

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Let's Do Some Stocktaking

Would it be completely corny to suggest at least a partial return to old-fashioned simplicity and morality as a possible way out of our current problems?

Would it be a confession of horse-and-buggy thinking to wonder if too many of us aren't racing our motors when we ought to be hitting the brake a bit?

Sure, we are living in the space age. Sure, everything today has to be fast, fast, fast. Sure, we have to realize that times have changed, and so have social customs, philosophies and values.

But does this mean that we have to work so hard to make so many things so complicated and so breathless—and often so devious?

Would it really be in the national and international disinterest to try to state things in such simple and forthright terms that they could be clearly understood by one and all—including even the man in the street?

Would it be utterly primitive and in fla-

grant violation of the Madison Avenue image to try to sell things on the basis of actual need, common sense and cold facts instead of status symbols, nonsense and hot copy?

Would it be reasonable to current custom to try to simplify things rather than to complicate them? To make them comprehensible rather than unfathomable?

Would it be crude and unsocial to approach our personal, civic and even national problems from the angle of "What is the RIGHT thing to do?" rather than from "What's the SMART way to handle this?" or "What's in it for ME?"

It has become the accepted custom in this country, and elsewhere, to do everything bigger and faster and more and more in the self-interest.

It might be interesting and refreshing to see how many of our tough problems would move toward a solution if plain talk and friendly understanding were substituted for doubletalk and dedicated confusion.

Anyone for giving it a try?

Paperwork Explosion

(Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser)

Like many people, the Federal Government finds it hard to throw anything away. According to the latest count by the General Accounting Office, the United States had in storage 6,900,000 cubic feet of records.

Government Printing Office, apparently feeling that many of the documents are superfluous, is suggesting that Federal agencies

screen their records more closely before sending them to storage. This is not likely to stem the avalanche because the GPO has just proudly informed Congress that due to new labor-saving devices, it has doubled productivity during the past nine years.

If the trend continues, Khrushchev will not find it necessary to carry out his threat to bury us. The nation will bury itself, under millions of tons of paper and microfilm.



HOLMES ALEXANDER . . .

Treaty Of Bad Choices

By HOLMES ALEXANDER

WASHINGTON—President Kennedy's nuclear treaty now threatens to fail him in two fields where, unhappily, he has failed before—his credibility and his judgment.

He has led us to believe that the suspension of above-ground testing could be militarily and scientifically justified at no additional cost to the national safety. He has sent his administration spokesmen to Capitol Hill with slickly prepared testimony that bore the evidence of collaboration and ghost-written unanimity.

Secretary Rusk, Secretary McNamara, Atomic Energy Chairman Seaborg and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Taylor, each in turn, swore up and down that the risks were minimal and the advantages manifest. But I do not think anyone could listen, as I have done, to General Curtis LeMay, the Air Force Chief of Staff, and to Dr. Edward Teller, the nation's foremost nuclear physicist, without feeling that the President's case for the treaty is little less than a political appeal to Russia and to "world opinion." As a proposition for military and scientific sufficiency the treaty has reached the brink of unbeliefability.

The treaty asks us to accept nuclear parity, when what we need is superiority—and preferably supremacy. It asks us to swallow the theory, voiced by McNamara and blasted by Teller, that we can go underground and successfully test the components of the unimaginably complex anti-missile defensive system without ever trying the system in the atmosphere as a whole. It asks us to believe that the President — after making himself the author and advocate of this partial disarmament pact, and the hawk of all the horrors of nuclear weapons—could, after so doing, creditably use nuclear threats and nuclear arms in a short-of-war action to deter, for example, a Red Chinese invasion of India. It asks us to believe, as Teller pointed out, that we can deny atmospheric, anti-missile weapons to European allies who are faced with Russia's nuclear arsenal, and yet not expect the NATO alliance to be blackmailed by fear.

Kennedy's plausibility as a wise treaty-maker lay in a near-shambles before the LeMay-Teller testimony. And his judgment did not look much better. In the promotion of the treaty he seems to show himself more as the political campaigner whose fluffs and mistakes will be forgotten

tomorrow, rather than as the leader who is making decisions that must stand the unrelenting proof of time.

For his form of presentation has left many Senators and observers with the impression that he demands a cabinet and a military staff who will sing for their suppers. His political approach has given credence to Teller's accusation that our atmospheric tests of 1962 were stopped short of the need to surpass Russia's advantages—stopped at a point where public and "world" opinion might go against the administration.

The President has denied this serious charge, as he might be expected to do, and his administration witnesses have backed him up. But the tests were feeble compared with Russia's. They are said in military circles to have been "psychological" rather than scientific. They were not satisfactory to General LeMay, among others, whose job is to win our wars. In these circumstances, as in the question of what side deals may have been discussed with Khrushchev, Kennedy stands in need of a credibility rating which was not high when the treaty was

broached and has not been recently improved.

Finally, taking the promotional ballyhoo as a whole—the American University address with the Munich music of appeasement, the Harriman mission, the Moscow spectacular of the signing ceremonies—it is evident that the President is very close to making the one big, conspicuous blunder that his knowledge of history must have warned him to avoid. He has encircled the Senate with choices not unlike those which Woodrow Wilson laid down on the League of Nations.

The present Senate, faced with this over-publicized nuclear treaty, can do three things—all of them very bad. To ratify the treaty would be to compound what many Senators regard as a dreadful mistake in Presidential judgment to reject the treaty outright would leave the American image, like Venus de Milo, maimed though still symmetrical and valid. To revise the treaty with reservations that Russia would probably refuse to accept seems the least of the evils at hand—yet, even that would precipitate a far worse crisis than the one we had before Kennedy undertook this radical and ill-conceived remedy.

Letters To The Editor

Solomon

If I may be permitted to try and put into words my views of the pending catastrophe which is hanging over our heads like the "Sword of Damocles," which is the rules promulgation of the American railroads. They are using the modern "Frankenstein" automation to force the public to dance to the tune of the "Pied Piper of Wall Street." J. E. Wolfe, who has been instrumental in the brainwashing of the people with the big lie of "featherbedding."

The weight and speed of operation of a present day freight train makes the safe operation by one man a virtual impossibility, no matter how competent and well trained he may be, or how many remote controlled safety factors are involved, there is still the human element to consider.

Now the temporary solution to the entire deviously contrived situation is to be laid in the lap of Congress, which, no matter how well intentioned, is expected to come up with a settlement worthy of Solomon in all his glory although the parties directly involved have been unable to arrive at any progress in over four years.

It appears that the present slaughter on the highways could be greatly reduced if the railroads were made to furnish an adequate number of passenger trains based on our exploding population instead of allowing them to operate with their greatly reduced personnel in order to add to profits which are already faltering.

If this whole controversy is to be settled by compulsory arbitration then we will have taken the first long step down the road which leads to socialism or fascism. Over a long period of years labor and management have built up a mutually satisfactory system of arbitrating most of their differences which has up to now been a source of pride to all concerned. Now at the last minute the pattern of long years is all to be scrapped at the stroke of a pen and we are to be left at the mercy of the dictates of "Wall Street" praying for a "Moses" to lead us out of this man-made wilderness and in some manner get another "Magna Carta" for the man in the street.

H. D. Lindsey
4546 Cleveland
Klamath Falls, Ore.
Engr. S. P. Ry.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Test Ban Witnesses

By RALPH de TOLEDO

The catch-phrase on Capitol Hill among those who strongly favor a test ban treaty is that, after all, it's "a matter of judgment." The President, Secretary McNamara, and some scientists are flatly certain that the gains of a treaty with the Soviet Union outweigh the risks. Dr. Edward Teller, father of the H-bomb, those members of the military who have not been afraid to speak out freely, and other witnesses feel that the risk to the nation is far too great. You pays your money, etc.

It would seem that where such great and vital differences of opinion exist—and where the administration frankly states that the treaty accomplishes little except as a "first step"—caution would dictate that the Senate reject the treaty. If it does not threaten America's national survival, then little is lost by not ratifying. If it does put us in jeopardy, then we cannot play games with the future.

This is a point which some Senator will perhaps make. But there is another question. If we are relying on the judgment of those who favor the treaty—and relying blindly on it—then it is pertinent to ask, "How good was their judgment in the past?"

I call as my first witness Dr. Norris Bradbury, director of the

Los Alamos nuclear laboratory in New Mexico. Dr. Bradbury is a fine scientist who has worked hard to perfect America's nuclear capabilities. He has been called in to give a scientific and political opinion of the dangers possibly inherent in the test ban treaty. In both areas—and I realize it is not tactful of me to note it—he has shown himself rather weak at looking ahead in science or looking back in politics.

It should be recalled that Dr. Bradbury was J. Robert Oppenheimer's choice for the post he now holds. In 1954, Dr. Bradbury appeared before the Gray Board, investigating the Oppenheimer case, as an anti-Atomic Energy Commission witness. At no point would he admit what had already been conceded—namely that Oppenheimer had opposed work leading to the creation of the H-bomb on "moral" grounds. Dr. Bradbury himself had been convinced that a thermonuclear weapon—the fusion or H-bomb—was an impossibility.

"The state of knowledge of thermonuclear systems during the war and thereafter, and really up until the spring of 1951, was such as to make the practical utility or even the workability in any useful sense of what was then imagined as a thermonuclear weapon extremely questionable," he testified.

What was known in 1949-50, he said, "would certainly permit one to be very pessimistic," just as the Administration is pessimistic about the anti-missile missile.

Yet from the early days of the Los Alamos project, Dr. Edward Teller fought hard for the H-bomb. In fact, he fought so hard that Dr. Bradbury eased him out of Los Alamos in 1951. Dr. Teller was not a prophet. But his mind was not blinded by preconceived ideas.

Scientifically, therefore, Dr. Bradbury was dead wrong, and belligerently so, about the possibility of devising an H-bomb.

Politically, Dr. Bradbury showed a blindness which certainly disqualifies him from passing judgment on the intentions of the Soviets or their capabilities. For example, he was asked a question about Dr. Klaus Fuchs, the British traitor who had already confessed to serving as an espionage agent at Los Alamos for the Soviet Union.

"There seems to be no question that he had a commitment to a foreign power, does there?" Dr. Bradbury answered: "I perhaps might have a slightly different interpretation of it. I think it must be said in fairness to Fuchs that he worked extremely hard and effectively for Los Alamos and this country."

Then discussing Dr. Oppenheimer's membership in "just about every Communist front" on the West Coast (J. Robert's admission) and contribution to Communist causes, Dr. Bradbury remarked in 1954: "I would not like to say that I regard these notions as either right or wrong. I say that simply they turn out to have been bad for him to have done at this time."

These are odd and fuzzy comments for anyone to make. But they are particularly interesting when they come from someone whose "judgment" the Senate of the United States is asked to rely.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Have you ever thought of the utter impossibility of describing someone you are particularly close to, or especially fond of? It simply cannot be done without sounding vague, stupid, insipid and quite superficial.

When an out-of-town friend the other day asked me what my middle daughter is like, I suddenly became banal and tongue-tied, mumbling something like, "Good sport . . . tall for her age . . . swims like a fish . . . nice kid."

But if we are asked about someone we dislike or resent, the words come tumbling out of our mouths almost faster than the brain can form them.

We know (or think we know) exactly why certain personalities offend us; we are mostly in the dark about the magic chemistry that produces not only love but also a sense of closeness and companionship.

This strange disparity is not limited to our feelings about people; it includes things as well. Although I have little interest in myself, I know that the average fisherman, for instance, achieves a deep spiritual satisfaction from his sport, which has little to do with the number or size of fish he has caught.

Yet no fisherman can put into adequate words his sense of "wholeness" or serenity while fishing, and the reasons usually given are obvious, trivial and lame.

STRICTLY PERSONAL

Deep positive emotions cannot be verbalized—which is why so many millions of bad love-poems and love-songs are perpetrated year after year. With the utmost of sincerity (and even with considerable talent), we become mawkish babblers when trying to convey such feelings.

It is no accident that almost every young writer begins his career with comedy and satire and scorn and malicious wit directed against society. Even Shakespeare began this way; the plays in which profound love dominates came much later in his career, and it took the sum of his genius to carry them off successfully, as in the incomparable "King Lear."

Music is a greater art than literature to me, precisely because it embraces a wider range of human feelings than the spoken word. I cannot help agreeing with Pater that "music is the art to which all the other arts aspire," for in it the form and the content are utterly the same.

The right movement of a Mozart concerto might make you feel what my daughter is like, but I can only tell you that she is tall for her age and swims like a fish.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—On what play is the libretto of Verdi's opera "Rigoletto" based?

A—"The King Amuses Himself" by Victor Hugo.



NOTHING SPECIAL

(W. B. S.)

If what I hear and see of the dismissal of Mrs. Betty Cote as Klamath County librarian is valid, then the incident is another of the most bizarre in a long chain of unfortunate incidents dealing with the library.

The library board (those members in on the kill) acted with seemingly nothing more than capriciousness as the basis for the dismissal. They can't take all the "credit" for the kill. Oh, no. One member of the county court is claiming that he is personally responsible for her dismissal. (This is not rumor or conjecture—he told me.)

The record shows that Mrs. Cote did a good job as librarian. As far as I know, even the board and the county court acknowledge this. While I don't want to get involved in a matter that involves the privilege and responsibilities of a public board to carry out an assignment, there appears to be some injustice in this Cote instance. The injustice comes in that the board told the present staff that there would be no decimation in personnel if and when a librarian was engaged to assume the top job. This seems to have been clearly understood by the staff—including Mrs. Cote who expressed a desire to work with the new librarian.

It would be reasonable and fair, I think, for the board to reconsider their action and extend to Mrs. Cote an invitation to assume a responsible position on the library staff. It is obvious that she has won the respect and loyalty of those she has worked with in making the Klamath County Library a going concern.

Ignoring the injustice to an individual in this instance, it is more discouraging to witness—again—the apparent weakness of Klamath County government structures.

It illustrates that capricious-

ness, personal spite and unsound business practices dominate the thinking of narrow-minded officials. This is something Klamath County residents have lived with too long. So long in fact, many people have the conception that nothing can be done about the situation. Something can be done if people will forget their apathy long enough to take some interest in government and those who are in responsible government positions in the county.

Speaking about civil rights (quite a few people are) how about this portion of an ordinance passed by the British Parliament in 1770:

All women of whatever age, rank, profession, or degree, whether virgins, maids or widows, that shall impose upon, seduce, and betray into matrimony any of His Majesty's subjects by scents, paints, cosmetics, washes, artificial teeth, false hair, Spanish wool, iron staves, hoops, high-heeled shoes, bolstered hips, or padded bosoms shall incur the penalty of the law enforced against witchcraft and the like misdemeanors and that marriage, upon conviction, shall stand null and void.

Now, that's a handy little rule—and I wonder how it never came up during the Profuma et al episode.

A reader who makes a hobby of finance has been examining the shrunken dollar. He says things are not as bad as they seem, because although the dollar does not go as far as it used to, what it lacks in distance, it makes up in speed.

Looking for something in our tool shed the other day brought on the thought that our forefathers ran a farm with less machinery than we need to keep a lawn.

A hopeless optimist is a fellow who believes a parking space will show up if he drives once around the block.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Student Conclave Attracts Leftists

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

WASHINGTON—The 16th annual convention of the United States National Student Association (NSA) is now under way in Bloomington, Ind., and all indications are that the current gathering will be an unsavory repeat performance of past meetings. The organization has obtained the reputation of being a mouthpiece for left-wing student politicians, and has been denounced and repudiated by moderate and conservative student elements since its formation in 1947.

NSA leaders assert that their organization represents the thinking of "more than 1,000,000 American students," and in years past the group's resolutions have been: "We, the students of the United States . . ."

This claim is interesting, particularly in light of the record. Of the nearly 2,200 colleges and universities in the nation, only 300 are affiliated with NSA. Of these, only 100 or so even bother to send delegates to the national conventions; and 94 per cent of these delegates acquire their

status through appointment, not student elections.

Even the student delegates have had little to say about NSA's pronouncements. For example, last year the organization released 83 policy statements on controversial issues ranging from nuclear testing to civil rights. Only 28 of these were adopted in the convention. The majority of the resolutions (35) were passed by the 31-member national executive committee, some with as few as 10 affirmative student votes.

Positions taken by the NSA in the past have followed the leftist line with precision. The group has called for abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and for repeal of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The 1961 convention condoned the Japanese student demonstrations against Eisenhower's visit as a recognition "of the right of students to non-violently protest actions which they consider unjust or undemocratic." The same convention condemned the United States for assisting Cuban refugees in attempting to oust Castro. On the question of Nationalist China (Formosa), the NSA has censured "the Nationalist government of Taiwan for its suppression of academic freedom and human rights." NSA's only concern about Red China is "the absence of formative contact between the United States National Student Association and the All-China Student Federation."

This year, as in years past, representatives of every left-wing group in the country have established a lobbying headquarters at the NSA convention, attempting to influence student legislation.

What does the ADA demand? Recognition of Red China; abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee; foreign aid to "neutralist" and Communist dictatorships; and accommodation with Castro Cuba.

The President has less than a month to redeem one of his most important campaign promises. Swinging through Texas on Sept. 12, 1960, nominee Kennedy promised to eradicate all dictatorships from the Western Hemisphere within three years. That gives the President two weeks in which to overthrow Fidel Castro, among other dictators still riding high.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Look, Bobby, if you wanted more of your stuff in the White House library, you should have written more books."