

Herald and News

Editorial Page

County Education Would Benefit

While advocates of both sides of the present county school consolidation proposal have been decrying the attitude that money is the most important element in the consideration. It is nevertheless apparent that major emphasis is being put by both sides on the economic factor.

It is unfortunate that this is so, but it is a fact. As a result, there is a great deal more of confusion than would exist if leaders and speakers devoted more effort to the other issues involved. Inasmuch as both sides are using different sources of figures to present their argument, we are hopeful that voters will completely disregard the claims made by both sides, get their own figures, or forget about the economics of the situation altogether. It is acknowledged here that the last-mentioned course of action is pretty hard to swallow.

The important thing to remember is that if consolidation has merit, otherwise, to justify a favorable vote Monday, there is not enough difference in cost regardless of which set of figures one uses.

One real important factor for voters to keep in mind is that voters, the various school board associations, the various citizens committees, and knowledgeable individuals have studied and advanced several proposals for solution to the school problem in this county. All plans have been rejected by the voters, or the school boards, or the citizen groups. It would not be reasonable to stamp the Monday ballot proposal as a "last chance" but we are coming dangerously close to exhausting the alternatives in our situation.

Opponents of the single county unit have made much of the cost factor (probably with good reason) and statements to the effect that consolidation would arouse bitterness, enmity and open warfare between the city people and their rural neighbors.

One cannot make light of either charge, but we are inclined to discount both.

None of us like to see our taxes go up, but they do, anyway, despite our individual efforts to keep them down. We are certain that no self-respecting citizen of Klamath County is going to allow education to suffer for lack of a few tax dollars. For the most part, that is what we are talking about here—only a few dollars a year more for consolidation, if it is effected. The cost would be so small, it appears, that it pretty well dilutes the argument against consolidation on the basis of economics.

As to the charge that a consolidated situa-

tion will lead to bickering and cleavages within the county: We have seen enough of these situations to realize that for some individuals, this will be true. But, we have enough faith and confidence in the people of Klamath County that we deeply appreciate the extent of their maturity and common sense that would not let such a terrible situation develop on a widespread basis.

There appear to be sufficient safeguards in the selection of school board members and administrative people to assure orderly, broad-based representation on the consolidated school boards. That will preclude any group or faction of the county's population exercising too much control over the destinies of a particular school unit within the county complex.

We have a great deal of respect for the argument that consolidation tends to dilute the opportunity for close "local" control. But, it is our belief that the benefits of consolidation, particularly as related to educational opportunity, transcend the "local control" consideration.

It is not entirely clear, at this time, just what is the effect of a recent act by the Oregon Legislature that revokes Klamath County's exclusion from reorganization laws of the state. Even the schoolmen cannot get together on interpretation of what the new law means or requires. It is not conceivable that the average citizen will be able to ascertain the significance of the legislature's action. However, it seems reasonably clear that the new law cannot change the situation in Klamath County physically. The same arguments prevail against the various plans that have been advocated in the past, and it is not feasible to think that the law will change any of those objections.

We have tried to be objective in this issue. We have recognized the validity of viewpoints of those who share a difference of opinion on the consolidation proposal. Letters to the editor and news stories we have carried have tried to present as clearly as possible the explanations and statements of those who should be knowledgeable in the subject. It is not necessary that we repeat these various pro and con arguments in a long editorial here. We have made an honest attempt to study the situation from the wide range of material available.

Based on the information available to us, we are of the opinion that voters Monday should react favorably to the consolidation proposal, and vote "yes."



Letters To The Editor

History

The need for reorganization of Klamath County school districts is not new. The problems that demonstrate this need have not solved themselves even though they have been considered in the past. It would be interesting to look at some of the past efforts at reorganization.

Without question the outstanding reorganization work in this county was the county unit plan creating the present Klamath County school district. This included all the area of Klamath County except that of District No. 1. Soon the Klamath Union High School district was superimposed over District No. 1 and the portion of the county district adjacent thereto for high school purposes. This is the present organization and well demonstrates, as most educators agree, the ineffectiveness of union high districts.

Early in 1953 the boards of the above three districts jointly requested a study and survey be made by representatives of the state department of education. The survey was to study building needs, population trends, and the degree of efficiency that could be attained under the present system. This survey pointed out the unique organization of the districts found in no other county in Oregon. To quote from the report, "Every-one familiar with the district organization in Klamath County is aware of the fact that under the present system there are very definite handicaps because of the three different types of school districts and their overlapping responsibilities. To meet fully the needs of the schools of the county within the next ten years or less, at a reasonable cost and to provide for the maximum efficiency, a certain amount of district reorganization seems inevitable. Any system in which the elementary schools are under the jurisdiction of one board and the high schools under the jurisdiction of a separate board is not only inefficient as far as cost is concerned but makes it very difficult to provide the necessary coordination and sequence in curriculum development and instructional efficiency throughout the system. Experience has shown that the most efficient school system is possible when all of the schools, both elementary and secondary within a geographic unit come under the administration of one board and a superintendent chosen by that board. This condition does not exist in Klamath County. This could be attained by district No. 1 joining the county school district. If this were done the union high school district would be dissolved automatically and all of the schools of the county both in the city and rural areas would come under a single board which would provide for unified administration."

In 1957 the School District Reorganization act was passed by the state legislature with its major objective the "Unified District." A county reorganization committee was established for the purpose of proposing a plan of reorganization to the voters for their approval. The plans studied by the committee were:

1. A single district for the county.
2. Two districts consisting of the present school District No. 1 and the present county unit elementary district.
3. Two districts consisting of the approximate K.U.H.S. district and the county unit high school district.
4. Three districts consisting of S. D. No. 1, a suburban district, and the county unit high school district.

Two districts with boundaries to be determined, that would divide the south suburban area between the two districts on the present pupil tax responsibility.

Plan No. 4 above was soon eliminated since it would create a very poor district as far as the assessed valuation per pupil was concerned. No. 5 can be recognized as the presently proposed "gerrymander" plan. This plan was found undesirable since it arbitrarily divided a social unit, was only a stopgap measure with no long range benefits, and offered little permanent tax equalization. Plan No. 1 was criticized for its difficulty of administration. It seemed to offer the best possibility for improvement of education and the most efficient use of building and facilities. In total disregard of the acute need for reorganization this committee had not agreed on any plan by 1961 when it was dissolved by legislative exemption of Klamath County from the act.

In the fall of 1962 a citizens committee again found that reorganization should be accomplished prior to a major building plan. The school board association, consisting of the three boards, tried hard to find an acceptable plan. The single district again appears as the most desirable educationally, and the most efficient cost wise.

As a result the boards of District No. 1 and the county district were petitioned and will hold an election June 10 to organize all the schools in Klamath County into a single county unit district. The voters will have an opportunity to express their desires on this date. Be sure to study all issues concerned and then express your wish on the ballot.

Ray Garrison,
2650 Hope St.

Equitable

One sometimes hears it said that it is not fair to expect people who live at Henley, or Merrill, or Bonanza to help pay for the education of children who live in the city.

It is very hard to say where fairness starts or stops in the area of taxation. It seems to me to be most unfair that the school district of Gilchrist, a very rich area, would have to be taxed to help educate the elementary children of the sprawling suburban area; a much poorer district in proportion to the number of children per tax dollar. However, this has been going on for years without protest.

Certainly it has been commonly recognized by all that where a substantial portion of the educational tax burden falls on the people within a certain area, then that district must be large enough to provide for enough of an equalization factor to furnish the opportunity for an equality of education for children within the area.

There are those who are very quick to say it is the duty of the city to educate the suburban children and others equally quick to say that these children belong in the county. I think this is a purely academic debate and that it is the duty and privilege of all of the wealth within Klamath County to educate all of the children within Klamath County.

A single county unit school district would provide an equitable taxing unit and a fine and efficient school district for administrative purposes.

T. A. Patterson,
2051 Lawrence.

Flexibility

The county-wide school district consolidation election on June 10 will estimate many weeks of

study by the school boards of District 1, District 2 and the county. During this time every conceivable form of reorganization was presented for study, thoroughly analyzed, and, except for the single unit district plan, eventually discarded.

It should be significant to the voters in School Districts 1 and 2 that the boards of directors of both districts have unanimously gone on record as favoring this form of reorganization. In doing so they have viewed the benefits of reorganization from the long range standpoint rather than the near term.

The heart of our present problem is centered in the Henley-KUHS area, which is, of course, the populous sector of the county and the one where these problems are likely to be continually present, in the foreseeable future. These problems are created by the population growth in the Henley-suburban Klamath Falls district. Only by removing the district boundary between these two areas and placing them under one school board with full authority for the education of all of the students through all the elementary and secondary grades can the necessary flexibility be obtained to solve these problems.

Although the immediate effect of a school district consolidation would be a slight increase in millage rates in the county versus no appreciable change in the suburbs and a small decrease in the city, if the Henley district grows faster than the metropolitan Klamath Falls area, as has been the experience in similar cases elsewhere, this situation could easily be reversed in a few years with the present urban area bearing the brunt of the tax load. As a result, those in the county who have been predicting "hard feelings" and "bitterness" if consolidation is approved and charging the city with asking the county to underwrite the cost of its education, can hardly be considered either far-sighted or realistic about the future growth of Klamath County.

Opponents of consolidation in some instances have, perhaps unknowingly, used half-truths and withheld some of the facts while proposing an alternative plan which they have represented as a painless panacea. The implication has been that reorganization can be had very quickly and simply by action of the Klamath County Board of Supervisors acting as a District Boundary Board. However, we may all rest assured that no major school district boundary change will ever be made by this body without a vote of the people.

The odds are that the school district consolidation to be voted on June 10 is the only plan of reorganization we will have a chance to vote on for a long time to come. If it is defeated our chance for a unified school system in the city and suburbs goes with it, and we must continue to make do as best we can with our outmoded, inflexible Union High School system.

So it is extremely important that every citizen express himself at the polls next Monday. The opponents of the measure can be expected to turn out in force. Consequently those who believe in improving our educational standards and organization here in Klamath County must be equally anxious to cast their ballots in favor of the proposition if it is to carry.

C. S. Houston,
Member, Board of Directors,
K.U.H.S. District No. 2.

Letters To The Editor

No Charity

This is an open letter to the people in Klamath County who care more for the education of all of our children than for area prejudices. We are for the Single County Unit System as the answer to the present and future school problems in Klamath County.

For one district to have crowded facilities while the adjoining district might have an underfilled school is a ridiculous waste of taxpayer money. If two districts adjoining each other are overcrowded, it also seems a waste of taxpayer money for them both to embark on two separate building programs, when a joint building between them, in the area that needs it, would be more economical. If, according to one of the many plans backed by opponents of unification, a greatly enlarged Henley High is to be built, why can't city and county build it together?

Many of us in City Elementary District No. 1 are not too happy about being held up as the "city slicker out to skin the farmer." Many of us do not live within or even very near the city limits. District No. 1 extends north as far as the Algoma area and west to include Lakeshore. We are proud of our schools and they aren't crowded or underfunded. We aren't asking for "charity to bail us out," as has been said so often. But K.U.H.S. is crowded. We in Elementary District No. 1 supply only one half of the students that join K.U. The County Elementary District provides the other half. We feel that if our joint populations need another school, we should build jointly to solve the problem.

Some people ask, "Is the fight for unification worth all the emotional upset and bitterness?"

Will there be less bitterness among the people of Bly, Bonanza, Chiloquin, Gilchrist, Malin, and Merrill if the county alone has to build a new Henley High of twice the size, than if it is built in partnership with City Elementary District No. 1?

Will there be less bitterness between the county and the suburbs if the people in this area are paying one tax on one side of the dividing street and another tax on the other side?

Will the bitterness over a tax raise now, to back all the children of the county, be more or less than the bitterness of a county that will have to build for and maintain 500 to 600 additional students and also build for and maintain all additional students resulting from the steadily expanding suburban area in their district?

The single county unit district is the only solution to our school problem that gives permanent equalization of taxation and that allows the best utilization of all the facilities present and future.

It is said that Klamath County is too big to administer as one district. From a population standpoint? With less than 1,000 students this is not so. School districts are often bigger. (Salem 15,000; Eugene 13,000; Portland 73,000.) Geographically speaking? At the present, the County School

District stretches from one end of the county to the other with administration offices in Klamath Falls. This would not change.

The utilities, rail lines, timberlands, and present and future manufacturing plants are here because of us all. Our farming and business and social lives are all interdependent on each other. Should not all of our children benefit from all of our combined resources?

People in the rural area have, more than once, asked what could they possibly gain from unification other than a bigger tax bill. Here are some advantages of a single county unit system: From the point of better education, a large district could afford traveling teachers and possibly science labs on wheels that could stay 2 or 3 days at each school in order that the smallest high schools could offer subjects that are not at present a possibility.

In many areas the telephone system can provide a direct phone line intertie between schools so that such subjects as languages can be offered with a traveling teacher calling at the schools 1 or 2 days a week to examine students and help out on problems. This is being done in California.

Another item of interest would be an expanded county instructional materials center containing more projectors, record libraries, book libraries, educational films, science equipment, and a number of other teaching materials that the individual school districts can now only afford on a limited basis. This center would work like a bookmobile program with the various teachers ordering their materials one week for delivery the next.

We feel that the Single County Unit is an offer of partnership for the present and the future. If this is really too unpleasant to the outlying districts we do not wish to force this partnership upon them. The vote on county unification will answer this question.

One thing that many of us in City Elementary District No. 1 feel, however, is that we cannot properly work our education system unless we have jurisdiction over our grades 1-12. We would like to be able, like the county, to get rid of the outdated union high school system and have a unified grade school-high school district so that we, too, could utilize our buildings and financing without having lines of legal jurisdiction interfering. We must in the near future get our educational house in order and satisfy state reorganization plans by having 1-12 jurisdiction over our students.

We urge both rural and suburban, and City Elementary District No. 1 residents to consider the long range picture and then vote your own conscience, but do vote. A "yes" vote means all the dollars for all the children and a grades 1 through 12 educational system. A "no" vote means that any school reorganization that will result will be without regard to equalization of any future population or financial growth. Vote June 10.

Bruce and Maxine Wirth.

STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

There are two contradictory, but equally strong, desires in the modern human being who lives in a mobile society such as ours. One is the desire to "belong"; the other is the desire to "stand out."

How successfully we can resolve the tension between these two contradictions is the measure of a society's growth and stability. And such tension can most easily be seen, for instance, in the world of fashion and style.

Edward Sapir, writing some years ago in the "Encyclopedia of Social Science," describes the "contradictory functions of fashion." Style on the part of women is always an effort to arbitrate, to strike a balance, between the desire to stand out in the crowd and the need to belong and be accepted by the group.

A woman would not customarily go out for an evening in a hat or gown that was 10 years outmoded, she wants to be in the current fashion. On the other hand, if her hat or gown is too much like some other's at the same party, she feels humiliated or cheated out of her individuality. What she is looking for, in Sapir's phrase, is "adventurous safety."

The contradiction was put in more basically psychological terms by Lin Yutang, in his witty epigram: "All women's dresses are merely variations on the eternal struggle between the admitted desire to dress and the unadmitted desire to undress."

Society, like all institutions, tends toward conformity, toward uniformity, toward group solidarity. Yet the individual, while needing the comfort of "belonging," also possesses the opposite urge to be different, to stand out, to assert his uniqueness in one way or another.

Changing fashions can be understood only as a psychological

means of giving expression to both these tendencies at once—the women all wear sack dresses or cloche hats at the same time, and yet each one endeavors to look as distinctively different as possible.

A good society seeks to preserve as much diversity as possible within the unity of the group. And although the United States prides itself on being the land of "individualism," we too often limit this to our economic life alone, and discourage individual expression in ideas, in ways of living, in the eccentricities and idiosyncracies that give a people color and vitality and charm.

A country without a "beat movement" of some sort, without its rebels, its innovators, its iconoclasts, would be spiritually and intellectually perished. And economic individualism could not long thrive in such a climate of social conformity.

Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Friday, June 7, the 158th day of 1963 with 207 to follow.

The moon is full. The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history:

In 1864, delegates meeting in Baltimore for the Republican convention nominated Abraham Lincoln and Andrew Johnson to head their ticket in the November elections.

In 1909, Mary Pickford made her motion picture debut with the release of "The Violin Maker of Gernona."

In 1948, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower took up his duties as president of Columbia University in New York.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

ARA Development Absurd

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

A Nebraska Republican charges that the Area Redevelopment Agency has so much money it doesn't know what to do.

As a consequence, the ARA has proposed grants that are economically indefensible, according to Rep. Halph Beermann. The \$450,000,000 from Congress this year, is considering a loan of \$1.6 million to build a soy bean processing plant in Dorchester County, Maryland. This is despite the fact that present facilities are operating at only 80 percent of capacity. Experts from private industry and the Department of Agriculture call the project absurd.

In New York, the ARA has tentatively agreed to underwrite 65 percent of a \$20 million sugar beet project. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman has promised Cayuga County a 50,000-ton sugar beet quota if the loan goes through.

Nebraska farmers have idle acres on which beets can be grown without federal aid. So do farmers in other states. "Actually," Beermann says, "farmers can grow all the beets they want. It is processing plants we need." And private capital won't furnish those until it is assured that the annual U.S. sugar quota—set by the administration—won't be drastically cut.

Republicans, after a thorough research job on ARA, discovered that 24 per cent of the loans approved between July 1, 1962 and March 25, 1963 went to finance motels and hotels. They claim that was not the intent of Congress.

One "distressed area" listed is Mineral County, Nevada, where the median family income is \$5,946 a year. The county's population rose 13.6 per cent between 1950 and 1960, while population in the county seat rose 51 per cent.

Republicans cite a Feb. 1 loan to the Ponchartrain Hotel in De-

troit for \$1,094,323 to help finance a 432-unit motor hotel and provide 450 new jobs. Detroit's hotel occupancy rate last year was only 34 per cent, however.

A sizable grant was made to Duluth, Minn., "to supplement convention, entertainment, recreation and cultural facilities." The cost for the 22 permanent jobs created figures out to \$277,272 per job.

Sen. Ted Kennedy, who promised voters he could do more for Massachusetts, has seen his juiciest plum snatched away.

Soon after Kennedy came to Washington as a freshman legislator five months ago, the Commissioner of Internal Re-

venue, Mortimer Caplin, announced that he was shutting down his Northeast Regional Office, located in New York. All its functions, he said, would be transferred to Boston.

Congressional reaction was violent. Republicans and Democrats alike charged the switch was politically motivated. They presented government statistics to prove that the move could not be justified for any reason but politics.

Congress called Caplin's boss, Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon to explain the move. Apparently, Dillon couldn't come up with enough reasons, for the announcement was quietly made that IRS would stay in New York.

Letters To The Editor

Burden

I am a resident of the city of Chiloquin and a taxpayer in the county school system.

I can't see where a single school district is going to be of any advantage to the people of the county.

I went to KU 23 years ago and granted they need a new school. But it seems to me that when our county school board proposed several ideas to the KU School Board and to Elementary Board No. 1 and they were all turned down that we should not have to help build a school for Klamath Falls.

I am the mother of four children, three of which have already graduated from Chiloquin High and I might add received fine educations.

We will not receive a better curriculum under a one unit district so don't see why we should

have to dig any deeper in our pockets.

As I have heard several times all we want is your money. I say let the people of Klamath Falls vote a tax or two to build their schools as the people in the county do.

We don't have a swimming pool for our school, our athletic program is self-supporting (or we don't have sports) and our children don't get any help for our lands.

Also we don't squander money for Greyhound buses, (our bus drivers work at other jobs also), but they still haul our boys to the games.

In closing I also want to ask people to think before they mark their ballot but I hope they see where they will be putting an extra burden on the rural people if they vote yes on Monday, June 10.

Mrs. Roger W. Wright,
Chiloquin.