

Editorial Page

Racing For The Moon

Would the people of the Klamath Basin be willing to put up \$10 million dollars to make certain that the United States gets to the moon first?

Or even closer-to-home, would every man woman and child in the Klamath Basin be willing to put up \$200 each to see that the United States is the first nation to get to the moon?

When we talk about a \$40 billion project to be the first to put a man or men on the moon, that's the amount we're talking about in terms of what it will cost locally.

The hue and cry is on as to whether or not the U.S. should invest a sum, estimated between \$30 and \$40 billion, for this purpose over the next five-year period.

Last week, former President Dwight Eisenhower rapped the plan to spend such a fantastic sum for this purpose as "nuts."

Scientists engaged in the project are clamoring for even more speed, and stressing the angle of national prestige as being of upmost importance.

Examining the problem coldly, we must arrive at the conclusion that there are only two basic reasons for such a project in the first place. One is the question of national prestige, namely, getting there ahead of the Russians, and the other is man's insatiable curiosity about the universe.

Of these, only the first would support a full speed ahead moon conquest plan.

Certainly, we cannot turn our back on space and its importance to the future of not only our nation but all the world. We also realize that the moon is only a jumping off point for space.

But, we are inclined to face economic facts just as squarely.

Ten million dollars would build at least two hospitals and perhaps three that would in turn provide material aid and comfort to untold thousands of the area today and tomorrow.

It would seem to us that if we are to

spend \$10 million of money belonging to people in this basin for a project, it should be for something such as this hospital.

We are as curious about the universe as the next person, but feel there are more urgent matters closer to home than an all-out assault on a "moon first" program.

Would our national prestige suffer if the Russians were the first to put a man on the moon?

Undoubtedly they would. The Russians in the past have handed us a number of setbacks in the space race principally because they aimed their space exploration at the spectacular projects.

In the interim, we were busy not just planning spectacular one and two-man orbit shots, but were carefully scouting the pathways into outer space for such things as radiation belts, weather capabilities and many other fields.

In other words, we have built a careful scientific approach to the conquest of space. This careful approach should not now be dumped aside just to make a spectacular jump to the moon.

For, if the administration gives the green light to this project and attacks it on a "crash" basis, all other types of space research will have to be curtailed and activity concentrated on this one project alone.

Space has been with us from the beginning and will be around to the end. Let's approach space in a calm, careful manner, continuing our broad, inquisitive approach over the years, pushing our projects deeper and deeper into space, but not at the cost of national bankruptcy.

If the Russians want to spend \$40 billion on being first to the moon, good! That's \$40 billion less they'll have to spend to make trouble down here, and will serve to deprive their peoples of \$40 billion less in material comforts and hasten the day when they'll cast off their communistic chains.

Is This The Only Way?

(Register - Guard, Eugene)

Contract troubles have developed in the lumber industry. Not to anyone's great surprise, however. Nor to anyone's joy.

Talk of strikes against Pacific Northwest mills, particularly the larger operations, has been in the air for months. And now the strikes have begun. And so have retaliatory lockouts.

Outsiders are in poor position to judge who's right and who's wrong — or to what degree both management and the unions are ignoring logic and practicability in this situation. Trustworthy information upon which judgments might be based has not been made public.

Whether the prevailing average wage in the industry is around \$2.10 an hour, as union spokesmen have said, or whether it is between \$3 and \$4 an hour, as management has declared, is probably a question of how

figures are figured. Whether the industry's workers should receive raises of a little more than 20 cents an hour over the next three years, or whether their pay should go up 35 cents an hour during that period cannot be fairly evaluated by guessing.

But labor is going to battle for the 35 cents, and lumber employers seem set on the lower figure.

It all seems so futile. Right now, certainly, the economy of the Pacific Northwest could use all the wages and profits that continued lumber industry operations would bring. But, because logical practices of settling labor-management differences, fairly and squarely, have not yet been devised, the prospect is that everyone—workers, mill owners and the general public — will suffer losses. It may take months, possibly many months, to offset these after peace is restored in the lumber industry.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Congo Force Expensive

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

The United Nations is already verging on bankruptcy because, among other matters, it must maintain an occupation force in the Congo. For this, the American taxpayer is shelling out millions of dollars, through his government, for UN bonds of doubtful value.

The operating cost of the UN forces in the Congo, however, is but a part of the money entailed. David F. Renwick, a former official of the UN in the Congo who resigned in disgust, lifts the lid on what is going on—and what it means in dollars and cents. He is so indignant that, in typical British fashion, he has been writing to the London newspapers about it.

During his UN tour of duty in North Katanga, Mr. Renwick was appalled by "the massive amount of black marketeering, pilfering, and outright stealing by certain UN military personnel." Both civilians and the military use Congo francs for black market activities, convert their great profits into hard currency, and send it home—thereby siphoning off much of the money that is sent into the African country. "The UN will do nothing about this owing to political pressure from New York and more especially by the governments of the troops concerned," Mr. Renwick asserts.

"Tax-free luxury items bought at UN PXs are also being black-marketed. This is costing the UN some 500,000 pounds (\$1,400,000) a month. Repair of property used by

civilian and military UN personnel will be astronomical, amounting to tens of millions" of pounds. (The pound is worth about \$2.80.)

"I have myself seen property damaged beyond repair by certain military (i.e. removal of all fittings, pipes, toilet equipment, furniture, floors, doors, and even windows)," says Mr. Renwick.

A UN soldier admitted that he had stolen 200 doors from various houses for making crates to be used for shipments of this "liberated" property by his officers. "Very many houses and buildings have been left empty shells by military personnel, and quite unfit for habitation ever again."

The removal of such equipment, furniture, and anything not permanently nailed down—as well as the theft of cars—will cost the UN, when it settles up, another 6 million pounds (\$17 million). Boatloads of this stolen property have gone to India. When Mr. Renwick tried to have one ship searched, he was prevented by higher UN authority.

Is anything being done to put an end to these practices or to punish those who indulge in them? "The UN sets up 'courts of inquiry,' but their main job seems to be a cover-up. Whitewash, Inc., has taken over fully at these hearings, and no UN official will dare to apportion blame or to take steps against the Indian troops. This might offend Prime Minister Nehru, a world leader who has yet to put his country's morality where his mouth is. The most tragic aspect of this

wholesale looting by troops sent to bring law and order is that money will be the least of the costs to the world. The UN occupying force was sent in, we are told, to keep Communism out. But how will the Congolese feel about the United Nations? Or the United States which was so determined to thrust the UN's nose in the Congo?

Premier Adoula remains in power only because the UN props up his corrupt regime. If the UN is withdrawn, then the central Congo will become a cockpit in which the blood of those who collaborated with the occupiers will flow in the streets and the jungles. The "dim, drums groaning" of Vachel Lindsay's poem will really pound. Whatever remains of the tidy framework of government put up by the Belgians will be swept away.

This is the kind of maelstrom Comrade Khrushchev and his trained Communist activists like to see. They can profit by it, no matter what happens—while the UN pays the bills. And none of it was necessary. The Congo could have, with the aid of Europeans there, made a peaceful transition to independence.

But, of course, that would have been too easy. For different reasons, the State Department and the Kremlin could not tolerate a strong, economically-sound Katanga. So the occupation was launched. The United States became the co-author of one of the dirtiest chapters in contemporary history.



A Careless Accusation

The Wall Street Journal

The President will find much sympathy with his impassioned plea to all Americans: To start solving the racial problem in their communities, homes and hearts.

It ought indeed to be possible, as Mr. Kennedy said, for American students of any color to attend any public institution without having to be backed up by troops; for anyone to be served in places of public accommodation; to register and vote in a free election without interference or fear of reprisal.

The Chief Executive also acknowledged other aspects of the

problem, such as the responsibility of the Negro community to uphold the law. He paid tribute to those citizens who have been working in their communities to make life better for all.

Yet the unavoidable impression left by his television speech as a whole is that 90 per cent of the American people are engaged in bitter and unremitting oppression of the other 10 per cent. "They are not yet freed from the bonds of injustice." And the President of the United States described the blessed land in terms of "caste system," "ghettos," and "master race."

We find it unfortunate that Mr.

Kennedy neglected to present a more careful and rounded picture. The omissions are a disservice first to the Negroes themselves. By dint of ability and work in a climate of opportunity, many have made enormous economic strides; nor are their legal and political gains insignificant. To that extent they are repeating the experience of many other minorities once subjected to discrimination.

A misleading picture is also a disservice to the image of America in the world. Much concern is understandably expressed at the impact abroad of incidents of racial violence, but what is anyone anywhere to think when the nation's highest voice speaks of the conditions of Negroes as little better than slavery?

It is a disservice, not least, to the U.S. Government. Through its judiciary, executive and legislative and its influence on public opinion, it actively promotes equality of treatment. This, we would say, is the reverse of a public policy rooted in notions of a master race.

It is a disservice, finally, to the overwhelming majority of Americans, North and South. They believe in equality before the law; they have long since accepted the Negro, economically and socially, in many places; a great many have worked to the best of their knowledge to improve his position locally and nationally.

Even in the places where Federal troops have been called upon to guarantee enforcement of Federal court orders, the action has not usually been necessitated by the community. In more than one case it has been the problem of a particular politician standing in all but solitary defiance. Neither that community, nor the nation, deserves castigation for the action of one man.

It must also be wondered what effect the President's picture will have on the existing racial tensions. "The fires of frustration and discord are burning in every city, North and South. Where legal remedies are not at hand, redress is sought in the streets." Unless, he said further, Congress enacts the legislation shortly to be proposed, the Negroes' only remedy is the street.

It is not clear how such language will encourage the Negro leaders to observe their responsibility to uphold the law. That responsibility, it seems to us, needs to be stressed, especially since so many legal remedies are available and public order and safety are increasingly endangered by choosing the street instead. And in such circumstances the responsibility of high office might well include a much stronger appeal to all groups for moderation and adherence to the law.

America, of all nations, has assimilated a host of ethnic and cultural strains. If the assimilation has not always been complete, smooth and instantaneous, it has nonetheless evolved into a society of high tolerance and mutual respect. The process includes the Negro; the process can and will be speeded and improved, especially if, as the President suggests, people will continue to work out their problems in their own communities.

But the conditions are not so grievous that the whole nation must be worked into a frenzy which can aggravate the tensions. And in order to improve the conditions of an aspiring minority, it should not be necessary to malign the good motives and continuing efforts of the majority.



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Don't Take Lightly Right Wing Force

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent

Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Anyone believing that the reactionary right-wing element in America is a minority not worth bothering about may have to revise his thinking in the light of recent developments such as:

—Defeat of the Kennedy administration's wheat control plan in a national referendum of farmers.

—Continued southern resistance to civil rights.

—Unexpected state legislature endorsement of three states rights amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

—Early organization of conservative political action groups to influence the 1964 congressional elections.

The new Business-Industry Political Action Committee (BIPAC)—launched with a \$100,000 contribution from National Association of Manufacturers—is expected to draw support from American Medical Assn. and similar organizations. The group intends to offset efforts of AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education—COPE.

This will lend added strength to the four-year drive by Americans for Constitutional Action to elect more conservative members of Congress.

ACA has just given public awards to 154 congressmen whose voting records show consistent support for conservative causes. Twenty freshman congressmen who have not yet compiled extensive voting records, but are on the "right" track, also were given awards.

If this is an accurate measure of conservative strength in Congress, it is still decidedly a minority. It consists of 20 per cent or 20 senators — 12 Republican and 8 Democratic—out of 100 senators. It has 35 per cent or 154 representatives — 130 Republican and 24 Democratic—out of 435.

Right-wing strength cannot be measured in Washington, however. It is found in roughly 1,000 organizations of all kinds and sizes with an unknown total membership scattered throughout the country.

So far, it has been impossible to unite them all on any one cause or program, and that is their greatest weakness.

Up to now, the prevailing analysis of right-wing movements is that the country has always had them and always will. They are considered a necessary part of the democratic process to balance the far left.

This was the viewpoint of Mich-

igan Gov. George Romney—the silver-haired boy of many conservative businessmen—on his last appearance in Washington. "The Know-Nothing Party of Abraham Lincoln's time was stronger than the John Birch Society of today," Romney commented. "I think both (the radical right and left) are deplorable," the governor declared.

On another manifestation of right-wing sentiment in America today, the governor was even more emphatic. This was in reference to the three constitutional amendments put forward by the Council of State Governments' Volunteer Committee on Dual Sovereignty.

"They would give the states more power to amend the Constitution without participation by Congress, to nullify the Supreme Court decision on state legislative reapportionment, and to set up a super court of one judge from each of the 50 states to pass on U.S. Supreme Court decisions."

"This smacks of the states passing the Supreme Court instead of the executive passing it," said Romney, "and one is as bad as the other."

This was one of three authoritative denunciations of the proposed amendments on the same day in Washington.

The American Bar Association Board of Governors adopted resolutions opposing the two amendments affecting the Supreme Court. ABA then referred to its full House of Delegates meeting in August the proposed reapportionment limitation.

Finally, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren, speaking before the American Law Institute, called for "a great national debate" on these states rights amendments to prevent their slipping through to adoption without challenge.

When these amendments were first proposed they were generally dismissed as so unconstitutional in themselves that they could never gain acceptance.

But in less than six months, 20 state legislatures have acted favorably on one or more of the proposals. Additionally, six states have acted favorably on the so-called "Liberty Amendment" which would abolish personal income taxes and force the government to turn over to private enterprise some 700 of its service operations.

All such proposals are considered well worth as much scrutiny as the reform programs advocated by the far left.

WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Communists Aiming At Panama Canal



By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Four times since January, 1959, a dark-haired young woman named Thelma King has left Panama for the Promised Land, Castro Cuba.

There she has broadcast inflammatory messages over Radio Havana and huddled with prominent Cuban Reds, including Fidel Castro and Che Guevara. "They have mapped strategy for one of Castro's most ambitious projects, a campaign to nationalize the Panama Canal."

Ever since the Hay-Bunaul-Varilla Treaty of 1903, the United States has possessed "perpetual" sovereignty over the Canal zone. Uncle Sam dug the ditch and paid for it. He gives the Panamanians almost \$2 million a year and three in \$24 million worth of real estate in 1955.

Nevertheless, the Communist-inspired drive to nationalize the Canal grows in intensity. A major reason, says Congressman Dan Flood, is the policy of appeasement laid down by occupants of the State Department's fourth floor.

The blame does not rest entirely with the Kennedy Administration. During the last years of the Eisenhower regime a major change in U.S. policy toward Panama was foreshadowed. To forestall any retreat, the House of Representatives, on Feb. 2, 1960, adopted a resolution, by vote of 309-12, urging the State Department not to fly the Panamanian flag anywhere in the zone.

Ignoring the vote, the State Department waited until Sept. 17, 1960, when Congress adjourned. An executive order was then issued, and proclaimed in Panama by Joseph Farland, our ambassador there. It ordered, for the first time in history, the Panamanian flag to be flown along side the Stars and Stripes throughout the Zone.

This exhibition of American weakness, in the face of outrageous Communist demands, has led to a sharp decline in American



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

What impressed me most about the Edward Albee play, "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" — apart from the stunning performance of the brilliant New York company—was the playwright's choice of characters and setting.

It is a devastating and shattering play, and it can be effectively criticized on a quite high level (as, for instance, in a recent issue of "Commentary" magazine); but, apart from its inborn defects, I thought that Albee showed courage and imagination making his characters intelligent and educated, and placing them in the groves of academe.

It is simply too easy for a playwright to attack and lampoon all the familiar stereotypes of bourgeois life in America today — to mock the advertising man or the business man or the world of clubs, of fashion, of small town insularity, of big city opportunism.

Instead, Albee aimed his shafts at those who profess higher things: the faculty people, articulate, oriented, and presumably civilized. His play is not "anti-intellectual;" he does not deride these people's intellectual superiority. He merely demonstrates that they are, as much as anybody else, the victims of their own unconscious conflicts.

These people have more sensitivity, more knowledge, more

STRICTLY PERSONAL

freedom from the pressures of competitive life, at least in the grosser ways. Yet none of this helps: faced with a bad marriage, with professional frustrations, they turn on each other ferociously and behave (because of their very articulateness) worse than the Philistines they look down upon.

What Albee forces us to recognize is that psychic disturbance and emotional malaise are not a matter of class, of culture, even of mental stature. Immaturity cuts across all lines; it is as prevalent in the seminar as in the saloon, as self-defeating in the faculty lounge as in the factory lunchroom or the hunting lodge.

Some ways of life, some occupations, it is true, may tend to bring on these disturbances more quickly or more dramatically; while others may mask them for a longer time. But, inevitably, the price of not growing up is the same everywhere — bitterness, blind rage and subjection by the illusions that do not comfort.

"Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" may be marred by some serious flaws in the playwright's own view of life; yet, for denying himself the luxury of aiming at easy targets, and for probing beneath the flesh of the very people who most admire him, Albee makes a point that is missed by most of the satirists and anatomists of the social scene.

BERRY'S WORLD



"... And had I known Profumo was LIBERAL ..."