

Editorial Page

Sign Of Life

The nation's doctors have adopted a new universal medical symbol which will be of vital help to persons who need special medical handling in an emergency—an auto accident, a seizure or other mishaps. The symbol may be displayed on a wristlet, an anklet or on a medallion around the neck. If the afflicted person is unconscious or unable to communicate, the emblem alerts those who come to his aid to look for essential medical facts on a card in his wallet.

Perhaps the wearer is an epileptic or a diabetic, unable to convey his need for special

care. Possibly he is allergic to antibiotics, such as penicillin. The emblem will warn his rescuers and the card will give the medical details.

As adopted by the American Medical Association, the new symbol contains a six point "sign of life" figure. Superimposed on it is the symbol of the medical profession, a staff with a snake twined about it. In many cases, those who need special treatment may face needless suffering or even death if their problem is not known. For them, this emblem will indeed be a "sign of life."

Here Today...

(The Oregonian)

The CAB's "use it or lose it" policy toward communities served by federally-subsidized airlines, discussed by A. Robert Smith in the adjoining column, on the surface appears to be a contradiction of the theory which led to the original development of these short-haul, local service carriers. But when one considers fully the great changes which have occurred in the field of passenger and freight transportation in the past two decades, it can be seen the policy, though harsh, is soundly based.

The air transport situation was much different when the local service airlines (West Coast was the nation's first) appeared at the end of World War II. In those days the DC-3 aircraft was cheap to buy and fly, and comparable in speed and comfort to the most modern planes used by the long-haul air carriers. Highways generally were narrow, crooked and slow by today's standards. For trips of more than 100 miles, the commercial airliner was an attractive proposition for travelers of the late 40s and early 50s. The small airlines obviously were filling a public need, and the federal subsidies were regarded as a temporary, readily-justifiable measure.

But times have changed. With the coming of modern, high-speed highways, the airliner has lost much of its time advantage for short trips. Many original stops on the schedule of West Coast and other U.S. local service airlines already have been abandoned, and it appears more abandonment will follow.

It is argued that with better equipment and more convenient scheduling, the local airlines could retain or increase their patronage in communities now regarded as marginal by the CAB. That is true in many instances. But more frequent service in newer aircraft means bigger operating expenses, and the CAB wants to reduce or abandon subsidies, not increase or perpetuate them.

To make their modern, faster aircraft profitable, West Coast and its compatriots want to carry more people more miles with fewer stops. In a sense they are moving into the field formerly occupied by the long haul carriers. But these face a similar problem with their big, swift jetliners. It is not inconceivable that in the years to come Portland and Seattle will be the only Pacific Northwest cities served by major airlines, and that all other Oregon and Washington cities will be left to the local service carriers.

Does this mean smaller cities such as Burns, Baker, Ontario and Lakeview will lose air service forever? Not necessarily. We have by no means yet reached the pinnacle of aeronautical design, and the next few years may see the debut of vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) aircraft which could make commercial, subsidy-free airline service practical even for communities too small to afford municipal airports. So the civic leaders in cities losing scheduled service should not lose heart. The science of aeronautics marches on, and the progress which brought air service to them in the 40s and 50s surely will bring it back by the 70s.



HOLMES ALEXANDER ...

Reds Solicit Negroes

By HOLMES ALEXANDER
WASHINGTON, D.C. — On Jan. 16, 1958, when Director J. Edgar Hoover was asking the House Appropriations subcommittee for funds to run the FBI during the next fiscal year, he said:

"The Negro situation is also being exploited fully and continuously by Communists on a national scale. Current programs include intensified attempts to infiltrate Negro mass organizations. The party's objectives are not to aid the Negroes—but are designed to take advantage of all controversial issues on the race question so as to create unrest, dissension and confusion in the minds of the American people."

Mass demonstrations by Negroes in the North and South, to be culminated with a huge march on Washington next month, were not in the news, as they are now, when Director Hoover gave this dispassionate, succinct and informed statement of Communist intentions. Last week Southern Governors Barnett (Miss.) and Wallace (Ala.) flapped the Red flag in words much like Hoover's. But the Barnett-Wallace testimony before the Commerce Committee's civil rights hearings was too self-interested to be effective. Another red object—the Red Herring of McCarthyism—came scurrying into the Caucus Room where McCarthy once reigned. The subject of Communist complicity soon got lost amid pious horror of "smearing" the Negro race and its leaders. Somebody suggested that J. Edgar Hoover be summoned as a star witness on the subject, but Chairman Magnuson was against it.

Fortunately, it is hardly necessary to call Hoover. A little page-leaping through House Appropriations hearings shows that the FBI director has several times asked Congress for money for the very purpose of investigating Communist incitation of the Negroes.

On March 3, 1961, Hoover told the House money-raisers:

"The sit-in demonstrations in the South were a made-to-order issue which the party fully exploited to further its ends."

By now the director was giving names, places and dates. He mentioned James E. Jackson and Joseph North, "national Communist party functionaries," who came around for the demonstrations at Richmond, Va., in February, 1960. He quoted the Negro Communist, Ben Davis, "the party's national secretary," as stating in March, 1960, that Negro demonstrations are the next best thing to "proletarian revolution."

Again, on Jan. 24, 1962, Hoover came to the House Appropriations Committee for funds, and one of his arguments was:

"Since its inception the Communist Party, U.S.A., has been alert to capitalize on every possible issue or event which could be used to exploit the American Negro in furtherance of party aims. In its efforts to influence the American Negro, the party attempts to infiltrate the legitimate Negro organizations for the purpose of stirring up racial preju-

dice and hatred. In this way, the party strikes a blow at our democratic form of government by attempting to influence public opinion throughout the world against the United States."

Well, nothing could be clearer than that. I have names for future columns showing proved Communists ferrying between Havana and the demonstration sites in American cities, and showing known Communists at the dirty work of teaching Negroes, and whites to hate one another.

But the point which Warren Magnuson's Commerce Committee ought to be honest enough to discover is already laid bare, and this is it:

The unhappy American Negro, generally immune to Communist blandishments and greatly preferring the American way, is now being solicited and tempted, organized and incited as never before, by the worst enemy our country ever had.

BERRY'S WORLD



"I don't care how jovial he seems, Averell, keep your back to the wall!"



IN WASHINGTON ...

It's Only Money — Yours

By RALPH de TOLEDANO
When I was new to the writing business, I had an editor who said: "Put it in terms of money and people will get the point." Well, will they? Going over the great mass of material that passes over this desk, I keep running into interesting little statistics on how the Treasury spends its money.

Representative Earl Wilson (R. Ind.) has spent years digging up hanky-panky in Federal military procurement and shown how billions could be saved without affecting the efficiency of the services. Very few pay attention.

The Area Redevelopment Administration was given a four-

year appropriation but after less than two years—with \$264 million still in the kitty—it asked for \$455 million more, and got it from the Senate. In one Pennsylvania county, \$46,650 was spent by ARA on an electronics course for "instruction and equipment." No equipment was available for recourse. But the tab noted \$38,682 for the non-existent equipment.

Representative William Brock (R.) of Tennessee informs his constituents that though their individual share of the national debt and the current budget (to date) is \$6,933, the Federal government is spending \$17,500 on studies in "Modification of Alcohol Prefer-

ence in Rats"; \$65,400 on determining the "Behavior and Ecology of the Wandering Albatross," and \$36,800 on being hip to the "Social Behavior of Ants."

The Republican Congressional Committee notes that disarmament is becoming a big business. The Institute of Defense Analysis, a Pentagon "hoondoggle," happily pays its president twice what a Congressman makes. It receives \$8 million from your Uncle and mine and has 234 employees. A gaggle of companies have contracts which cost the taxpayer anywhere from \$10,000 to \$500,000 each.

In Los Angeles, Serendipity, Inc., has been awarded a \$23,326 contract to find out if each unit in the armed forces should have a "wit" or funny man.

If the report from Serendipity, Inc. is positive, each unit will begin to clamor for its own comic. And can you imagine what putting Shelley Berman and Jonathan Winters on the Pentagon payroll will cost?

The Kennedys, through Brother Jack, have asked Congress to increase the White House helicopter fleet (all 10-passenger jobs) from eight to 10. The two new whirly birds will cost the Treasury \$1.2 million each. The President's request went by almost unnoticed though bitter Republicans, watching the take-offs and landings on the White House lawn, complain that President Eisenhower's occasional jaunts to Burning Tree once made front page news.

Foreign aid proponents argue that most of the money is spent in the United States, so it isn't really hurting. But the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee points out that that mighty little of our foreign aid expenditures come back to the United States. In 1959, it was 14 per cent; in 1960, 12 per cent; in 1961, 10.5 per cent; in 1962, 10 per cent, and in 1963, an estimated 12.7 per cent. When a foreign aid appropriation or authorization reaches the Hill, however, the figure most often used to lull the legislators is 90 per cent.

Congress is hoping to cut billions from the Federal budget. Because sums of this magnitude mean little, Representative Thomas Pelly offered some statistics. He points out that if a man began spending one dollar a minute at the time of Christ's birth, he would just about be running through his first billion dollars. A billion dollars would buy enough autos to jam them bumper to bumper from Cleveland to Salt Lake City.

But if money speaks, it must have laryngitis these days. Everybody talks economy. The Administration complains that it has cut the budget to the bone and is holding out on new expenditures. Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges tells Congress that his department could be cut down 25 per cent, then adds 10 per cent to the payroll.

Does anybody care? Or are those who clamor for fiscal sanity and a dollar's worth of Federal activity for a dollar of tax money simply out of step with the times? Obviously the Administration believes that the public doesn't really mind—just so long as there is enough serendipity to go around. Remember serendipity? It means, (according to Webster) an aptitude for having nice things happen to you.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Purely Personal Prejudices: The ability to go fast creates a kind of dishonesty, like that of the normally law-abiding motorist who, in speeding along the highway, tries to deceive and outwit the police; it is perhaps no accident that the classical god Mercury, who flew with wings at his heels, was at once the god of speed and the god of thieves.

Those who praise "action" too often have a contempt for thought: this is why the "man of action" eventually runs the risk of becoming the man of violence, which is action for its own sake, with no rational end or purpose.

Most of the disappointments of later life could be lightened immeasurably if we could but learn (and truly believe) early in life that what we confusedly call "happiness" is a direction and not a place.

The one says, "You must change man in order to change society"; the other says, "You must change society in order to change man"; and neither can see that each has hold of only one-half of the truth, that the two seeming oppositions are reciprocal, and we can never achieve the one without working on the other.

The most foolish philosophers are those who hold the doctrine that most people are fools; when people seem to be stupid it is because they are preoccupied, because their minds are closed by fears or anxieties; but it is a very great mistake to think that a closed mind is an empty one—consider, for instance, children who seem "stupid" in school because their interest hasn't been awakened, but who are skillful and lively in the games that do interest them.

"Our souls are not much hidden," wrote Charles H. Cooley, in a passage I often return to. "Nothing is truer to experience or more wholesome to recognize than that the impression we make comes from what we are."



By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA)—All the sweetness and ever-loving coexistence coming out of the Moscow nuclear test ban conference preliminaries is in marked contrast to the growing record of Russian espionage now being disclosed in major western capitals.

There's a belief that the Soviet spy network has been vastly expanded since the end of World War II. This is verified by the number of Russian diplomatic personnel assigned to the United States, nearly doubled in the last 10 years.

In May 1954 there were 212 Russian officials assigned to the United States.

Five years later, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover put the number at 315—an increase of almost 50 per cent.

As of May 1, 1963, however, there were 415 Russians in the United States, assigned to Washington and the United Nations headquarters in New York. Moreover, there were 317 diplomats from the seven Communist satellites in the U.S.

The 19 Cuban officials assigned to the United Nations in New York brings the total to 751.

They had 1,118 dependents in this country. This aggregate, furthermore, does not include an unknown number of American Communists who may be reporting to Red master spies.

Since it has been estimated that 70 to 80 per cent of the Communist-country officials assigned to this country are in intelligence work, the spy potential is about 500 to 600 operatives.

Three years ago the U.S. State Department estimated that Russian and Chinese bloc countries had some 300,000 trained spies serving throughout the world. The number is greater now.

This year's spy mania opened with the Soviet's public trial and execution of its own Col. Oleg Penkovsky. He had been charged with betraying Russian secrets to the western powers. The case was used to frighten the Russian people and to tighten the Soviet's own security network.

Hard on the heels of these disclosures last May came the Brit-

ish War Minister John Profumo-Christine Keeler scandals which also involved Russian Navy Capt. V. M. Ivanov.

Other European capitals rocked with Russian spy disclosures in rapid succession.

In Stockholm Col. Stig Wennerstrom, a disarmament specialist, was exposed as having given Sweden's secrets to the Russians for 15 years.

Bonn put on trial three of its top intelligence agency operatives—Heinz Felfe, Hans Clements and Erwin Tiesel—for betraying West German secrets to Russia.

A case with a different ending involves Dr. Giuseppe Martelli, an Italian atomic scientist just cleared by a British jury on charges of passing secrets to the Russians.

Now undergoing his second trial in New York is U.S. Navy Yeoman Nelson C. Drummond, accused of the sale of confidential defense information to the Soviet Union.

The prize boo-boo in the international espionage game in the case of Soviet master spy, Anatoly Dolynitsin, still not fully disclosed. A year and a half ago he surrendered to American agents in West Berlin, who kept his defection secret.

When he went to London to help the British clean up their shattered intelligence service, his name was foolishly made public. Moscow claims he is still in Russia. But other reports have Russian counterespies on his trail to kill him if they can catch him.

The one new spy plot is the case of the Russian couple—real names unknown—caught by the FBI in Washington. They had assumed the identities of two innocent and unsuspecting American citizens, the Rev. Robert K. Balth, an Amsterdam, N.Y., priest, and a Norwalk, Conn., housewife whose maiden name was Joy Ann Garber.

The phony "Mr. and Mrs. Robert Balth" were caught red-handed passing U.S. military information to Ivan Egorov, a Russian United Nations official in New York, and his wife. All four have now been arraigned for trial.

But this case of stolen identities is one that not even the mystery fiction writers had dreamed up.

WASHINGTON REPORT ...



By FULTON LEWIS JR.

Maintaining Orderly Government Process

There occurred in Philadelphia, Penn., on June 21, 1773, an event that would profoundly affect the creation of a Federal City in the District of Columbia.

It is an event worth recalling as upwards of 100,000 angry citizens prepare to march on Washington late next month.

The yellowed pages of the North American Intelligencer and the Pennsylvania Packet, both Philadelphia newspapers, tell the story well.

On Thursday, June 19, 1773, a group of 80 mutinous soldiers of the Continental Army marched on Philadelphia. They came to demonstrate at the Continental Congress for the right to choose their own officers, for higher pay and better working conditions.

Two days later, on Saturday, June 21, the soldiers stormed the Continental Congress. An eye-witness Intelligencer account reads:

"To the astonishment of the city, and the public dishonor, these troops, with fixed bayonets and drums beating, marched into the State House, the seat of Congress and the Supreme Executive Council."

"Having placed guards at the different doors, and set off detachments to those places where they supposed arms and ammunition were deposited, they set up a written paper to the President and council desiring that they might be authorized to choose their own officers and demanding an answer in 20 minutes, or an enraged soldiery would be let in upon them."

"No address was made to Congress, which was assembled upon special business; but not choosing to deliberate under the bayonets of an armed mob, they retired without any other insult offered to them, collectively or individually."

"In the meantime the soldiery grew very clamorous, complaining of the detention of their pay, of the non-settlement of their accounts, intermixed with general reproaches on public authority of every kind, and threats of violence if their complaints were not instantly attended to."

The "written paper" was immediately taken under consideration by a special Committee of the Congress and the sergeants who led the mob were able to keep peace and order for a while.

In the meantime, the Congress sent an urgent message to the

Supreme Executive Council of the State of Pennsylvania, asking that effective measures be taken to safeguard the public from a "disorderly and menacing body of armed soldiers."

Pennsylvania officials shot back an answer, saying their militia was "disinclined to act upon the present occasion."

Congress reacted immediately, by adjourning until June 26 at Princeton, New Jersey. An editorial in the Pennsylvania Packet suggested a solution to the whole mess:

"Ought not the Representatives of the Congress be securely and commodiously placed that the business of the Continent may not, by any local or accidental circumstances, be interrupted?"

Subsequently a Constitutional Convention was called for the purpose of framing a Constitution for the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, of that Constitution states that: "Congress shall have the power . . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by Cession of Particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of Government of the United States."

Members of Congress from Virginia and Maryland, who had been present at Philadelphia, convinced their Governors to each cede a small tract of land to the Central Government and the District of Columbia was created.

The reason for all this was explained by James Madison in the Federalist Papers: "Without complete authority at the seat of government . . . the public authority might be insulted and its proceedings interrupted with impunity."

THEY SAY...

Nationality and religion are separate and distinct. Our nationality is American, our religion is Judaism, our homeland is the United States of America. We reject any concept that all Jews outside of Israel are in "exile."

—Clarence L. Coleman Jr., president of American Council for Judaism.