

Herald and News

Editorial Page

A Failure And A Promise

That a new Federation of Malaysia now exists in Southeast Asia is a healthy and hopeful sign. Any kind of solid offset to Indonesia is welcome in the free world.

It is too bad that the Borneo territory of Brunei, rich in oil, chose at the final hour to stay out of the new federation. But evidently the prospect remains strong that it will soon join. A dispute over finances lies at the root of its present delay.

No one may pretend that in size, resources and people the Malaysian federation will prove a true match for mighty Indonesia. Yet it can hardly fail to act as a brake on Indonesian President Sukarno.

Indonesia and Sukarno, taken together, represent one of the great failures among the emergent peoples of the postwar era.

This sprawling island nation is one of the most naturally blessed in riches of any land on earth. Under proper guidance it should have been a thriving place, a model of what a "new" people can do, a bulwark of independence with a people wholly hostile to tyrannical communism.

In fact, it is probably one of the most mismanaged countries on the globe. Fantastic resources are inadequately developed. So bad is the situation that this lush tropical territory has had to import foodstuffs.

Sukarno has set an example as an irresponsible wastrel. And when he has not been seeking his own pleasure in other lands, he has outraged international political morality

by undertaking such adventures as the campaign for seizure of West New Guinea.

Because he unconsciously plays East against West, Sukarno gained West New Guinea. The United States and other Western powers pressed the weary Dutch to yield this once colonial land, even though it has no racial and cultural but only the thinnest administrative ties with Indonesia.

That was a victory for Sukarno's rampant immorality in Southeast Asia. It was prime evidence that even a newly emergent nation can be "colonial" in the name of anticolonialism.

For a time Sukarno appeared to buck also the new federation of Malaysian peoples. But somehow or other saner counsels managed to prevail and he stopped short of action which for all practical purpose would have aligned him with the world's worst modern aggressors.

For Malaysia is a fact. If Brunei comes in, the federation surely will not be poor. It has a golden opportunity to help stabilize fluid conditions in Southeast Asia. Not only can it serve as balance wheel, but it can offer itself as proud example of how a new country can marshal its resources and people to serve its independent destiny.

The embarrassment of comparison might even lead Indonesia one day to seek new, responsible leadership which could realize its amazing potential and set it on the same high course.

Letters To The Editor

Phoners

The phone rang and the answer to the question was said. So, I won \$100.00 one hundred dollars worth of merchandise. Can you believe it?

I'm to have a lube job and all my tires switched around and six doughnuts. One place offered to let me wash all my laundry if it didn't go over ten lbs. There is a free hamburger with french fries even. Two places said I could have a two dollar and fifty cent (\$2.50) dinner if I brought a friend who could spend two dollars and fifty cents for their dinner. We could get in free.

Then there was a gift of six doughnuts.

Four very nice coupons said we could see the show free if we went out of town to see it.

Did I mention the grab bag? Something free every time if we played just once.

Some one wanted to look at our house wiring. That's real nice of them.

Did I remember to mention all those doughnuts?

Well, it was fun. I truly received nine dollars and ninety-five cents worth of laughs. Next time perhaps I'll win one hundred dollars worth of salt.

Polly Hope.

Fallacy

An economic fallacy has gripped our nation. Unless its grip is broken we will soon be living in a bankrupt United States.

The fallacy with which we and our government are enthralled is deficit spending. Better known as the "Spend Yourself Rich Philosophy." Despite federal deficits in 27 of the last 33 years we are still not rich and we have a national debt of \$300 billion. Still our government persists in deficit spending and plans another deficit next year. You and I who elect the government must bear the blame for this. We elect men to office to do what we desire and so we must tell them that we want the government back on a sane fiscal policy.

I will now pause so our liberal friends may say, "It's not so bad, we owe it to ourselves." But we don't — ask your liberal friends how much they have loaned the federal government. The answer is, usually, nothing. And you, sir, how much have you yourself loaned the federal government? Again nothing. So you see we don't owe it to ourselves. We do owe it to banks and money lenders both here and abroad. These people expect to be repaid. Do we pay them? No, we are even forced to borrow money to pay them the interest on what we already owe.

I pause again so our liberal friends, if any are still with us,

may say, "It's really not so bad, our gross national product is \$500 billion and our debt is \$300 billion." Another fallacy, the gross national product does not belong to the non-profit federal government, it belongs to the business firms and their stockholders. The only claim the federal government has to the gross national product is the taxes on it. And despite what our liberal friends may say the federal government does not have an unlimited claim on the earnings of business or individuals. So we still have a \$300 billion debt and comparatively little income to pay it.

We all know what happens to a family, a business or an individual who lives beyond his means. The same fate awaits the nation that does so also. Even if John F. Kennedy himself should tell you it isn't so, don't you believe it.

Write your senators and representatives, tell them to get the government back on a sound financial footing or we'll elect men next time who will.

Remember, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

James K. Shafer, Rte 2, Box 2105, Medford, Ore.

Turnabout

A news item from Sacramento tells of a man who is bartering being sentenced to spend 60 days in jail and fined \$1,632. His offense was in attending a barber school while drawing this money for unemployment. Some states allow those attending schools to draw unemployment, so long as in other ways they are eligible, but most of them do not.

Are such laws in line with what we need to promote here? Are they even in line with our claim of wanting to raise the general educational levels, and to raise more people to work performing abilities of the kinds modern production is coming to demand?

Most of us know of cases where the young fellows who had worked on the same jobs some were drawing unemployment while merely lying around, dry-rotting at best, but more apt turning themselves into winos or worse, while others of them were going to school, often forced to neglect school work because of time spent on jobs at half pay to secure the wherewithal of financing themselves, unable to draw unemployment.

Would it not be more in line if it were just reversed? And made so those out of work, and for whom the employment offices could not find work, would have to attend some schools or take some training courses, to qualify for receiving unemployment.

If that were the case it would put an end to those cases where people, who had gone well down

the roads of dry-rot and of becoming winos, deliberately lay off and qualify for unemployment for that.

I hold there are fewer who do this than some would have us believe, either to receive unemployment or county or state relief benefits. But I think the situation is such that it makes the state putting a reward on people staying out of school and training classes, as most of them now do, in connection with unemployment benefits, as stupidly ridiculous.

O. O. Womack

Protection

On the night of June 8, my husband and I and our three children stopped for an overnight at a motel on Second and Main Street in your city, Klamath Falls appeared to be a fine place for travelers to spend the night. It could have been except for a group of noisy, beer drinking, foul-talking young men who hid away their beer supply in the men's room of the Standard Oil Station next to the motel. Perhaps up to a dozen cars, mostly "souped-up" recent models, including one Cadillac, hot-rodded in and out of this station from about 10 p.m. to 2 a.m. As the night wore on and the beer supply diminished, these rough-necks became more boisterous, more foul-mouthed and more pedantic.

Our accommodations were directly above the parking area of this Standard station so we and our children were spared nothing in the way of noise or profanity. I wondered where your local police force kept itself. I learned next day that this is a common occurrence — that while the kids are whooping it up on the main street, the police are out on the highway chasing tourist offenders who might be exceeding the speed limit by five miles an hour.

Next morning at breakfast I watched two police cars patrolling an empty Sunday morning street. Why weren't they there Saturday night preserving the peace of Klamath Falls' main thoroughfare? I also learned that complaints to Standard Oil have not been heeded. I have put a letter in the mail to the president of that company today.

I know there are many respectable families in Klamath Falls who resent such black marks on their city's reputation. Better these people insist that their police enforce their laws before Klamath Falls becomes a by-passed city.

I have sent a copy of this letter to the Klamath Falls Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. S. F. Christofferson, 5703 Princeton Ave. N.E., Seattle 5, Wash.

Man's Reach Should Exceed His Grasp---



U.S. Encourages Impatient Act

By ARTHUR KROCK
(In The New York Times)

WASHINGTON, July 11—Newly independent governments which are members of the United Nations got sound advice at Geneva from Adlai E. Stevenson yesterday. Speaking to the Economic and Social Council of the U.N., he warned these governments that their "acts of impatience" toward the South African Republic and Portugal would undermine the U.N. if they were imposed in the form of policy decisions.

But the Government of the United States, of which Stevenson is the U.N. spokesman, has great responsibility for stimulating these "acts of impatience" to the point where newly independent countries in Africa and Asia are moving pre-emptively to expel South Africa and Portugal (but not, of course, the U.S.S.R.) from the organization. The responsibility was first incurred when, in seeking to demonstrate a sweeping policy of "anti-colonialism," the Kennedy Administration instructed its U.N. Representative to vote for one of the most irresponsible and biased resolutions ever offered in that body.

This resolution, addressed to the native revolt against Portugal's colonial regime in Angola, endorsed the principle of "immediate" self government for all the African peoples, regardless of their capability for it. And, though calling on Portugal to "show due respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms," the resolution made no mention of the Angola terrorists who were violating these by widespread rape, pillage and murder among the white colonials. Nevertheless, the United States Representative voted for this slanted text.

On other U.N. occasions, sometimes after "registering a protest," the vote of the United States was cast for proposals by the newly independent nations that were travesties of the principle of U.N. neutrality in keeping the peace of the world to which all members are committed by the Charter. One of these proposals initiated the use of force to put down the secession in Katanga but excluded from its scope a concurrent secession in another province by the followers of Lumumba. Stevenson protested that the pro-Lumumba secession could develop into a greater threat to world peace, but

on instructions from Washington he voted for the resolution.

By "going along" with such procedures, and sometimes vying with the new nations in shows of "anti-colonialism," the Kennedy Administration not only generally encouraged their "acts of impatience," but became less and less influential in restraining their excesses. One day, for example, after the U.S.S.R. had vetoed a Western motion for a ceasefire in Goa that India had seized in violation of the Charter, Stevenson, noting he had been present at the birth of the U.N., exclaimed that "tonight we are witnessing the first act of a drama that could end with its death."

The U.N.'s "peace-keeping" in the former Belgian Congo which developed into three separate military expeditions to Katanga and a full-scale war against Tshombe, was equipped, financed and transported by the Government of the United States on the very disputable ground that this was necessary to avert a "confrontation" with the U.S.S.R. In addition to that support, without which the U.N. war could neither have been conducted nor won, the Administration lent the pressure of its envoy to compel Tshombe to

sign an agreement with the central Government, which had him under arrest at the time.

To stave off the insolvency of the U.N., largely created by this "peace-keeping" operation, this Government has purchased most of the \$140 million in U.N. bonds that have small chance of redemption. Moreover, the State Department competed with the U.N. Secretariat in a successful vendetta against Tshombe, who—though he has thoroughly proved he lacks the stuff of the hero-patriot-martyr he professed to be—was the only strong pro-Western leader in the Congo, and governed the only area with law-and-order and a viable economy.

The culmination of this transgression of the U.N. Charter, abetted by the United States, is that the organization will leave the fate of the country to a central Government of dubious official standards and international affiliations when the U.N. troops are pulled out of the Congo at the end of this year.

What else than these "acts of impatience" of the newly independent countries could have been expected by the Government which contributed so greatly to their incitement?



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Purely Personal Prejudices: People who frequently feel they are being "insulted" are highly insultable — they unconsciously provoke situations in which they can feel rebuffed and rejected, in order to justify their deep sense of grievance against the human race.

Nothing in the world is as useless as a moral generalization that everybody believes; its very unanimity allows us to give it complete verbal assent without bothering to put it into practice.

The happiest marriages are those between a husband who knows how to listen and a wife who knows when not to talk.

STRICTLY PERSONAL

A fine semantic definition was made by Proust when he observed that "Everybody calls 'clear' those ideas which have the same degree of confusion as his own."

Those discontented souls who are perpetually searching for someone to "understand" them would be most discomfited if truly understood; what they are really looking for is someone to misunderstand them in a way they find acceptable to the ego.

Animals react to our tone of voice, not to our words; and so do children, who rightly pay more attention to the way we say things than to what we say.

Speaking of animals, I have long relished the anti-sentimental remark by Karl Kraus, after hearing about the "loyalty" of dogs. "To be sure, the dog is loyal. But why, on that account, should we take him as an example? He is loyal to men, not to other dogs."

It is a singular fact that obscene literature arises only in highly civilized societies, and would be incomprehensible to primitive societies; rather than a vice, obscenity is a disease of cultural old age.

A philosopher in love is just as ridiculous as anybody else—and even more so when he tries to philosophize about it.

A servant may work in a house a month without knowing where the spoons are, but not for a week without knowing where the skeletons are.

It is a dangerous half-truth to believe that "history repeats itself": in a more profound sense, history never repeats itself, and each age commits great follies by wrongly applying some lesson of the past to a unique event of the present, which it only loosely resembles.



NOTHING SPECIAL

(W. B. S.)

I guess I am not hankering for the good old days. But, I can remember, as a kid, when we did not even have electric lights. For recreation we played baseball and hunted flicker-tails. The family household (not necessarily ours, only) was a busy, happy place. Big kids took care of little kids, mother was kept busy in the kitchen—cooking, ironing, sewing and peeling and cooking vegetables out of the garden or the cellar, or chopping off a chicken's head and picking it. In most instances, Dad worked 12 or more hours a day to earn three bucks or so to keep the household going. For some reason, in those days (some mighty lean ones, incidentally) people were paying their bills, the divorce courts had little business, folks were not suing each other for an easy buck, and no one was having nervous breakdowns, and nobody knew what a tranquilizer or a pep pill was.

Odd, wasn't it?

Caller wanted to know the other day: How come we call for car, boat, scooter, motorcycle and bicycle licenses when we don't bother to license or impose a charge upon horses?

The question ought to bring out a few warm replies from horse lovers. Of which I am not.

Machines are being developed that will respond to spoken commands. Who ever suggested that husbands couldn't be replaced?

Normand Poulshock is looking for members for his Klamath Symphony Orchestra. Needed are string players, horn players and the works. If you feel that you're a good enough musician to play with the orchestra, call Bowden Music Company and leave your name and telephone number. Norm conducts music lessons there twice a week, and he'll get in touch with you. The orchestra will play its first concert of the

season in August, and Norm plans to start practice sessions around the first of August.

The last word in an argument is what a wife has. Anything a husband says after that is the beginning of another argument.

WHICH AM I?

I watched them tearing a building down. A gang of men in a busy town. With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell.

They swung a beam and a side-wall fell. I asked the foreman, "Are these men skilled?"

"As the man you'd hire if you had to build?"

He gave a laugh and said, "No, indeed!"

"Just common labor is all I need."

"I can easily wreck in a day or two."

"What builders have taken a year to do."

And I thought to myself as I went my way.

Which of these roles have I tried to play?

The sickening Fourth of July traffic toll—a disgrace to any civilized nation—is all the more tragic because it never need have happened, and would never have happened had enough drivers been willing to do three simple things.

They include obeying traffic rules and regulations to the letter in simple faith that they have been enacted to protect the driver. Extending to other drivers the courtesy they would like other drivers to extend to them. Substitute common sense for frenzy and patience for wrath.

And if three safety precautions are too high a price for saving human life, one safety rule alone would cut the toll in half—the Golden Rule.



THE GLOBAL VIEW...

Summit Meeting Looms 'Probable'

By LEON DENNEN

Newspaper Enterprise Analyst UNITED NATIONS, N.Y. (NEA)—W. Averell Harriman, chief U.S. delegate to the Moscow nuclear test ban talks, is also presumably negotiating for another East-West summit meeting.

In the view of United Nations diplomats, the Kennedy administration's sudden "optimism" about Premier Khrushchev's new offer of a "partial" test ban indicates that secret preparations for the summit are already under way.

Even Britain's liberal journal New Statesman, which seems to have a pipeline to some of the President's advisers, now believes that "The road to a new summit meeting begins to look a little clearer." The British Labor party's mouthpiece frequently predicts U.S. diplomatic moves even before they are leaked to the Kennedy administration's favorite newsmen.

What, then, is behind Premier Khrushchev's latest offer, and how far should he be trusted?

Undersecretary of State Harriman is, unfortunately, a professional optimist. He misunderstood the Russians' imperialist aims in East Europe when he was President Truman's negotiator in Laos in 1962. Now he apparently believes that a ban on nuclear testing is a promising area for agreement with Moscow.

Western efforts to reach such an agreement were so far frustrated by Russia's refusal to meet even President Kennedy's minimum requirements for on-site inspection, especially of underground tests. However, during his recent visit to East Germany Khrushchev proposed a ban on surface, atmosphere and underwater tests ostensibly because they are self-policing. He did not change his mind on the crucial question of on-site inspection but suggested that the whole problem should be left hanging in the air.

As seen by U.S. specialists on Russia, a test ban agreement on Khrushchev's terms — ratified with all the fanfare at a summit meeting — could only serve the interests of Russia's much-troubled premier.

It would, of course, strengthen Khrushchev's hand in his dispute with Red China. It will obligate the West to recognize the legitimacy of the Red regimes in East Europe and Cuba. It will surely open for Russia increased trade opportunities with the West and enable Khrushchev to appease the economic needs of his disgruntled

and restless satellites.

The Soviet premier hinted as much when he also suggested, as part of the nuclear test ban bargain, a "nonaggression" pact between NATO and Russia's counterpart, the Warsaw Pact nations.

Khrushchev is not likely to abandon the Marxist-Leninist doctrine or desist from fomenting civil strife and "limited" wars of national liberation, especially in Latin America. He will thus be satisfied with any Western concessions, however minor, that he hopes to gain at a new summit meeting.

But what can the Free World possibly gain except more dissension in NATO?

President Charles de Gaulle, whose ambition is to make France a nuclear power, has no interest in the type of test ban proposed by Khrushchev. Pro-NATO German partisans of retiring Chancellor Konrad Adenauer will surely consider a non-aggression agreement with the Warsaw Pact nations as an American attempt to give international recognition to Communist East Germany.

Thus, even if Khrushchev fails to get his pacts he will have succeeded in creating more doubt and dissension in NATO, already in tragic state of disarray.

Ambassador Harriman will do well to remember Khrushchev's favorite proverb that "When you take an eel by its tail or a politician by his word, precious little remains in your hand."

Almanac

By United Press International Today is Sunday, July 21, the 202nd day of 1963 with 163 to follow.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The morning stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

The evening star is Mars.

Those born today include American novelist and Nobel Prize winner Ernest Hemingway, in 1899.

On this day in history: In 1861, the first major military engagement in the Civil War was fought at Bull Run Creek, Va.

In 1923, John Scopes, a biology teacher in the Dayton, Tenn., high school, was found guilty of teaching the theory of evolution, which was contrary to state law.

In 1944, President Franklin D. Roosevelt was renominated for a fourth term and Harry S. Truman was the vice presidential candidate.