennedy Administration is moot. Mr. Day has gone out of his way to antagonize and alienate several million articulate stamp collectors in this country—as even the most casual reading of the philatelic press shows. His attitude is that stamp collecting is a child's pastime—so he has refused to cooperate with important philatelic groups around the country. Oddly enough the Philatelic Agency of the Post Office is the only part of the department which shows a consistent and substantial profit. Postmaster General Day's insistence on reissuing in multi-million lots the Dag Hammarskjöld "invert" error infuriated collectors around the country. They say that this has destroyed the philatelic integrity of this country by involving it in the production of phony errors. The philatelic press refers to this reissue as "Day's dumbbell" and the major publication in that field loudly applauds the possible passing of the postmaster scene of the present Postmaster General. If the next election were up to the stamp collectors of the country, the traditional Chinaman could defeat Mr. Kennedy.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

The other evening I heard a man arguing that a certain book should be suppressed because it contained material that could be "dangerous" and "harmful" if it fell into the wrong hands.

His attitude—so common and so wrong-headed—reminded me of what Jacques Maritain, the great Catholic scholar, had to say on the same subject: "If books were judged by the bad uses man can put them to, what book has been more misused than the Bible?"

In the 1500 years since it was codified and made canonical, the Bible has been used by innumerable sects and rulers to justify (and indeed to exalt) the burning of witches, the torture of heretics, the practice of slavery, the extermination of peoples, the subordination of women, the custom of polygamy, and scores of cruelties, barbarities and bigotries of the most odious nature.

Almost anybody can use almost any book for almost any purpose. I have been recently going through a collection of Nietzsche's works. All most people know about him was that he apostrophized the "superman" and that the Nazi movement seemed to take much of its philosophical impulse from Nietzsche's writings.

But a careful reading of his work shows quite the contrary. He was violently anti-German, and considered himself a "good European." Some of his finest passages indelict nationalism and war; he opposed anti-Semites as vulgar and brutish. His "superman" was the diametrical opposite of Hitler's "Blond Beast." And he anticipated many of Freud's

deepest insights into the irrational character of prejudice and hate.

Our own Founding Fathers provide a similar example. We can find in the speeches of Washington and Jefferson enough to provide us with ammunition for nearly any cause. I could easily compile a selection of Jefferson that would make him sound like a revolutionary Marxist; and a selection of Franklin that would make him sound like a pacifist and a toady to King George.

To repress a book because it contains "dangerous" or "harmful" material would be to exterminate 90 per cent of the world's great literature—for the greater work of art is, the more universal, the more embracing, the more it can be misused for every perverted cause.

The only book that cannot be dangerous or harmful is the bland book, the meaningless book, the insipid and characterless book that discourages thought, feeling and reaction. And it is such books that proliferate when controversial works are suppressed: censorship, whether in Russia or America, always leads to the tyranny of the commonplace.

THEY SAY . . .

These persons can no longer be treated on an "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" basis.

—Dr. L. H. Bartemeier of the AMA, endorsing President Kennedy's plan for mental hospitals in every community.

WASHINGTON NOTEBOOK

Tax Ruling Could Raise Family Havoc

By WASHINGTON STAFF

Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Explaining new regulations on travel and entertainment expense deductions for income tax purposes, Mortimer M. Caplin, Internal Revenue Service Commissioner, declared that a bachelor businessman might be allowed to charge off the costs of a girl friend or secretary if she served in place of a wife as a hostess for essential business entertaining. "But as a family man," Caplin said, "I want to express my concern about entertainment expenses for wives."

The mystery of why Morocco's young King Hassan II did not bring his wife along on his official visit to Washington and New York was cleared up by the Moroccan embassy with the explanation that she is awaiting the arrival of her second baby. The first child, born last August, was a girl.

The Princess Consort—she is not called Queen in Morocco and won't be until she bears a son who will become heir to the throne—is described as a beautiful Berber girl, not yet 20, daughter and granddaughter of governors of a northern mountain state. Her brother was military aide to the King, and that is how he happened to meet her. It was a real romance and not an arranged marriage for political unity in the kingdom.

Their marriage was a quiet one, celebrated throughout Morocco by royal gifts to the poor. Even though she is the King's wife, the Princess takes no part in official functions, is never photographed and is given no publicity by the royal palace.

Asked if there was any connection between his kingdom and the famous Manhattan "Club El Morocco," King Hassan replied that unfortunately the night club paid none of its taxes to his government—only to the state of New York.

Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert and his boss, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, have been put on the spot by Congress in connection with the TFX—Tactical Fighter Experimental—controversy.

Zuckert tells friends he feels "as surrounded as a goalie on a hockey team trying to defend his goal with two of his men out of the game in the penalty box."

Another TFX story now circulating in the Navy corridors of the Pentagon claims that the TFX tri-service fighter plane problem really had its start back a year or so ago when the top defense brass came up with a unified tri-service belt buckle.

Political satirist Mark Russell has written a song parody on the doings of Rep. Adam Clayton Powell of New York. Title of the song: "How to Succeed in Washington without Really Being There."

Entertainer Eartha Kitt says of Washington officials: "They have a sense of humor about everything but taxes."



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .
Chamber President Fights Power Grab

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — A new set of devils—said to be responsible for the growing power of the federal government regardless of whether Democrats or Republicans run the White House and Congress—has just been identified by the president-elect of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

He is Edwin P. Neilan of Wilmington, Del., chairman and president of the Bank of Delaware, who will be installed May 1 for a one-year term as head of the nation's largest business organization.

Speaking just after announcement of his election by the chamber's board of directors, Neilan declared that the impetus for "nationalization" in the United States remains the same regardless of which political party is in power.

"It comes," he asserted, "from a relatively small group of entrenched civil servants who use both parties to extend their power and social philosophy."

"They appear to be beyond any adequate control by the thin layer of political appointees at the top."

Neilan names no names, gives no specific examples, does not identify in what government agencies "the entrenched" are to be found.

But this is something brand new in the way of a charge from the business community as to who is responsible for all the big government programs businessmen object to.

Neilan's target isn't the Americans for Democratic Action, the favorite group to blame for what's wrong with the country. Neither does he make the Communists his whipping boy. Nor does he hold that new Washington policies are dictated by the labor bosses—though he does have some definite views on treating the monopoly power of labor unions the same as business monopolies.

Democratic new frontiersmen aren't blamed any more than the Republicans by Neilan. No, it's this unspecified little group of top grade civil servants—government career men barred from political activity by the Hatch act, bureaucrats if you will—who are now held up by him for indictment on charges of running the Establishment.

In this connection, it is recalled that when the Eisenhower administration came to town 10 years ago there was a definite effort to get government career men out of all policymaking jobs and appoint Republicans in their places.

The effort wasn't completely successful. But when the Kennedy administration took over it very definitely removed all Republican policymakers and replaced them with Democrats.

Most career civil servants, considered experts in their respective fields, stayed on in their non-policy-making jobs. The best of these people are usually singled out to get annual meritorious service awards for carrying out plans approved by the policymakers as authorized by acts of Congress.

But, says Neilan, "these federal officials are on the road selling their subsidy programs as painless panaceas for almost every type of community problem."

"They endeavor to convince business, civic and political leaders that shopping for money in Washington is like visiting the bargain basement. The next step will be to create a cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and turn our cities into federal dependencies."

This last point is what Neilan hopes to oppose most vigorously in his year as U.S. Chamber president. He is on sound ground here, although he probably is fighting a hopeless battle.

He admits it is easier for mayors to come to Washington for \$100,000 grants or loans than to try to raise money at home.

Neilan identifies himself politically as a great ticket splitter. Born in Michigan, reared in the Midwest and Texas, he voted for Al Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt—the first two times. Then he became a registered Republican.

"I'm not sure I can qualify as a conservative," he says. "Some of my banking competitors say I'm not."



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .
Russians Get Heavy Machinery From U.S.

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

"The United States is faced with a new kind of warfare which deals—not in bombs and bullets—but in commodities and cargoes."

That is the way New York Senator Ken Keating describes the "economic offensive" waged against this country by Soviet Russia.

"The economic policies and the political drive of the Soviet Union are meshed for the greatest aggressive impact," he says. "Business as usual relations with the Soviets, therefore, can only strengthen their economy and add thrust to their political objectives."

Senator Keating has words of praise for Joe Drago, a Long Island machinist, who fought a valiant battle to prevent advanced machinery from going to the Soviet Union.

When Drago, an employee of the Fairchild Stratos Corporation, came to work one morning in December, 1961, he received a worried call from Shop Steward Ron Pettit.

"You better hurry right over here," he was told, "we have a problem."

"What kind of problem?" asked Drago, who is president of Machinists Local 893.

"Hold onto your hat," said Pettit excitedly, "we're making some machinery to be sent to Russia."

"Come on," snapped Drago, "I don't have any time for jokes."

"No (snooping, Joe)," Pettit insisted, "we're making foundries."

As Drago soon found out, it was, indeed, no joke. Heavy industrial machines, to be used in paper making, were to be shipped behind the Iron Curtain via Japan.

Reaction on the part of Drago's fellow unionists was quick. As he tells it:

"They wanted immediately to go on strike; there was talk of contacting the Disabled American Veterans to picket the plant, and the workers who were involved with the actual building of the units wanted to disassemble what they had built."

"I told the fellows we would have none of that; we were a law-abiding union with obligations to a contract that we would thoroughly investigate the problem, then seek a solution."

Drago went to company headquarters, asking them to reconsider the decision to build the machines. On December 27, 1961, "an inter-office memo" went to every employee. The company assured its employees that the Soviet sale was government-approved, could help build world trade and safeguard world peace.

At the January, 1962 meeting of Local 101, members voted unanimously to take all legal steps to stop the material from falling into Communist hands.

Drago and Pettit went to Washington to confer with leaders of the Machinists Union on ways to block the shipment. "This was the first shock of many," Drago remembers, "we were met with blind eyes and deaf ears."

Finally the two men got appointments with State Department top brass and were ushered into plush offices, Drago says.

"From behind the grand mahogany desk, and out of the well-padded leather seat came the official 'rationalization' which we were not looking for."

Told that the trade would help ease world tensions, Drago and Pettit were mystified.

"Perhaps we are 'simple' laymen," says Drago, "We cannot understand this confusing, ambiguous and contradictory policy which condones the sale of economically strategic goods to an enemy when the United States is asking its fighting men to give up their lives for its freedom."

Rebuffed in Washington, the two unionists returned to New York. They were able to steer through the convention of the 100,000-member New York State Council of Machinists a resolution begging the Administration to prevent the export of strategic goods to the Soviet Union. They told their story to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which held a New York hearing on trade with the enemy.

But all in vain. The Fairchild Stratos Corporation earned its dollars with the approval of our government. And the Soviet Union has advanced technical machinery available only in the West.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—Which U.S. president was criticized for asking the Senate to ratify a treaty joining Hawaii to the United States?

A—Benjamin Harrison.