

# Editorial Page

## The Slim Edge Of Success

People like certainty. Consequently, even in a shades-of-gray era like the present, they seek clear black and white labels to pin on men, issues and a variety of other things.

Inevitably, therefore, they try to draw a pretty sharp line between success and failure. Yet the truth is, the gap between the two sometimes is almost imperceptible.

Admiral George W. Anderson, former Chief of Naval Operations and our new ambassador to Portugal, touched on this point in the specific context of military affairs in a recent speech to the National Press Club.

The admiral was, of course, arguing a case that greater consideration be given at the level of top civilian control to the views and the experience of professional military and naval officers.

Of the qualified military man Anderson said:

"He is exposed to the narrow margin between success and failure, not only in weapons, but in leadership and in understanding of the enemy."

At another place the admiral said: "I am concerned that, in the selection of weapons, aircraft or ships, there may not be a full appreciation of the decisiveness of a nar-

row edge in superior performance, both to achieve maximum safety and to succeed in combat."

What Anderson suggests is valid not only in the hard arena of military strength but through nearly all life.

Success again and again turns out to be a matter not of swamping your competitor in business, or a profession, or politics. It is a thing of getting just a few inches ahead, sometimes by working harder and longer but often mainly by concentrating better on the job at hand.

In countless instances the measure of difference is superior desire. Given that, a person somehow finds adequate tools, subjects himself to whatever stiff disciplines may be needed, labors as persistently and singlemindedly as the circumstances demand.

Out of that often narrow margin of extra effort, comes the crown of success. Any slight flagging, any brief wandering of attention from the critical task could have turned it into failure.

We should understand, then, in Admiral Anderson that the difference most of the time is not a matter of black and white. Any of us may win the day by striving without letup for a deeper shade of gray.

## Why Punish The Good Samaritan?

Last spring a medical doctor passing through Pennsylvania on a train went to the aid of a fellow passenger seized by a heart attack, only to be sued by the man's family when the attack turned out to be fatal.

A few months earlier, a Massachusetts physician vacationing in the Virgin Islands performed an emergency operation to try to save the life of a resident who had been electrocuted, and was repaid for his act by being arrested for practicing without a Virgin Island license.

Such cases, particularly those in which the Good Samaritan winds up being sued for

damages, have become so widespread that many doctors now say quite frankly that they would rather leave a stranger lying in a pool of blood than do anything to assist.

What possible combination of grief and greed it takes to motivate a family to sue a doctor who has done all he could to help, we cannot possibly imagine, but we presume it is more of the latter than the former.

New Jersey, in any case, has just put an end to such cruel nonsense by passing a law which will absolve all medical practitioners of any civil liability in such instances.

## Fair and Warmer



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

## Treaty Brings Letdown

WASHINGTON—The first clear and undeniable legacy of the limited nuclear test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, even before that pact has been ratified by the Senate, is a sense of letdown and of take-it-easier now moving in the American air.

The Administration's policy planners call it "euphoria," and because of it they are in a curiously awkward position. Their earnest support of the treaty must be constantly and strongly proclaimed. But their anxiety lest it lead to a slackening of Congressional and popular will is no less real, though it is mentioned only in cautious tones.

That such a slackening has al-

ready occurred, in Congress at least is an undoubted fact. It may seem ironical but it is nonetheless true that this accommodation with the Russians, notwithstanding all of President Kennedy's warnings that the great contest has thereby lost none of its essential peril for the West, is going to be costly in many ways.

It will, for one sharp and concrete illustration, help bring yet further cuts, before Congress is through, in the already tattered foreign aid program. The half-billion-dollar reduction made by the House of Representatives to scale the authorization down to \$3.5 billion will not be the end of the tale. If final Congressional action does not produce an additional half-billion-dollar cut then

every present omen is absolutely wrong.

And in more subtle ways the damage is considerable. Internationalism in general is slipping badly in Congress—not by any means altogether because of the treaty but in important part because of it. This approach or quasi-approach or maybe approach—call it what one will—to less strained relations with the Soviet Communists is causing altogether too much hope to break out altogether too prematurely in too many men of Congress.

For long years those people had been fed up with carrying the hard, tough load which unrelieved war had placed upon them. The treaty seems somehow to make the load rather less real, rather less necessary, in the sense that it seems, however slightly, to relieve the cold war itself.

The truth is that a whole political generation has been conditioned by the endless and quite truthful cries of three administrations—Truman's, Eisenhower's, and now Kennedy's, that the nation must never for one moment relax in its determination and its sacrifices before the bulking menace from the East.

Now, in order to accomplish heavy Senate approval of the treaty, it has been necessary for the Administration to be saying what seem to be two quite different things at the same time: First, that this treaty is, in fact, some advance in the cold war. Second, that nevertheless we must not for an instant let down our guard, since in bottom truth the cold war is just about where it was before. These two statements are not really mutually exclusive; but they are inevitably confusing.

Adding to the difficulty is the fact that while the Administration's first point is only arguably sound, there cannot be the smallest question that its second point is profoundly and unarguably sound.

Washington is therefore in a position roughly opposite to that in which it is unwise to cry "fire" in a crowded theater. Here it is very dangerous to cry "peace," or any other reassuring word that even remotely sounds like "peace."

It is against all these circumstances that the first major public speech delivered by Secretary of State Dean Rusk since the treaty was negotiated should be read. Before the American Legion in Miami Beach, the Secretary found it prudent to stress the quite unabated danger from international communism more strongly, or at any rate with much more effective impact, than any of the presumed opportunities for further negotiations that might now be open to the West.

It all comes, at last, to this: For better or for worse the treaty is now an accomplished fact in all but the most literal sense. We must live with it. But will the country, upon mature reflection, now insist upon staring at a pie in the sky that simply is not there? Or will it prove itself mature enough to go on carrying the old, nasty, necessary, load without that constant, unrelieved shock treatment from the national leadership to which it had become so well accustomed?

## EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .



## Financing Operations High On U.N. Agenda

By PETER EDSON  
Washington Correspondent  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.  
WASHINGTON (NEA) — There are 78 items on the provisional agenda for the United Nations General Assembly this year.

It is likely a few more will be added during the session which convened Sept. 17 in New York.

About half of the subjects up for discussion relate to international disputes. The other half relate to U.N. housekeeping operations, including financing.

As of Sept. 15, all member nations are sufficiently paid up on their assessments to be able to vote on all issues before the 1963 Assembly. But if additional payments are not made before Jan. 1, Soviet Russia, France and some of the Communist satellite countries will become more than two years in arrears on regular and special assessments for peace-keeping operations.

This would subject them to a loss of voting rights in 1964 or until they paid up. The guess is that they will pay up just enough to retain their votes, as they have in the past.

But if France and Russia choose to make another fight against special assessments for keeping the peace in places like the Congo and Near East, it will be a battle threatening future U.N. effectiveness.

As of July 31, U.N. collections were more than \$180 million in arrears—\$44 million on working capital and regular assessments, \$36 million for the Near East Emergency Force, and \$100 million for the Congo account.

At the General Assembly special session earlier this year emergency financing of \$42 million was arranged to carry on operations through Dec. 31.

The United States made some progress in getting its assessments for extra contributions reduced from 49 per cent to 37 per cent of the total.

There was some congressional

complaint that this was not reduced to the 32 per cent of total which the U.S. pays on regular assessments. But considering that the United States has 40 per cent of the total gross national product for all U.N. members, the 12 per cent cut on special contributions was regarded as a good start.

On the purchase of U.N. bonds—a hot issue in the last Congress—total purchases up to Sept. 1 were \$145 million by 50 countries, with \$2 million more pledged but not paid in U.S. purchases are half of this amount, keeping the pledge to match other purchases up to \$100 million of the \$200 million issue.

The 1964 budget which Secretary General U. Thant presents to the General Assembly is for \$66 million for the U.N. itself, plus \$100 million for its specialized agencies. With \$14 million in receipts, the net total is \$102 million.

Total U.S. contributions to the U.N. for 1964 are \$57 million in regular and special assessments, plus \$175 million in contributions outside the budget for programs like Palestine refugees and the Children's fund.

The United States gives 40 per cent of the special fund for economic planning, 70 per cent of the United Nations Emergency Force costs in the Near East and up to 100 per cent on some of the special research projects.

This is criticized as being of no immediate or direct benefit to the United States. There are demands in Congress—like the proposal by Rep. Durward G. Hall, R-Mo.—that U.S. contributions to any international organization be limited to a flat one-third of the total budget.

But there is little support except from right-wing extremists for the prediction of Rep. James B. Utt, R-Calif., that the United States eventually will have to get out of the United Nations and that the U.N. will have to get out of the U.S.

## WASHINGTON REPORT . . .



## Powell Faces Tough Fight In New York

By FULTON LEWIS JR.  
WASHINGTON — The Reverend Adam Clayton Powell, a political cat if ever there was one, may be down to the last of his nine political lives.

The Congressman from New York's Harlem suffered a crushing defeat earlier this month when voters buried under an avalanche of votes a Powell-backed candidate for City Council.

Harlem voters instead chose J. Raymond Jones, a one-time Powell ally. It was Jones who five years ago engineered Powell's congressional re-election when organization leaders tried to dump him for supporting Dwight Eisenhower in 1956.

Jones, who is now Harlem's undisputed political king, is blunt in his denunciation of Powell.

"There has been no one in the history of the Negro race who has shown greater contempt for the Negro than Adam Powell. He thought he could make us all jackasses and pull us around by the tail. He was wrong."

There is now talk that Jones may contest Powell's House seat in next year's Democratic primary. He denies this. Jones does acknowledge, however, that efforts are underway to draft James Farmer for the race.

Farmer, militant head of the Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), has not yet indicated whether he will run. He has been active in Louisiana integration efforts while Jones and other Harlem leaders were opening their dump Powell campaign.

Officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People can be expected to oppose Powell in 1964. The congressman-minister has been outspoken in his criticism of the NAACP for accepting the support of white liberals.

Roy Wilkins, NAACP Executive Secretary, ridiculed Powell's suggestion that Negroes now march on New York City to demand equal rights. Calling the scheme nothing short of amazing, Wilkins said Powell had abdicated his responsibility to his people.

There are reports that Powell, tired of U.S. politics and fearful of what next year will bring, might chuck it all for Puerto Rico. Ever since he married a Puerto Rican—and pot her on the government payroll for \$12,000 a year—Powell has spent more and more time at his Caribbean villa. There he has been engaged in open political warfare with Governor Luis Munoz-Marin, an opponent of Puerto Rican statehood. Powell has clamored hard for statehood, a position, incidentally, held by island Republicans, not Democrats.

A recent press report said Pow-

ell was "trying to convince the Republican Statehood Party he can wield enough influence to win their cause in Congress. . . . Payment, no doubt, will be a Senate nomination."

Statehood Republicans of Puerto Rican descent are trying to warn their island colleagues not to have anything to do with Powell. Oscar Gonzalez-Suarez, GOP leader of New York Puerto Ricans, says:

"Powell is an opportunist. If the island's Republican leaders are taken in by his glib tongue, they will be performing a great disservice to the Puerto Rican people and intellectuals. We have enough skilled people to serve as our leaders and spokesmen."

"This is not a question of race," says Gonzalez-Suarez, "it is not a Negro. It is the man himself. Powell is erratic, a backslider. He is now being repudiated by his own people. Why should we adopt him?"

When this office tried to reach Powell for comment, the congressman was nowhere to be found. He would not return messages left for him at his office.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR Ward Park

It has been a pleasure to work with Ned Putnam and his fine family who have helped make possible Ward Park into one of the finest children's playgrounds in Southern Oregon. You will be missed when you leave Klamath Falls.

I think how fine it has been, Ned, that when I needed help to get something done, you were ready to help without charge and to share your good mechanics when I asked.

Ned has resigned as a member of the park board but he will be back some day.

I also extend my appreciation to the family of the late Andy Bergloff who also gave many hours of time and money to build playground equipment and to help in many other ways. Also to all members of the different boards of directors and others who have helped make the park possible.

This project shows what can be done if everyone will work together.

I can't name all of you for fear of leaving someone out, but I thank you all for helping make this park possible.

Harry Wiard and family

## IN WASHINGTON . . .



## Reuther Ranting Illogical

By RALPH de TOLEDANO  
Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, anyone to the right of Americans for Democratic Action is a member of the "radical right." There are times when Mr. Reuther even feels that AFL-CIO president George Meany may be a secret conservative. Mr. Reuther doesn't like this.

Sometime ago he and his brother Victor prepared a memorandum for Attorney General Robert Kennedy to bring about the suppression of conservative thought and political action. To quote the Reuther brothers directly:

"What are needed are deliberate Administration policies and programs to contain the radical right from further expansion and in the long run to reduce it to its historic role of the impotent lunatic fringe."

Since the Reuthers and their liberal-labor friends lump most of the Republican Party in the "radical right"—and since they have already attempted to smear Senator Goldwater with that name—Walter and Victor in effect asked the Attorney General to embark on a program which would reduce this country to a one-party state. The radical right "must never," the Reuthers admonish the A.G., "be permitted to become so strong as to obstruct action needed for democratic survival and success."

The "democratic success" demanded by the Reuthers must be brought about by a witchhunt among our military leaders to determine which of them are tainted by "radical right" ideas. They should be warned to cease and desist, and if they persist in believing that Communist "treason at home" should not be tolerated, this should be "grounds for dismissal."

But that is only a start. The Reuther memorandum says chillingly, "It is not known the extent to which the Federal Bureau of Investigation has planted undercover agents inside the radical right movement. . . . If it has already done so, the information would be readily available upon which to draw up charges for a hearing against one or more of the radical right groups."

I am sure that if the FBI has infiltrated conservative groups, it has been under protest, for this is clearly a violation of the mission set for it. I have no brief for the John Birch Society. But it is not subsidized by a foreign power. It is not plotting the violent overthrow of this government, and it

is not engaged in any conspiracy to violate the laws of the United States. It therefore does not belong on the attorney general's list as the Reuthers passionately believe.

The only "crimes" against the Birchers cited by the memorandum are that they have money to spend, that they are organizing to spread their views, and that they "slander" people.

The Reuther definition of "slander" and that of our courts are widely dissimilar. But there are laws in the books against slander, and legal action can be taken by any aggrieved party. What galls the Reuthers is that nightsticks are not being swung over "radical right" pates or their money confiscated.

But having decried the alleged "secrecy" of the John Birch Society, the Reuthers rise up in arms over the public acts of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade. Many of its meetings are televised so that all can see what Dr. Schwarz is up to. The Reuthers want the Internal Revenue Service to look into this. They want the Federal Communications Commission to take action against stations that sell time to sponsors who wish to broadcast H. L. Hunt's Life Line programs. I have never seen Life Line —

and it may be a dreadful show. But the "vast wasteland" would become dead air if artistic merit or sound content were a criterion. The Reuthers, however, are not concerned with these matters. They are opposed to anti-Communist television programs because they presumably encourage "the belief of the American people that domestic Communism has succeeded in betraying America."

This, to the Reuthers, is nonsense. The Communist spies who stole the secrets of the atom bomb, as well as the Alger Hisses and Harry Dexter Whites—they never existed but are a figment of radical right imagination. Or if they did exist, let's forget about them as quickly as possible.

Reading the Reuther memorandum to the Attorney General, I ask myself: What motivates an otherwise brilliant man to utter such nasty nonsense? He had to fight tooth and nail to break the Communist hold on the UAW. A conspiracy of Reds and gangsters nearly blasted off his arm with a shotgun and blinded his brother in one eye. He knows the score. Yet he is busy selling the line that Communists are no longer a problem in this country—but the conservatives are. Maybe the coming elections have something to do with it.

## BERRY'S WORLD



"Would you play a 'cosa nostra'?"



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Attending the opening of an art exhibit some time ago, I overheard a sweet little lady protest to the painter: "Why is modern art the way it is?" To which he politely shrugged, and murmured tactfully, "Why is modern life the way it is?"

But the best response to this constant query has been given by Robert Beverly Hale, of the Metropolitan Museum in New York, who once made the following explanation:

"If our art seems violent, it is because we have perpetrated more violence than any other generation. If it deals with weird dreams, it is because we have opened up the caverns of the mind and let such phantoms loose."

"If it is filled with broken shapes, it is because we have watched the order of our fathers break and fall to pieces at our feet."

"We have seen, in our century, the development of fantastic scientific paraphernalia and much ill will. We live in the fear of some monstrous event which will bring, at best, a curious and distorted future; at worst, annihilation. The artist is in part a prophet. We should not complain if the shadows that have lately haunted us have for some time been visible upon his canvas."

In one sense, great art is timeless; in another, it is the product of its times. Bach's music could not have been written except in an extremely religious atmosphere. Modern composers don't even try to sound like him, for they are looking at an entirely different world from an entirely different angle.

The long, leisurely Victorian novel is out of mode, for the tempo of the times has changed. Our novels are staccato, charged with demonic fury, brutal, bitter and resentful. The artist, after all, only works with the material he finds at his disposal. Even Shakespeare made most of

## STRICTLY PERSONAL

his Greeks and Romans speak and behave like 16th Century gentlemen.

The modern painter is no longer "realistic" in the old-fashioned sense, because the universe has taken on a different aspect of reality.

All the ancient gods have been questioned; some have been overthrown; and nothing has yet arisen to take their place. The chaos in the frame is, in its own way, a realistic reflection of the chaos in the mind of modern man.

## Almanac

By United Press International

Today is Monday, Sept. 23, the 208th day of 1963 with 99 to follow.

The moon is approaching first quarter.

The morning star is Jupiter.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Those born today include Augustus Caesar, the first Roman emperor, in 63 B. C.

On this day in history:

In 1779, the U. S. S. Bonhomme Richard, commanded by the American naval hero John Paul Jones, defeated the British frigate Serapis in a naval battle off the coast of Scotland.

In 1928, Jack Dempsey lost the heavyweight championship boxing title to Gene Tunney as 420,000 fans watched in Philadelphia.

In 1943, the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China established the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) to help war-liberated areas of the world.

In 1950, Congress adopted the Internal Security Act, providing for registration of Communists and their internment in times of emergency. President Truman had vetoed the act.