

Herald and News Editorial Page

Thresher Loss Mourned

The charmed life of America's remarkable nuclear submarine force is over.

There is terrible irony in the fact that tragedy has struck what may have been the Navy's greatest submarine of all time—the powerful USS Thresher. It was the world's fastest and deepest-diving undersea craft.

Only the families and friends of the 129 men aboard the Thresher can feel the full weight of this sudden disaster.

For them there is no comfort aside from the knowledge that this nation is immensely grateful for the service the lost men performed in this critical arm of the country's defenses.

Those linked in any way with the life of the submarine understand that the threat of death is always present. In this instance some are perhaps finding a small crumb of solace in realizing that the Thresher's evident plunge to a depth of 8,400 feet would have brought death quickly to all on board. No submarine is built to withstand such pressures.

The Thresher's skipper, Lt. Cmdr. John W. Harvey, was a veteran of atomic submarines, having served on three others, including the Nautilus, the illustrious first among

America's nuclear vessels. He belonged to the distinguished company which twice made undersea voyages to the North Pole.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Thresher carried 17 civilians, specialists who were busy judging its performance on this fateful train run out of Portsmouth, N.H.

For all the attention given our growing number of missile-bearing Polaris submarines, the undersea force today is still too much an unheralded wing of our defense.

Yet it is not improper to say that in this age of fast-flying missiles and supersonic aircraft, often amazingly sophisticated in searching out targets, the hard-to-detect submarine is a great bulwark of our security.

One could fairly argue that our submarines — Polaris, nuclear "attack" vessels like the Thresher, or conventional craft — are now the backbone of a Navy that has magnified its usefulness while shifting its functions in a greatly altered defense world.

Americans make sad tribute to the officers, the men and the civilian specialists who went down with the ship which was to have been one of the brightest links in a superb protective chain vital to us all.

Counsel For The Defense

(The New York Times)

Twenty-five years ago the Supreme Court held that every person who faced a criminal charge in the federal courts and could not afford a lawyer was constitutionally entitled to have one provided for him. But when it faced the same question in the state courts—which try most of this country's criminal cases—the court required counsel only in capital cases and those involving "special circumstances."

This week the court wiped out what it rightly called this "anachronism." Justice Black surely spoke for enlightened opinion generally when he said: "In our adversary system of criminal justice any person haled into court who is too poor to hire a lawyer cannot be assured a fair trial unless counsel is provided for him."

Declaring a constitutional right to counsel is, however, a long way from establishing a working system to provide effective counsel for every needy defendant. Even in the Federal courts, 25 years after the right was declared, it is still not assured in any systematic way. Lawyers, often young and inexperienced,

are picked by judges to serve without compensation, even for out-of-pocket expenses — a system that is fair neither to the lawyers nor to the defendants.

A committee named by Attorney General Kennedy and headed by Prof. Francis A. Allen of the University of Michigan Law School has recently drafted a broad solution for the problem in the Federal system. It recommends that every Federal court be required to appoint a paid public defender, paid appointed counsel, use the services of a legal aid society or adopt a combination of these approaches. Counsel would have funds for such essentials as investigation and hiring expert witnesses.

Legislation, to effect this reform, long overdue, can be enacted without partisanship. The Kennedy Administration is giving its support. Such enlightened Republicans as Representative Lindsay of New York have done pioneer work.

Without effective counsel for the defense there cannot be a fair criminal trial. Congress has a great chance now to meet this need in the Federal courts and, while doing so, to provide leadership for the States.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Some weeks ago, I wrote a little piece of fluff about the brainy father being beaten at Concentration by his 5-year-old daughter. The letters began to pour in, and are still arriving, about all the fiendish little children who delight in humiliating their elders at cards, games, puzzles, and other contests of perception and memory.

The most interesting letter, however, came from a man in Florida who is a retired magician of considerable professional standing. He wrote, in part:

"When I was performing sleight-of-hand, and similar feats, it was always easy to fool the adults — in fact, the more intelligent and educated the adult, the easier he was to fool. College professors were my favorites."

"But any child under 12 is poison to a sleight-of-hand man. The child is not distracted by patter, the way an adult is. He keeps his eyes focused on the right card and the right hand, and the slightest hesitation or fumbling is immediately evident to him. Growing up seems to be largely a process of diluting our attention, and diffusing our perceptions."

As we grow up, our field of vision expands, our minds fan out (as it were), and many peripheral objects claim our attention. The quantity of our comprehension increases, but the quality goes down. We "see" what our sophistication has trained us to see, not what is really there.

This is why the intelligent and educated spectator is so easily taken in by sleight-of-hand. He has taught himself to look for

Cross in the Deep



STRICTLY PERSONAL

subtleties, for shadings of difference, for a certain patterning of expressions and gestures and reactions.

The child, unsophisticated in this regard, looks only for the obvious—and the obvious, of course, is most hidden from sophistication. Poe's classic little tale, "The Purloined Letter," is an excellent example: a pile of letters is the first place a child would look for a hidden letter, and the last place an investigating adult would look.

We laugh at our children's simplistic solutions of war and peace, and we say that the children do not understand the complexities of the world situation. But we are the ones who are distracted by superficial factors, and it is the child who concentrates on the fact of death and the foolishness of adult conflict. What else can it mean to say that "a little child shall lead us?"

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Proper Blame

Read your editorial "Common Thieves" of April 8th, 1963 on page 6. It was all so true except you overblamed the registered guest by 75 per cent at least. I agree lots of "articles walk off" but the largest per cent of missing articles are taken by people visiting your registered guests in units, such as friends, guests and relatives and motel hired help. Those common thieves have read and heard so much about "guests walking off with articles" that they know they are perfectly safe in helping themselves as it is an old thing to blame "guests. Deplorable situation.

We find the traveling people and working men passing through are very thoughtful people except for very rare cases.

G. R. Moon,
Parkway Motel-Trailer,
123 N. 4th St.,
Lakeview, Ore.

THEY SAY...

I thought a few months ago that Kennedy would be impossible to defeat. I don't think so now.

—Sen. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz.

If you think Hollywood is dead, you should walk around Rome, Paris or Madrid and see what's going on in motion picture production. In Paris you can shoot rabbits on the sound stages.

—Producer Darryl F. Zanuck.

Gas Tax

I read a news article last week where there was a proposal that the State of Oregon give the City of Portland a million or better dollars. This money was to come out of the State Gasoline Tax Fund. The money was to aid them in bringing the Olympic Games to Portland.

This sort of raised my eyebrow wondering how come they had such a gas tax surplus to use for things other than highways. In tonight's Herald and News paper, Wednesday, April 10th, the highway commission has reversed itself wanting to add one cent a gallon tax and increasing license fees \$3. Reason stated for increase was the Highway Commission hasn't the money to construct or repair our have not highways such as 101.

News items such as above makes the motorist and taxpayer wonder just what is going on. Also has quite an effect on his voting at a later date.

E. J. Drew

Other Editors Say... Highway Murder

(The Sacramento Bee)

Taking note of an appalling 17 per cent increase in highway deaths in incorporated areas this year as compared with 1962, Gov. Edmund G. Brown properly has called for drastic tightening of traffic law enforcement.

He wants an increase in the highway patrol, the use of radar to stop speeding, the use of unmarked patrol cars, chemical tests for those accused of drunk driving and the mandatory use of seat belts.

In addition the governor appealed to judges to be more strict in imposing penalties against flagrant law violators.

The alarming increase in traffic fatalities is prima facie evidence that not enough of an effective nature is being done to reduce the toll of deaths and injuries.

Obviously the use of slogans, appeals to common sense and wrist slapping penalties for dan-



EDSON IN WASHINGTON...

Observers Predict Victory For Byrd

By PETER EDSON

WASHINGTON (NEA) — The consensus at the black tie dinner honoring Harry Flood Byrd's 30 years of continuous service in the U.S. Senate was that the Virginia gentleman apple grower will run for re-election in 1964.

"If he doesn't, all hell will break loose in Virginia among the people who want to succeed him," one Old Dominion official put it.

And if that happens, the famous Byrd political organization — the most effective but the loosest-knit political machine in the United States, built around the personality of one leader—might well fall apart.

Byrd will be 76 in June. If he runs he will be re-elected, and he would be 81 at the end of another term.

But as Virginius Dubney, editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, said to unanimous applause: "I hope he runs for another term in 1964. Any man who can climb Old Rag Mountain every year, leading younger men, is able to serve a sixth term."

Byrd did announce that he would retire in 1958 at the end of his fourth term, when he was a mere 71. But all his cohorts and followers demanded that he run again. And in that connection, Vice President Lyndon Johnson told this story:

Among those who went down to Richmond to make impassioned speeches that Byrd should change his decision not to run was the late Sen. Robert S. Kerr, D-Okla. As ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, Kerr might succeed to the chairmanship if Chairman Byrd retired.

Three days after Kerr pulled all his oratorical stops in an appeal that Byrd must run for re-election, the withdrawal was withdrawn. And the crestfallen Kerr came to Johnson, who was then majority leader to ask, "Why do you reckon Harry changed his mind?"

Johnson in turn asked his long-time desk-mate Byrd and got the cryptic reply, "I just couldn't let Bob down."

"It was the only time," Kerr commented later, "that Harry Byrd ever paid a damned bit of attention to any of my speeches."

These were just a couple of the highlights at the Smithfield

(Virginia) ham and (imported) champagne dinner which the Reader's Digest gave for some 300 of Byrd's colleagues and admirers to mark—a month late—the 30th anniversary of his original appointment to the U.S. Senate, March 4, 1933.

"Just think of it," said the Digest's executive editor Hobart Lewis, who presided, "Senator Byrd has been down here holding his finger in the dyke all this time. We wanted to title an article about him, 'Profile in Courage,' but decided not to."

Bernard Baruch, now 83, came up from South Carolina to honor the 75-year-old Byrd with this tribute: "If Diogenes had lived in this age, he would have put out his lantern and gone home, happy to have found his honest man."

There were about as many Republican senators at the dinner as Democratic senators, which was only to be expected. Because that's the kind of following and appeal Harry Byrd has.

Sen. Everett M. Dirksen spoke for the Republicans, and also as a Virginian, because, as he said, his opponents back home in Illinois had accused him of being a "fugitive" when he built a house near Leesburg, Va., "a \$350,000 estate," they charged, though it was all on one floor.

"The Senate has just conferred on Winston Churchill the citizenship of the United States," said Dirksen. "We have no titles in America, but we have a nobility which has to be earned. And you (Senator Byrd) are of the nobility of free men."

There were other tributes galore which the senator modestly said "later he did not deserve, though they filled his heart."

At the end they gave the senator a golden apple because, as Lewis said:

"We hope all your endeavors will bear fruit and that all of your days will be golden."

"I hope these can be raised on my trees," said Byrd. Somebody had pointed out earlier that in all his years as an apple grower, Byrd had never taken one soil conservation payment from the government and had never sold the government one apple.

That characterized him as well as anything said all evening.



WASHINGTON REPORT...

India Foreign Aid Faces Congress Cut

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

There is bad news that President John Kennedy must soon convey to his latest pen pal, India's Jawaharlal Nehru.

For many months now, the Chief Executive has exchanged personal letters with Nehru, when he considers a statesman of the first rank. Mr. Kennedy must break the news that not everybody in Washington agrees.

Congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle are whetting their axes for an all-out assault on the foreign aid budget earmarked for Nehru.

To date, India has received from this country more than \$4 billion. Angry solons complain that Uncle Sam has received nothing—save the back of Nehru's non-aligned hand—in return.

Not even the Indian invasion by troops of Mao Tse-tung has softened congressional feeling toward the world's premier neutralist. Georgia's Richard Russell, powerful chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, says that Nehru's troops "put on a disgraceful exhibition in permitting themselves to be driven out of what should be impregnable strongholds in the border mountains."

He opposes U.S. military aid to India since "modern arms will just fall into Communist hands."

A Michigan Republican, Rep. William Broomfield, has completed a personal review of the Sino-Indian conflict and has discovered the reason Nehru's troops were so humiliated. He points out that at the very moment that Chinese soldiers first poured into Indian territory, the best Indian troops were stationed on the frontier of Kashmir, the Moslem territory.

He wants an increase in the highway patrol, the use of radar to stop speeding, the use of unmarked patrol cars, chemical tests for those accused of drunk driving and the mandatory use of seat belts.

In addition the governor appealed to judges to be more strict in imposing penalties against flagrant law violators.

The alarming increase in traffic fatalities is prima facie evidence that not enough of an effective nature is being done to reduce the toll of deaths and injuries.

Obviously the use of slogans, appeals to common sense and wrist slapping penalties for dan-

gery that Hindu India occupies by force.

Saville Davis, an astute observer for the Christian Science Monitor, last month characterized the Nehru defense policy as:

"The stationing of most of India's army with its best weapons on the frontier of Pakistan—while leaving the Chinese Communist frontier virtually undefended except by the interposition of patrols and some half-hearted deploying of pathetically under-equipped forces."

Summing up the reasons for Indian defeats of last year, Davis noted the refusal of Nehru "to make concessions to Pakistan in Kashmir to free the Indian troops so they could face the Chinese."

There is little doubt, incidentally, that India has been in the wrong in the Kashmir dispute. For 15 years, Nehru has refused to implement a promise to allow free elections in Kashmir because its Moslem voters would undoubtedly choose to align themselves with Pakistan, not India.

Again last year, Pakistan tried to negotiate a settlement with India. The Pakistani ambassador to the United Nations asked that anyone, even an Afro-Asian "neutralist," be appointed to do another investigation of the Kashmir situation and make recommendations for settlement.

On June 22, India rejected an Irish resolution that reminded both parties of the promise of free elections made in 1948 and 1949. It asked both sides to enter into new negotiations and to refrain from aggressive moves against each other.

A Soviet veto defeated the resolution in the Security Council. The United States supported it.

Note: Congressman Broomfield says that 80 per cent of Nehru's army is poised on the Kashmir, not Chinese, frontier. He opposes further aid to India until a Kashmir settlement is reached. He says:

"I cannot see how, under present circumstances, the supply of massive U.S. military equipment can serve to strengthen India's defenses against the Chinese Communists. On the contrary, continued U.S. military aid to India could only serve to make Mr. Nehru more determined in his resolve not to make concessions in the Kashmir dispute, which in turn will make the dispute itself more difficult to settle."



IN WASHINGTON...

NLRB Overreaches Powers

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

A recent decision by a National Labor Relations Board trial examiner holds that management was "unfair" because it was too persuasive in presenting its case to its workers. The Taft-Hartley Act guarantees to an employer rights of free speech which were denied by the Wagner Act.

This new NLRB doctrine that an employer may speak to his workers only insofar as he is not persuasive is a clear violation of the law. It is part and parcel of a new NLRB philosophy which holds that management, though abiding by every single clause of the labor statutes, may still be breaking the law as a whole — a concept which would have a rough time in the courts.

The NLRB, however, has little concern for the niceties of law or proper procedure. Its members have been known to issue statements prejudging cases before all the evidence is in or any decision has been arrived at. The NLRB, in fact, considers itself a law unto itself—and this is true whether it is ruling in favor of labor or against it.

There was a time when, in its early days, the NLRB was infiltrated by those known then (and now proven) to be Communists. They have since made the rounds of the Congressional investigating committees drearily hiding behind the Fifth Amendment but carefully refraining from denying the mountains of evidence placed in the record against them.

During this period, the NLRB ruled consistently in favor of those CIO unions then under Communist control. The AFL unions shouted long and lustily but they were ignored. In 1949, after the loyalty-security program had begun to clear Reds out of government—and after Taft-Hartley had given the CIO a mechanism for cleaning its own house of Communists and their stooges—labor and the NLRB entered into a honeymoon period.

Under the Eisenhower Administration, the NLRB was not so openly anti-management — much

to the AFL-CIO's disgust. But it has since returned to its hand-holding ways with organized labor. It now considers itself a kind of labor Supreme Court which like the original product, can legislate and execute its own laws.

The question arises, however, as to the function of the NLRB. Is it proper for an appointive and administrative body to serve as judge and jury in cases involving labor disputes, to interpret the statutes as it wishes, and to upset the Constitutional provision that (1) the accused is innocent until proven guilty and that (2) the judicial process is reserved to the courts.

Presumably, the NLRB was to have served as an umpire in labor-management disputes. Its powers have grown so that it now sits as a kind of kangaroo court to implement the decisions of trial examiners who are all too frequently tied in one form or another to the labor movement.

Labor law, until it had been muddled up by the NLRB, was relatively clear. It would seem that like all other law, the crimes it defined, when committed, should have been prosecuted by the Justice Department. If General Motors or General Electric—the two most unpopular generals on the New Frontier—violated the labor-management statutes then, on complaint of the union involved and after a grand jury indictment had been handed up, the Attorney General would have the right and duty to prosecute.

Instead, at considerable cost, the NLRB holds hearings at which labor and management present their cases to a trial examiner, then the NLRB reviews, and if either party is dissatisfied, the matter can then go to court where the whole process is repeated, though guided now by rules of evidence and Constitutional safeguards. The point, however, is that the aggrieved party — usually management — must then initiate a suit and prove its innocence of charges made by the NLRB. This adds an unconstitutional insult to financial injury.

In denouncing compulsory unionism, Franklin D. Roosevelt once said that to force a worker to join a union would be "too much like the Hitler methods toward labor." The NLRB is the mainstay of compulsory unionism, although the rising tide of opposition to the union shop which perpetuates this practice has slowed the bureaucrats down.

If the NLRB were abolished, matters of labor law would be decided by the courts. Unions that protest loudly of "unfair" labor practices every time they lose a bargaining election would think twice before they made a formal complaint to the Justice Department. And the Attorney General would hardly tie up the courts with unsubstantiated complaints. Then collective bargaining could proceed on the basis of mutual respect and not in an atmosphere in which the unions can always threaten to call in Big Brother — the NLRB.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Wednesday, April 17, the 107th day of 1963.

The moon is in its last quarter. The morning stars are Venus and Saturn.

The evening stars are Mars and Mercury.

On this day in history:

In 1519, the Diet of Worms excommunicated Martin Luther from the Holy Roman Church after the former monk refused to admit to charges of heresy.

In 1790, Benjamin Franklin died at the age of 84.

In 1962, Capt. Joseph Kaufman of the U.S. Air Force was found guilty by a court martial of having passed military secrets to East German Communists.

A thought for the day—Benjamin Franklin said: "Human felicity is produced not so much by great pieces of good fortune that seldom appear, as by little advantages that occur every day."

Winged Creatures

ACROSS	DOWN
1 Singing bird	46 Masseuse's forte
3 Wingless insect	49 Wash lightly
9 Bird bill	53 Boundary
12 Harness part	54 Comb. form
13 Antarctic sea	56 River (Sp.)
14 Eggs	57 Organs
15 Neglected items	58 Guide's notes
17 Seine	59 Feminine
18 Bull finish	60 Nickname
19 Retainers	61 Florida county
21 Without (Latin)	61 Plexus
23 English coal measure	
24 Cover	1 Pronoun
25 Rows slightly	2 Chibchan
26 Pierce	3 Indian
32 Accented	4 Exude
34 Dress	4 Homes for
36 Invent	5 winged
37 Huger	6 creatures
38 European stream	5 Weekday (ab.)
39 Face	6 Glanced
41 Sweet potato	7 Theow
42 Referee (ab.)	8 Property item
44 Paradise	9 Person of nn
	10 account

Answer to Previous Puzzle

MAVERICK	WITNESS
ARENAS	VENUE
ADOLEST	INTEREST
SNOWBEN	WHEN
TRIVIAL	TRAP
TRAGICAL	DEAD
MOLLE	LEASER
MALE	REAR
ARABIAN	ESLAV
SNEAK	ESSES

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
46	47					48		49	50	51
53						54		55		
56						57		58		
59						60		61		62

NEWSPAPER ENTERPRISE ASSN.