

Herald and News

# Editorial Page

## Political Party Responsibility

The fabled congressional coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans, which has existed in varying strength since 1939, is not what it used to be.

When President Kennedy took office in 1961, he could usually expect something like 60 southern Democratic votes in opposition to major domestic proposals.

For a variety of reasons, that total slowly has been reduced to a point where it now ranges from 30 to 35 on critical administration measures.

Administration liaison officials have been effective in many instances. And some southern lawmakers have changed their view as to what their constituents want.

Curiously, however, as this shift has occurred, the Democratic administration has not gained proportionately more comfortable margins for its principal programs. For, as Democratic vote totals have risen, Republican support for administration proposals has declined sharply.

There was a time 20 or 30 or more GOP House votes were fairly certain for any major Democratic bill. Steadily that figure has sagged, until in some recent cases less than 10 fence jumpers have been counted. Once or twice it has been just one.

Republican leaders in Congress point

proudly to this performance as evidence of increasing party unity. Democrats are likewise pleased at the diminishing opposition from within their own ranks.

The situation that exists today is much closer than for many years to that which some political scholars consider a proper show of "party responsibility."

Some scholars argue persuasively that a party label cannot mean much unless the overwhelming majority of its office-holding members stand together in support of agreed programs clearly different from those of a rival party.

This seems to make eminently good sense, if not carried too far. Obviously there can be important measures, beyond the defense field, on which both parties ought to see nearly eye to eye. Neither party should oppose just for the sake of opposing.

Some politicians think unity of party must be rigid and total. Yet this notion leaves the national interest out of the picture. It is interesting to note, too, that quite a few political scientists believe the test of party unity is successfully met if office-holders stand together on many—but not all—major issues.

The key here is sound leadership judgment as to what it is important to be unified about. We cannot exalt such unity above the national good.

## Warning On Pesticides

(The New York Times)

Confirming the long-held views of many individual scientists and conservation organizations, the President's Science Advisory Committee has issued an important and disturbing report on the widespread, sometimes indiscriminate employment of chemical pesticides in this country.

The report leaves no doubt that some of these chemicals, even when properly used, have killed large numbers of birds, fish and other useful living organisms, thus upsetting the ecological balance. Furthermore, the committee makes it clear that there is a great deal that we still do not know about the long-range effects upon human beings of continued ingestion of even small quantities of these chemicals, which can enter the human body through the food we eat, through inhalation, and through skin absorption. The dire effects of ingesting large amounts of the chemicals has never been in doubt.

The report is a vindication of those who for many years have warned against the dangers arising from the unchecked proliferation

of synthetic chemicals. Of course these products of modern chemistry have brought substantial benefits in the form of higher crop yields and the elimination of some important disease carriers. But what has never been adequately understood by the public is the possible cost and probable hazards.

A serious re-examination is required of such measures as heavy applications of DDT, heptachlor, and aldrin or dieldrin for controlling Dutch elm disease, infestation by fire ants, plagues of Japanese beetles, and so forth. The federal as well as many state and local governments are now engaged, at public expense, in the use of chemical pesticides that may in many cases be doing far more harm than good.

Public controls over the use of these potent substances is inadequate at present. The division of responsibility and power among existing agencies can no longer be accepted, nor can any excuse for further legislative failure to cope with the problem so well presented by the President's committee.

"I Do Believe He's Trying to Tell Us Something!"



## Letters To The Editor

### Support

Recently a group of local musicians, under the leadership of LaMar K. Jensen, put on a free concert and dance at the OTI gym. The group, who call themselves "The Starlighters," worked hard to put this show together and played hard to make it a real treat when it was put on. The concert, which consisted of big band arrangements of standard numbers and some excellent jazz, had an attendance of around 30 people, and the dance immediately after had about the same.

It seems a shame that so much work, and time, and talent, should be so completely ignored by so many people here in the Basin. Jensen and the boys put on a show that would have done credit to almost any major group playing today, and did it for 30 people. The whole affair was arranged through the local musicians union and was sponsored by OTI. There were posters in a few spots around town, news releases in your newspaper and on televi-

sion and radio. One would think that more than 30 persons would have been exposed to it, and would have responded. Apparently they either did not hear of it or chose to ignore it.

In a time of over-commercialization of almost everything, a group willing to furnish free top quality entertainment seems quite refreshing, if not astounding. Especially in a town that seems to be desperately in need of more togetherness, I would think that any community undertaking that has any undertones of culture would be more than welcome, and eagerly accepted. It seems that this is not the case, as the aforementioned affair was not only unattended but seemed singularly unappreciated.

Personally, I wouldn't blame the group if they forgot the whole thing and planned no further affairs of this kind, however I sincerely hope that there will be more concerts, and more dances, and soon. I do believe that there must be many people in the area that will support, and attend such

affairs, and I know that once they do they will enjoy them as much as I have.

Now I would like to publicly thank LaMar Jensen, and all of the boys in the band, for a fine effort and an enjoyable evening. May we have many more, with the support of the community.

Tom Mann

### Question

Reference your editorial Friday, May 1, 1963 on labor unions:

I do not personally belong to unions of any sort at present due to working for myself. However, if it were not for strong union representation in Los Angeles, or as far as that goes, all of California, the state would probably be as backward in social and working conditions as the state of Oregon is.

I sell lumber in California and I see the fine homes these workers are able to own and I realize that if it were not for those "union monopolists" they would be living on welfare, a good percentage of them.

Also your editorial on state's rights: Do you really believe one state should set itself against the nation's best interest? You give that impression.

Richard L. Nyberg, 141 Oak Gr. Rd., Medford, Ore.

### Appreciation

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the excellent coverage and cooperation the newspaper has given the music department this past school year in publicizing our many concerts and other activities. Much of the success of our concerts can be credited to good publicity, and certainly the newspaper has been especially helpful this year.

I am sure that I speak for the rest of the music faculty when I express our sincere appreciation. I especially have enjoyed working with George Alobrick, who is always so congenial and seems to take an interest in our news items.

LaMar K. Jensen, Director Instrumental Music.

## STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

A man I know was talking at lunch about a widely known columnist who specializes in humor and whimsy. "Why doesn't he ever write about serious and important things?" he asked me. "Certainly he's amusing, but there are more substantial matters in the world to write about."

I disagreed with his point of view. "Each person should do what he does best," I suggested. "And this columnist is excellent as a light entertainer. He fills a need, does no harm, and gives people pleasure. Why ask more of him?"

The man at lunch was a victim of what I call mock-seriousness. He wants everyone in the public prints to focus on the important issues, and he ignores the obvious fact that some writers are not equipped to comment on matters beyond their immediate perceptions.

The columnist in question is modestly aware of his limitations. He has a keen eye for foibles, a deft way with language, and a puckish sense of humor. If he tried to do more, he would end up doing considerably less; like Sir Arthur Sullivan forsaking the blithe Savoyard operetta for ponderous "serious" music that is mostly undistasteful to today.

I would make precisely the opposite criticism: that there are too many commentators who are floundering beyond their depths, who lack the background, the intellectual stature, and the analytical powers to convey more than a superficial (and thus distorted) picture of what is happening and what it means.

There are many who deplore the fact that so witty and satirical a sports writer as Westbrook Pegler, for instance, decided to cover the larger arena of world events, for which nothing in his background had prepared him. Overwhelmed by the complexity of his subject, his humor turned corrosive and his perspective became warped.

Many people, it is true, do not live up to their potential, but just as many, it seems to me, are trying to live beyond theirs. The air is filled with voices pontificating on everything from birth control to bomb-testing, and the voice of the reformed disk-jockey is often louder than that of the man who has devoted a lifetime to studying such matters. Too much is said about everything, and not enough of it has any meaning.

The puckish columnist is to be commended for working within his severe, but admirable, limitations, and refusing to become an oracle. What he does is small, but craftsmanlike, and it is a real pleasure among so many pundits whose volume is equalled only by their vacuity.

## BERRY'S WORLD



"After we read 'Silent Spring,' we decided to live and let live."



## EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . . 100 Nations Launch Assault On Hunger

By PETER EDSON  
Washington Correspondent  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.  
WASHINGTON (NEA) — This World Food Congress which brings 1,200 delegates from 100 countries to Washington June 4-8 for an attack on the problems of hidden hunger may be one of the most important international conferences ever held. It could have far-reaching influence on human welfare and happiness.

It really will be the 20th anniversary conference of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO was organized at Hot Springs, Va., in 1943 to plan for postwar agricultural rehabilitation. FAO really predates the U.N. itself, which was born two years later and held its first session in 1946.

Now headquartered in Rome, FAO inaugurated a five-year Freedom From Hunger campaign in 1960. This was to be a self-help program—not a relief or welfare give-away by have nations to have not.

The Washington congress comes at midpoint in that campaign to assess results so far and to plan for the future — the short range up to 1960 and the longer range up to 2000 A.D.

All members of the United Nations were invited to send delegates to this congress. That leaves out Red China, of course, which probably has the world's worst food shortage. The United States is the host government but the unofficial role is carried by a private citizens' organization, the U.S. Freedom From Hunger Foundation, as a people-to-people program. Ex-President Harry Truman is honorary chairman of the foundation, James S. Patton of Farmers Union its president, Thomas M. Ware of International Minerals and Chemicals Corp. its vice president and general chairman of the World Food Congress committee.

When it became apparent that many of the smaller, less developed countries might not be able

to send adequate delegations to Washington, Thomas C. Butler, president of the Grand Union Co., and chairman of the foundation's finance committee raised funds from private industry which paid the expenses of 80 delegates from 60 developing countries.

Many delegates brought their wives but 92 women are present as delegates in their own right — about half of them from the United States. Among the prominent foreign women on the program are Mexico's first lady, Dona Eva Samano de Lopez Mateos; Mrs. Flora Azikiwi, wife of Nigeria's prime minister, and Princess Souvanna Phouma of Laos. Mrs. Orville Freeman is chairman of the women's hospitality committee. She has rounded up a bevy of cabinet and other high officials' wives as hostesses.

An important item on the hospitality program is a planned dinner and evening in a typical American home for every delegate and his wife.

Eighteen tours have been arranged out of Washington into New England, the Carolinas, Tennessee Valley and the midwestern states where there are extensive farming operations.

Practically all the 100 countries participating have issued special postage stamps commemorating the event.

One feature of the program will be U.S. Postmaster General J. Edward Day's dedication of the American Freedom from Hunger Stamp.

Working sessions of the congress will be held in the State Department's international conference room, which is wired and equipped to handle simultaneous translations from the three official languages, English, French and Spanish.

An opening night reception for all delegates and guests in the State Department's John Quincy Adams room should be the most colorful social event in Washington since the astronauts first were honored.

## WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



## Senators Advocate Stronger Executive

By FULTON LEWIS JR.  
Senatorial colleagues are shocked at Senator Joe Clark's blistering attack upon the legislative process. There is no reason to be.

Clark, a millionaire socialist out of Philadelphia, wrote a fortnight ago that he had no hesitation "in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America, local, state and national, are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process."

He went on to call the U.S. Congress an area where vested interests ran riot, where conflict of interest rides unchecked, where demagoguery knows few bounds, where ignorance is often at a premium and wisdom at a discount, where the evil influences of arrogant and corrupt political machines ignore most successfully the public interest, where the list for patronage and favors for the most faithful do the greatest damage to the public interest.

To cure the ills, real or imaginary, Clark had one solution: Strengthen the Executive, weaken the Legislative.

The diagnosis and cure are those of a dyed-in-the-wool Fabian, and Clark, to his credit, has never tried to hide his colors.

He has gone on record abundantly as to what he conceives a "planned economy" to be, and what he wants to do with the "full force of government."

In an article for the Atlantic Monthly, the Pennsylvania solon assailed the production of color television, the manufacture and sale of soft drinks, cigarettes, whiskey and cosmetics. If a not the time come, he asked, for the government to replace the marketplace?

"They plan well in Russia," he wrote. "There someone decides where little Ivan is going to work. If, at the age of 11, he seems unresponsive, he goes back to the collective farm. If he shows promise, his education is continued at state expense through technical school and the university. Education and incentives for different occupations are adjusted to meet personnel needs by the current Five and Seven-Year Plans."

Why can't we do the same thing here, he asked, using "persuasion" instead of compulsion? He did not elaborate on what forms this persuasion would take, but it winds up sounding a great deal like the compulsion it is supposed to replace.

Clark wrote: "How can we use both the carrot and the stick to get these people trained and on their way to where they are needed? How can we get more and better teachers, scientists, priests, politicians, rabbis, ministers and social workers? To get them we shall have to settle for fewer brewers, night-club proprietors and lobbyists."

Clark, who won razor-thin reelection last fall, believes the "full force of democratic government" should be utilized to advance "social, economic and political justice on the local, state, national and international scenes."

On foreign as well as domestic matters, Clark stands far to the left of his Administration. A member of Americans for Democratic Action, which favors recognition of Red China, Clark has a suggested surrender of Quemoy and Matsu, plus "redemption of friendly trade" with Mao.

A former mayor of Philadelphia, Clark recently saw the Democratic organization turn on ADA. Its policy of appeasement, said party leaders, was not compatible with Democratic policy. The ADA platform calls for total disarmament under UN supervision; aid to Communist countries; a hands-off policy toward Castro Cuba; recognition of Red China.

Note: Joining with Clark in his attack upon Congress was J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Fulbright was blunt: "The Constitution is outdated. Government by the people is possible but highly improbable."

He, too, urged transfer of congressional functions to the Executive. Fulbright comes out, too, for managed news: "Public opinion must be educated and led. This is pre-eminently a task for Presidential leadership."

## Almanac

By United Press International  
Today is Wednesday, June 12, the 153rd day of 1963 with 202 to follow.

The moon is approaching its last quarter.

The morning stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

On this day in history:  
In 1620, John Winthrop, first governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company, entered Salem Harbor.  
In 1942, musical comedy star Lillian Russell married her fourth husband, Alexander Moore.  
In 1941, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower received the freedom of the city of London during a reception in his honor.

A thought for the day—Aristotle, the Greek philosopher, said: "To entrust to chance what is the greatest and most noble what is a very defective arrangement."



## IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Troops Destroy Katanga

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Today's text is a brief news story.

"Elisabethville, Katanga, Congo, June 4 (UPI) — A drunken mob of central Congolese army troops terrorized the copper mining town of Kolwezi last night, killing a Belgian and an African, it was reported today."

There is a nutshell in the result of the tender ministrations of U.N. Secretary-General U. Thant and the millions of dollars poured into the Congo to break Katanga President Moise Tshombe and to "liberate" his country. Half the cost of the U.N. operation in the Congo was paid by the United States. Throughout this vicious intervention in the affairs of another country, Thant has argued that it was necessary to prevent bloodshed and to restore law and order.

That the areas of the Congo controlled by the central government were then as now being terrorized by drunken troops was a known fact. That those troops receive a minimum pay of \$100 a month — far more than U.S. soldiers get — and that the government was afraid to discipline them was also known. It was also a demonstrable fact — as Sen. Thomas Dodd and others observed on the scene — that Katanga had the only stable government in the Congo. Where chaos and economic collapse prevailed in other sections, Katanga had a sound currency and a thriving economy.

Yet for reasons best known to its deep thinkers and brilliant planners, the State Department insisted on a costly and brutal occupation of the Congo to maintain the tottering government of

Premier Cyrille Adoula and to launch an invasion of Katanga. The Congo did not benefit by the forcible union with Katanga. But Katanga has been steadily brought down to the level of the other bankrupt provinces.

And what has it done to the U.N.? While its occupation troops unleashed bombers, artillery, and infantry against Katanga at the slightest provocation, the U.N. has amiably watched the excesses of the central government's army of unrestrained thugs. Murder, rapine, theft, and cannibalism have gone unpunished — even uncriticized. Meanwhile the cost of this occupation has mounted at an estimated rate of \$10 million a month. The Soviet Union — having egged the U.N. into Congo intervention when its stooge, the late Patrice Lumumba, was in power — has refused to pay its share of the costs. So have other countries. With the United Nations facing bankruptcy, the United States has been the putty. The State Department is always ready to pick up the tab — any tab.

"Never has so much been spent by so few for so little reason" may be the State Department's epitaph — if it is not our own.

And it goes on. The occupying U.N. troops are still there. They do nothing constructive to bring peace and prosperity to the country. In fact, their very presence encourages the excesses of the "army." So far, the aim has not been to bring unity to the Congo but to take punitive actions against Katanga and its president. The passion expended by the U.N. civilian and military leaders in their unreasoning ha-

tried of M. Tshombe would be a fit topic for a psychiatric study. The simple solution would be to withdraw the U.N. occupation forces. Let the Indian troops go back to their own country. Prime Minister Nehru could use them to bolster his forces along the Chinese Communist border. The U.N. bureaucrats now lord it over the Congo wouldn't have as many opportunities to push people around if they were returned to the glass menagerie on the East River — but the climate would be better and the beer more plentiful.

The Congo would finally be faced with the choice of straightening itself out or collapsing. If M. Adoula can't control his "nation" then there must be others who can. If he cannot impose his specious claims on Katanga, then that area can free itself of the inefficient Congolese tyranny and work out its own salvation. America has always believed in the doctrine of self-determination — and the vast majority in Katanga want no part of the central government.

The State Department stamped the administration into agreeing to the U.N. occupation by arguing that without it the Communists would take over. (I am always surprised at the department's sudden and whimsical concern over Communism when it wants to put over a point.) But the Communists are still around and the Adoula regime would be no more of an obstacle to them than a vacuum. The U.N. forces, moreover, would not lift a finger to stop them. If the Communists have not taken over, it's because they can't or don't want to. It's time to end the occupation.