

Herald and News

Editorial Page

A Three-Dollar Bill?

There has been a great deal of editorial criticism of proposals to eliminate or reduce the tax deductions now allowed for donations, by individuals and enterprises to charitable, educational, and other non-profit causes and institutions.

The obvious result would be a massive reduction in the money given for good works. But charity is not going to stop, education is not going to stop, and religion is not going to stop. So, if the flood of private funds is dammed, where is the money to come from? Answer: From government.

It has been suggested that some of the

proponents of this proposal may want just that, in order to advance a vast Welfare State program in which ultimately government would do everything, run everything, and be all things to all men.

Finally, what virtue is there in any alleged tax reduction plan when it is accompanied by other plans which would increase the tax burden, both directly, as in the case of the added social security levies that became effective January 1, and indirectly, as in the case of elimination of traditional deductions? If that turns out to be the situation, the nation is being sold a three-dollar bill.

Critical Days For New Constitution

(Register - Guard, Eugene)

The next few days may be among the most critical in Oregon constitutional history. Important legislative committees likely will make key decisions bearing upon whether they will submit a reasonable and workable constitution to the people of Oregon, chance submitting a constitution they can't defend, or submit nothing. At stake is the executive section of the proposed constitution, probably the most controversial part of it.

The revised constitution provides for a single executive, a governor. Now executive authority is shared with a secretary of state and a treasurer. In addition, a labor commissioner and an attorney general are now elected by all the voters. In addition to providing that the governor would be the only executive, the proposed constitution provides for a comptroller, who would be selected as provided by statute. If the Legislature wished, it could provide that he, too, be chosen by popular vote. But under the terms of the proposed constitution, he would have no executive authority. He would be only a watchdog.

The reasons for the single executive are sound. If another person is to share executive authority, he must be either a harmless drudge or a political rival of the governor. If he's a drudge, we don't want him. If he's a rival, his presence in the state structure could so easily be disruptive. We saw that clearly in the Holmes administration. Governor Holmes was governor. But sitting with him on the Board of Control were Secretary of State Mark Hatfield and Treasurer Sig Unander, both of whom wanted his job and both of whom ran for it as soon as they could. A politically dynamic, ambitious man just must build up a political life of his own. Otherwise he's going no place, and he knows it. Only a drudge is willing to sit in the shadows.

This is a convincing argument to the legislative committees studying the new constitution. Or so members say. But, they contend, the people of Oregon will never accept a new constitution that reduces the number of elective officers. So, they argue, for expedience another executive or more should be thrown in as a sop to the voters.

Lane County's Richard Eymann sees it more clearly. First, he said, one ought to decide what these additional people are going to do. Then, if they are needed, provide for them. But don't provide for them first and then try to find something for them to do.

It is insulting to the voters to suggest that they will be ruled by some fancied prejudice in the backs of their minds, but unswayed by arguments the committee members say are convincing. Certainly, the proposed constitution will have its opponents, people who are always against change. But if it cannot be defended either by legislators or by its own writers, it won't have a prayer of passage by the voters in 1964. The committees and the authors need to preserve what George Washington spoke of as a standard to which the wise can repair.

It would also be insulting to voters to seek to keep them from voting on this document. It was written by an excellent committee after months of work. It's the public's business. The Legislature got into the act only because the people, by vote, asked the Legislature to work out an arrangement for presenting such a document. Under other circumstances, a constitutional convention might have been called. Then a constitution would pass or fail regardless of legislative feelings toward it. Thus the Legislature has a trust to submit a constitution, and as good a constitution as it can come up with.

Nixon Looks Like A Politician

(By Gladstone Williams
In The Sacramento Bee)

Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon's recent activities have convinced a lot of observers that he is back in politics again with both feet despite his renunciation of further political ambitions after his defeat for the California governorship.

These observers look on the several speeches Nixon has made in the past fortnight or so as indicative of his new frame of mind. In addition he has held a press conference, something he said he never would do again when he conceded his defeat belatedly last November.

Then too he has appeared on a nationwide television show which was given heavy political overtones by his exhortation of the Kennedy administration.

All of this has prompted one leading magazine, US News & World Report of Washington, DC, to comment: "It seems plain to most observers that Mr. Nixon is back in politics with both feet. But to what purpose? Some think he is setting out to become a Republican kingmaker, much as Thomas E. Dewey did after his defeat (for the presidency) in 1948."

Others have taken a similar view. His private meeting in New York with Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller is cited as lending substance to the kingmaker speculation. Nixon is known to think highly of the New York governor, whom he regards as the leading candidate for the Republican presidential nomination in 1964.

For one thing, Rockefeller stepped aside to let Nixon win the nomination without opposition in 1960. But who Nixon's real choice may be for the party prize is not known, if Nixon knows himself.

After his meeting with Rockefeller, Nixon also held an extended session with Leonard Hall, former Republican national chair-

man and a leader in the Nixon camp during the 1960 campaign. Certainly he and Hall did not spend the time talking about the weather.

None of these activities adds up to any loss of interest in politics by the former vice president. As a matter of fact, it never did make sense that a man who came as close to the presidency as Nixon did, losing by fewer than 120,000 votes out of some 68 million cast, could take himself out of politics completely.

When, in his disappointment over defeat for the California governorship, he indicated he was through with politics it, therefore, was taken with something more than a grain of salt. A man does not spend as many years in the political arena as Nixon did and then give it up at the age of 50.

And so the only question in the minds of most observers since his statement of last November has been what new political step Nixon would take. His defeat for the governorship eliminates him as a candidate for the GOP presidential nomination next year. The only other elective office open to him in 1964 is his old seat in the Senate. He could run for the nomination to oppose Senator Clair Engle, Democrat.

But it seems that will be too soon after his 1962 defeat for him to risk another race then. If he still has his eyes on another White House try his bet will be to run for governor again in 1966. Success in that would enable him to make a strong bid for the party presidential nomination two years later, when the second term of President John F. Kennedy would expire, assuming the president's reelection.

Many observers feel this is in the back of Nixon's mind. It is natural for a man who has been defeated for political office to want to vindicate himself at the polls. Hence it is no surprise to see Nixon

on beginning to show political activity again.

The way is open for him to keep himself in the picture by undertaking a kingmaker role in the next Republican National Convention. If he backed the winning candidate and the Republicans should emerge as victors in the 1964 election, he could command a place in the cabinet of the next administration.

But even if the Republicans should lose Nixon might gather enough political hay out of his part in the campaign to build him up for another try at the governorship. Few political leaders hereabouts are willing to take him at his word that he is through with politics.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Thursday, April 11, the 101st day of 1963.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The morning stars are Venus and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1814, French Emperor Napoleon decided to abdicate and signed a proclamation to that effect.

In 1899, the U.S. proclaimed a peace treaty with Spain to end the Spanish-American War.

In 1947, infielder Jackie Robinson of the old Brooklyn Dodgers became the first Negro to play major league baseball.

In 1931, President Truman relieved Gen. Douglas MacArthur of his command in the Far East.

A thought for the day: American humorist Mark Twain said: "Soap and education are not as sudden as a massacre, but they are more deadly in the long run."



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Purely Personal Prejudices: The real danger of our technological age is not so much that machines will begin to think like men, but that men will begin to think like machines—that machine-oriented thinking will dominate us, to the exclusion of morality, of conscience, of value-judgments.

By the time a speaker says, "To make a long story short," he has already made it too long.

Those who refuse to modify a system argue that modification is likely to produce disorder; but since conditions in any system are always changing, it may very well turn out that the refusal to modify the system is itself a "modification" which may produce disorder. (This is the paradox inherent in the conservative position, which so often loses everything because it is unwilling to change anything.)

Hate, no less than love, distorts our estimate of reality; as Nietzsche said of the militaristic spirit: "How good bad music and bad reasons sound when one marches against an enemy!"

The only time most people are aware of their conscience is when they can say, with more than a touch of smugness, "I have a clear conscience about that." When is their conscience unclear?

Sometimes we remain faithful to a cause only because its opponents are so stupid and ob-

noxious; in this way, blind opposition generates more fervor on the other side, even when faith is lagging.

It is hard for many parents to believe this, but most children understand adults better than adults understand children—that is, our unconscious and unexpressed motivations are quite clear to the child, while the child's unconscious motivations are not seen by us, because we have already constructed an artificial picture of the child as we want him to be, or as he should be, but not as he really is.

The most dangerous lunatics in society are those who are not committable: those who would pass any psychiatric tests for insanity, but who nevertheless suffer from grandiosity, delusions of persecution, and enter public life to expose some "plot" that is "threatening" all of us. Both Hitler and Stalin were crazy in this way; and yet both were "sane" by ordinary medico-legal standards. Private lunacy gets a padded cell; this form of public lunacy too often wins a throne-seat.

Some words are never used, except by those who lack the quality: just as a gentleman never mentions the word "gentleman," so the word "cultured" is used only by those without it, the word "refined" used only by those lacking it, and the phrase "gracious living" implies its precise opposite the moment it is spoken.

Indian War Dance

ACROSS		DOWN	
1	Suwan Indian	1	tribe of the Five Nations
2	Indian	2	for instance
3	troop	3	Cartograph
4	Indian	4	for
5	troop	5	troop
6	troop	6	troop
7	troop	7	troop
8	troop	8	troop
9	troop	9	troop
10	troop	10	troop
11	troop	11	troop
12	troop	12	troop
13	troop	13	troop
14	troop	14	troop
15	troop	15	troop
16	troop	16	troop
17	troop	17	troop
18	troop	18	troop
19	troop	19	troop
20	troop	20	troop
21	troop	21	troop
22	troop	22	troop
23	troop	23	troop
24	troop	24	troop
25	troop	25	troop
26	troop	26	troop
27	troop	27	troop
28	troop	28	troop
29	troop	29	troop
30	troop	30	troop
31	troop	31	troop
32	troop	32	troop
33	troop	33	troop
34	troop	34	troop
35	troop	35	troop
36	troop	36	troop
37	troop	37	troop
38	troop	38	troop
39	troop	39	troop
40	troop	40	troop
41	troop	41	troop
42	troop	42	troop
43	troop	43	troop
44	troop	44	troop
45	troop	45	troop
46	troop	46	troop
47	troop	47	troop
48	troop	48	troop
49	troop	49	troop
50	troop	50	troop
51	troop	51	troop

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
56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66

STRICTLY PERSONAL

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Essential

The problems of the railroad workers are many and an informed public will not be so quick to believe the accusations of featherbedding made by the railroads. This is one of the major issues at stake.

Firemen are as necessary now as ever. They are concerned now with a different kind of fire, it's true, not one contained in a fire box which must be fed to produce steam, but the fire of electricity, generated by the diesel motors. It would be just as fair to claim a farmer—or a housewife—or many other present day workers are featherbedding. After all their working conditions have changed, too.

We no longer cook over a wood stove, make our own bread and our own soap or raise and preserve our own food as our mothers and grandmothers had to do and because a farmer uses modern mechanized methods instead of trudging behind horses or mules we don't say he is featherbedding. Changing times and methods make a job no less essential.

So the fireman's job has changed but he is still needed. Now he has to know the fundamentals of the diesel motors, to be able to locate and fix troubles that occur while the train is running under power—that is the only way the trouble can be found.

He is a definite safety factor in many ways—an extra pair of eyes to watch for danger where the engineers can't see—a copilot, so to speak, for the engineer, who can take over the controls if he is needed. After all, the engineer is human and subject to sudden illness and other unforeseen happenings as well as any other person. The fireman is trained and able to take the controls of the train in such an event.

And last, but not least, the fireman is the future engineer, learning a complex job the only way it can be learned, as an apprentice under the guidance of the experienced engineer. Management seems to have lost sight of this important aspect of the picture.

The job of the railroad man may look easy when you see him riding along in the train but it is complex in so many ways. And the life of a railroad man and his family is complex and different than any other. So, please, learn our side of the story before believing the accusations of featherbedding.

Do you know what an "extra board" is? Ask any railroader and he will tell you. Here they serve the early years on a job while gaining seniority. While on the extra board they have no steady, set place to work but must go anywhere in this division to work for as long as they are needed.

So they must maintain a home for their family and also pay their own expenses wherever they may be working; they receive no away-from-home expense account for this. So it goes, no regular home life with wife and children, and double living expenses until they have gained enough seniority to hold a steady run. Then when a fireman takes his examination and is promoted



NOTHING SPECIAL

(W. B. S.)

I was glad to see George Callison set the record straight for the crepe hangers and gloom chasers in his column last Sunday. Klamath Falls and the Klamath area have sustained some severe economic hardships, but not to the extent that we are down for the count. We have many good things going for us—the picture is not black. But, if we just sit on our collective duff and cry we can expect the worst. Leaders in the community must take the initiative and howl down the detractors and moaners.

I have a solution to all of the problems of KUHS: Simply close down the school for four or five years or so. This will enable taxpayers to accumulate a reserve; the kids will be able to go out and earn their own living; teachers can find some worthwhile work, and we can quit worrying about the quality of the music and athletic programs for a while. I would suggest the same thing for elementary schools in the city, but I'm afraid Warm Springs does not have the facilities for all those mothers of children between the ages of 6 and 12.

Games, anyone? The Seattle Argus recently ran a brain-twister which, it said, is a sample logic problem—not at all typical—one high school teacher recently handed her algebra class. You're invited to take a crack at it to test your own reasoning processes and reactions. Here's the way it goes:

Five men, each of a different nationality, lives in a different colored house, drinks something different, smokes a different brand of cigarettes, owns a different animal.

Here are the clues:
There are five houses in a row.
The Englishman lives in the red house.
The Spaniard has a dog.
The person who lives in the green house drinks coffee.
The Ukrainian drinks tea.

The green house is just to the right of the ivory house.
The man who smokes Old Gold owns snails.
Kools are smoked in the yellow house.
The man in the middle house drinks milk.
The Norwegian lives in the first house.

The Chesterfield smoker lives next to the man with a fox.
The man who smokes Kools lives next to the man who owns a horse.
The Lucky Strike smoker drinks orange juice.
The Japanese smokes Parliaments.

The Norwegian lives next to the blue house.
The questions:
Which man drinks water?
Which man owns a zebra?

There are no tricks involved. There is an answer. All that's required is brains and a deductive process. I'll print the correct answer in a few days. Let me see and hear what some of you deduce.

To the first person sending in the correct answer, I'll give two tickets to the Klamath Community Music Festival.

Expensive driving (or, statistics we can do without): Life insurance benefits paid in 1962 to families of policyholders killed in auto accidents totaled a record \$164,000,000 or \$23 million more than in 1961. The Institute of Life Insurance said about four per cent of all life insurance death payments resulted from automobile fatalities.

Here's the way government economy works: By abolishing the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Committee, which in 1962 had 49 employees, \$550,000 was salvaged from the budget. But the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in 1964 will have 223 permanent employees and a budget of \$2,402,000.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Civilian Planners Wrecking Defenses

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

The honeymoon is over for Robert Strange McNamara.

Labeled the "greatest Defense Secretary in history," urged to run for President in 1968, the subject of gushing cover stories only a few short months ago, McNamara is now the most unpopular New Frontiersman in Washington.

There are few Republicans or Democrats, who rush to his side. Paul Douglas in the Senate and Sam Stratton in the House are virtually alone in their defense of the onetime Ford Motor chieftain. Neither wields much influence and neither is expert in Pentagon affairs.

The secretary is now labeled a tyrant, a dictator by top-ranking congressional figures. Virtually every expert on Capitol Hill—Russell, Vinson, Goldwater, Symington, Amden—has criticized him.

Republicans say flatly that McNamara's policies play into the hands of Moscow. They say he has weakened America's strategic position by cancelling the Skybolt, killing the RB-70, junking the Jupiter missiles trained on Soviet defense installations.

Democrats have joined the chorus. Sen. Strom Thurmond, a general in the Army Reserve,

charges that McNamara's refusal to "expedite development and deployment of a defense against ballistic missile attack has created a very real and dangerous gap."

Within the past few years, Thurmond says, McNamara has been faced with a key decision: whether or not to go forward with production of the only anti-missile system the free world has under active development. Each year he has decided, over military objections, against spending the \$600 million for production of key component parts for the Army's Nike Zeus system. This despite the fact that Army scientists have scored success after success with the Zeus in test range trials.

Late last year, after the Zeus passed its ultimate test by picking out and destroying an intercontinental ballistic missile fired several thousand miles away, McNamara decided not to "rush" production of an anti-missile missile. Under McNamara plans, the U.S. might—and then again, might not—have such a weapon by 1970. The Russians, McNamara admitted in Senate grilling, should have one by 1965.

Thurmond feels that McNamara has adopted the policies of Prof. Jerome Wiesner, chief science adviser to the President. Wiesner told Soviet scientists in December, 1960, that possession of an anti-missile missile by this country would upset what he called the nuclear parity. He urged an international agreement "to explicitly prohibit the development and deployment of such a system."

The Russians took Wiesner's view with a grain of salt. They continued massive research on development of such a missile and will have one years before the U.S.

In recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, argued for the Nike Zeus. He told House members that America will suffer a "Cold War defeat" when the Soviets announce they have developed an anti-missile missile. The first side to put such a missile in operation will rack up a major propaganda victory, to say nothing of a military breakthrough.

"We would have had a technological triumph over the Soviets," said Taylor. Pentagon officials vetoed the idea as "too expensive," however.