

Editorial Page

Vote 'NO' On Income Tax Measure

Despite the seemingly overwhelming flood of material supporting the 1963 legislative income tax program, we believe the people of the state should defeat the measure at the forthcoming October 15 election.

It may be an oversimplification, but we believe the reason for our position is simple: it is a bad tax bill.

In support of this contention, we offer these arguments:

—The measure bears most heavily on those least able to pay—the lower income citizens.

—The measure embodies a tax on a tax because it does not allow the deduction of federal income taxes.

—We can defer some of the programs outlined for implementation during this biennium.

—The law does not go far enough in distributing the costs of government among the whole population.

—There is considerable room for wondering if the sizeable tax hike embodied in the bill is necessary. While the Ways and Means Committee did an excellent job of scrutinizing and overhauling budget requests, we think there is still room for improvement. This is particularly true in state agency services and elementary education. We reiterate here our hope that higher education budgets will escape additional pruning if the measure is defeated.

—Rejection of the measure by the voters will serve to convince legislators and state officers that we do not favor instigation of

programs and services we are not in a position to pay for.

—Another argument—although admittedly not having anything to do with the merits of the measure itself—is the evident pressure that is being exerted for passage of the bill is a source of irritation and wonder. At least, one cannot help but wonder where all the money comes from for the flood of "YES" propaganda that crosses our desks. Postage, paper and handling of all of this material must call for a staggering expenditure. Much of this material is coming from the state offices and institutions which claim it is not possible for them to cut budgets, manpower and capital outlay. But this frenzied activity cannot help but produce some wonder of the validity of the claim.

There is considerable exchange of half-truths and distortions being carried on by partisans on both sides. But the simple fact remains that HB 1846 is a bad bill and deserves defeat by the voters.

One must admit that some inconvenience to state agencies and institutions will result from defeat. We think the heads and administrators of these various units at state and local level should have foreseen the inevitability of referral of the tax measure and its defeat, and planned their budgets accordingly. It is obvious the legislators considered referral when they appropriated a special fund to handle election expenses. Those who did not heed the warning might find themselves facing economic and administrative crises in the next biennium.

Regardless, we feel that now is the time to face up to reality.



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Solons Blame Kennedy

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

WASHINGTON — The Kennedy Administration stands accused of "gross deception" in winning Senate ratification of the partial nuclear test ban.

The charge is made by Rep. James Weaver, a member of the House Space and Astronautics Committee with access to top-secret information.

Weaver says administration censors deliberately withheld from senators information that would have jeopardized chances of treaty ratification.

During the Senate debate, South Carolina's Strom Thurmond charged the Soviet Union may have developed a "clean," fallout-free H-bomb. He referred to an unpublished Aug. 3 explosion at the South Pole that experts thought might have been a Soviet bomb.

Thurmond, a general in the army reserve, was flatly contradicted by Sen. John Pastore, ranking Democrat on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. The Antarctic report, said Pastore, was untrue.

One day after Senate ratification, reporter Earl Voss wrote in the Washington Star: "A mysterious explosion near the South Pole, estimated to have been 25 times more powerful than the Hiroshima atom bomb, has been detected by eight free world sta-

tions watching for unannounced nuclear tests."

The blast occurred Aug. 3. There was no fallout from the blast, leading experts to suggest the Soviet Union may have developed a clean bomb, according to Voss. Such a bomb, in the hands of the enemy, would radically alter the nuclear balance of power. Only atmospheric testing could develop such a weapon for the U.S.

Possession of clean bombs would mean uninterrupted atmospheric testing by the Soviets since fallout samples are presently the only proof that above-ground nuclear explosions have taken place.

The Aug. 3 blast was not the first. There have been five similar explosions since the Soviets began the use of the Antarctica for "peaceful scientific purposes" in 1960.

News of the South Pole explosion was deliberately withheld until Senate ratification of the test ban, an administration official told Voss.

Those reports were not the only ones to bear top-secret labels during Senate debate. "Missiles and Rockets," an authoritative trade publication, broke classification Sept. 9 to reveal:

"The Soviet Union may be developing an anti-ballistic missile system capable of deactivating U.S. missiles in their silos with

the electro-magnetic energy from exploding high-yield Soviet nuclear weapons.

"The Soviet lead in anti-ballistic missile development has been acknowledged even by administration supporters in the test ban debates. It is based on the long-range electronics of strong electro-magnetic pulses to cripple the electronics system of a missile so that it cannot be fired.

"It could mean the United States has invested billions of dollars in a Maginot Line of Atlas, Titans and Minutemen that could be rendered useless by the new Soviet development."

Earlier U.S. tests showed exploding bombs could throw out of orbit the U.S. second strike retaliatory system.

The 1958 Argus test series in the South Atlantic caused "dramatic and unpredictable trans-hemispheric electro-magnetic disturbances," according to one scientific report. The report said that a low-yield blast at 200 miles altitude caused intermittent failures in the "function of the North Atlantic coaxial cable and other critical defense systems."

Some scientists say explosions of high megaton bombs, which the Soviets possess and we don't, impact for distances of more than 1,000 miles. Thus, an explosion over Kansas could well affect weaponry throughout most of the continental U.S., perhaps nullifying our second-strike capability.

With a ban on atmospheric testing by this country we might not know—until it is too late.

Letters To The Editor

Rumor

There have been rumors that the Klamath case under the termination act in the United States Court of Claims (Docket No. 123-61) has been thrown out of court and only the claims brought by those members in the Anderson case (Docket 87-62) are now before that Court. I consulted with the Klamath tribal attorneys, Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, on Sept. 16, 1963, to clarify the uncertainty. I was advised that there is absolutely no truth to the rumors. Because the rumors have led to uncertainty and mistrust, I would like to have the following information published so as to truly inform all the Klamath members of the status of their claim.

Mrs. Marie Norris, 3305 Altamont Drive.

Increase

Even though we have sufficient referral signatures to place the State Income Tax Bill up to the voters on Oct. 15 I think we should go all the way to arouse the voters so all of them will

go to the polls on that date. For example: Under this bill a family of four earning \$1,000 will have a tax increase of 100 per cent; \$2,000 — 60 per cent; \$3,000 — 70 per cent; \$4,000 — 62 per cent, AND \$10,000 only 40 per cent. Plain to be seen just who it is intended to hook.

Then use my "tell them and sell them" plan, that is tell 10 or more persons, have them tell 10 or more and so on. Write your friends in other parts of the state to do likewise and in a very short time everyone will know what the score is. This applies especially to the home grounds of those who supported the bill. Your senator or representative can give you the list. I carry extra copies of the Greater Oregon paper and hand a copy to those who may be lukewarm or undecided and it has proven 100 per cent effective. It's high time that the money hungry chaps in Salem and the Hawaiian picnicers learn that we common folks aren't as dumb as they think we are.

Claude M. Hall, Sunny Valley, Ore.

Almanac

By United Press International Today is Wednesday, Oct. 9, the 282nd day of 1963 with 83 to follow.

The moon is at last quarter. The morning stars are Mercury and Jupiter.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

On this day in history:

In 1701, Yale College was founded.

In 1781, George Washington fired the first gun at the siege of Yorktown.

In 1838, a mail-carrying overland stagecoach reached St. Louis Mo., after a trip of 23 days and four hours from San Francisco.

In 1958, Pope Pius XII, the 261st pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church, died.

A thought for the day — The American president, James Monroe, said: "National honor is national property of the highest value."

'Don't Think I Stand Idly By — I Keep Asking Them Not To Do This'



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

Indonesia Tactics Dull U.S. Patience



By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent Newspaper Enterprise Assn. WASHINGTON (NEA) — The good feeling toward Indonesia that has pervaded Washington during the last year is about all gone.

In this past year: —Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy conducted a successful mission to Indonesia.

—Sargent Shriver got the first Peace Corpsmen admitted to Indonesia, and more have been asked for.

—American aid for volcanic eruption victims on Bali was effective and appreciated.

—President Sukarno's threat to confiscate American oil properties was settled with a 20-year agreement for 60 per cent of the profits.

—Sukarno reorganized his government, removed all Communists from top offices, and American aid officials began to work directly with ministers who could make decisions.

An economic stabilization plan to curb inflation was worked out and its first phases put into operation.

—An American economic mission planned a five-year, \$400 million aid program for Indonesia, half of it to come from the United States.

—Sukarno began to see he must have western aid to survive. When the Netherlands turned over West New Guinea to Indonesia for free—at U.S. and U.N. urging — Sukarno indicated this was the last of his expansionist dreams, for a time.

After initial protests, he agreed to join the Philippines in support of the new Federation of Malaysia—Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak and the rest of North Borneo. Now he has changed his mind and threatens war. And things are going from bad to worse.

Malaysia has replied with orders to build up its defense forces. But there are thousands of miles between the North Borneo frontiers. So any fighting will be with words or with jungle warfare.

Where Sukarno put himself in real trouble was by allowing the

British embassy in Jakarta to be sacked and by seizing British properties in Indonesia. There are still British garrisons in North Borneo, and both Australia and New Zealand have pledged support for Malaysia if it is attacked.

Indonesia has a 350,000-man army. It has received more than a billion dollars worth of arms aid from the Soviet bloc, including a cruiser, support ships, 20 submarines, 100 MIGs, some bombers and transports, radar and ground-to-air missiles.

Contrary to general belief, there has been no great American military aid to Indonesia. She bought some transports on credit. Some of her officers have been trained in the United States. Army engineers have trained Indonesians in road building.

In 18 years, Sukarno has solidified his own political position as the father of his country, having been elected president for life.

He claims to be a neutral, running a coalition of political parties. But the Indonesian Communist party—PKI—is the world's largest outside of Russia and Red China.

He has mismanaged the once-flourishing though war-torn economy inherited from the Dutch into near ruin. Today it cannot raise enough food for its 100 million people and must depend on imports.

There is galloping inflation. The official exchange rate of 45 rupiahs to the dollar has gone as high as 1,300 on the black market, but is now reported at around 850.

The United States has plowed \$750 million aid into Indonesia since it gained independence in 1945, trying to save it and build it up as a South Pacific bulwark.

But unless Sukarno backs down from his Malaysian defiance, future U.S. aid will be cut off. Funds already committed, like a \$17 million loan to get industries going, will be expended as agreed on.

Indonesia's balance-of-payments deficit is put at \$400 million a year. Its big creditors are the United States, West Germany, Japan, France and the International Monetary Fund, from which it wants more.



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

Moderates Lose Round

By WILLIAM S. WHITE WASHINGTON — An election just held in the Maryland town of Cambridge has delivered a cruel blow to the hopes of all moderates for a reasonable accommodation of the racial problems of this country.

It has also again illustrated the enormous difficulty of seeking solutions by law to the ethical question of discrimination in privately owned eating places.

By a 274-vote margin out of nearly 4,000 votes cast a proposed amendment to the city charter to desegregate lunch counters and restaurants was defeated. It was offered, reluctantly, by white moderates in an effort to end four months of race turmoil. And it was in fact rejected not by whites but by a partial Negro boycott of the voting booths ordered by a militant Negro leader, Mrs. Gloria Richardson.

Mrs. Richardson proclaimed that it was improper even to hold a referendum on what she called an "uncontroversial, unvotable, constitutional right" to eat where one chooses.

The mathematics of the thing, at any rate, were indeed incontrovertible. For only 40 per cent of the eligible Negroes cast their ballots as against 76 per cent of the whites. Incontrovertible, too, on the very face of the returns, was the fact that the Negroes could readily have had their ballot-box solution of their complaints if they had chosen to take it. For, again mathematically, they would have had, and did have, much white support.

The fate now of Cambridge—where white leaders with a century's tradition of segregation as a way of life had sought to meet the Negroes a good deal more than halfway by their lights—is not pleasant to contemplate. Nor is there any lack of sadness as the mayor of Cambridge, Calvin W. Mowbray, turns away in defeat from a brave and patient effort to lead his fellow whites to a tolerant settlement of the town's troubles with this weary comment: "We'll have to start all over again, so to speak."

But what is much sadder is the impact of this referendum on the whole issue over this nation. If white moderates, after months of persuading and pulling the immoderates along are in the end to be denied the practical means for racial peace even when offered in a full and fair election, where are they now to turn? And how many moderates will there be now, in a place like Cambridge?

These questions are of fundamental importance. For if the Negro militants now take the line that discrimination is not properly to be voted upon in Cambridge, how can it properly be voted on in the Congress of the United States? What happens, under this logic, even to the Kennedy Administration's civil rights bill demanded to placate the Negroes? The alternatives to voting solutions are—what? The permanent use of state or federal troops in a kind of continuous state of martial law, to open up lunch counters and restaurants

wherever they may be closed to Negroes? A constant stream of orders from the Supreme Court to the same effect?

It is, of course, obvious that Mrs. Richardson does not speak for all Negroes, and not even for all the more militant Negro leaders. Still, the history of this sad racial conflict is full of instances where one day's single extremism by one Negro leader has led to tomorrow's extremism among many Negro leaders—a fact that is well known to the administration itself and privately deplored.

It is arguable, moreover, that if the Constitution of the United States really forbids discrimination on all private property, Mrs. Richardson may be historically correct in her position. The Constitution, however, has not yet been so interpreted. And until and unless it has been so interpreted there is surely no evil in an attempt at an ordinarily democratic local solution—especially when that solution could readily have assured what was sought.

This columnist has spoken out against instances of white Southern extremism—most recently the Birmingham church-bombing—which bedevil any reasonable accommodation of a tragic issue. Is it not now time to consider Negro extremism? And is it not time to ponder whether the solution—wherever the question at issue is not an undoubted legal right, like the vote, but a most debatable right, like entry to private property—is, after all, really attainable only in the hearts of men?



WASHINGTON CALLING . . .

Goldwater Boom Spurts

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON — The Goldwater balloon is going up so fast that it is almost out of sight of this fogbound capital. The propulsion comes from many sources, not the least of which is the senator's own driving power fed by the growing conviction of his followers that he is the man of destiny.

Euphoria is the only word to describe the atmosphere being created around the country in the Goldwater-for-President movement. The true believers have ceased to count the number of delegate votes necessary to give their hero the Republican nomination. Taking that for granted, they are now counting the electoral votes that will give him victory over President Kennedy.

To some of the pros in the party this seems a bit premature. They can see several dangers in the early inflation of the Goldwater boom. One obviously is timing. There will be so many months for the opposition—in both parties—to center fire on the balloon as the full light of publicity falls on it. Up until quite recently almost no one, including the senator, took the presidential boom seriously.

But a greater danger lies in the maneuver which Goldwater seems to be undertaking. His critics, and even some of his friendly backers, believe he is trying to make a 180-degree turn while steaming full speed ahead. That is to say, having gone on record over the past 12 years with forthright, not to say extreme, views on almost every issue of foreign and domestic policy, he is presently engaged in revising and downgrading those views.

Goldwater does not see it in that light. As he put it to me in a brief talk sandwiched into his crowded schedule, no one up until now has paid very much attention to what he has said. When they examine his views they do not find them as "crack-pottery" as they had been made out.

He says with the disarming smile that is part of his charm that he does not hold that consistency is a virtue. The senator might have added that it is a luxury no politician can afford. A thick book at the top of the best seller list (JFK: The Man and the Myth) was written to be all things to all men. In this same department the most careful job done thus far on Goldwater is by Congressional Quarterly in a report putting his

record, his statements and his votes alongside an interview updating his position on important issues.

The embrace of the extreme right is another and even more threatening hazard to the Goldwater candidacy. This was brought into sharp focus by what happened in California the other day.

Robert Gaston, head of the California Young Republicans, made a violent speech in Salinas attacking many Republican leaders and calling Democrats "thieves, crooks, liars and trash." General Eisenhower "destroyed the Republican Party," the United Nations was "nothing but a gigantic Communist front." He welcomed the support of the John Birch Society. When he took his stand on principles and someone asked him to define them, his advice was to read Goldwater's books and they would learn.

But he brought his audience up cheering when he said "the answer in '64 is Goldwater." "Talk to your neighbor," said this fiery ultra, "if he doesn't like it ram it down his throat."

When the speech was called to Goldwater's attention, he wrote a letter of sober rebuke to Gaston. While he differed on most issues with Democrats, he said, they were not thieves, liars and

crooks. Nor could you ram anything down anyone's throat. The Arizona senator made it plain he did not agree with most of the extreme views of the young Republican leader.

The incident illustrates only too clearly his problem in holding out extremists who gave him idolatry just this side of downright worship. Goldwater has criticized Robert Welch, suggesting he should be removed as head of the John Birch Society. But he has praised Birchite members as good citizens whom he knows in his own community.

What the ultras could do for Goldwater—if it came in late December, a month before he has promised to make an official pronouncement on whether he is a candidate, it would be the finest possible Christmas present—would be to repudiate him as a traitor to his past. They are not likely to do that. They have too big a stake in him and his candidacy is too attractive.

Defying all the rules in the rule book, the Goldwater boom will go down as one of the most remarkable phenomena in America's political history. He is of Jewish origin. He comes from a state with only four electoral votes. He is on the record with extreme views on almost every issue. Yet there it is—big as life and twice as natural.



STRICTLY PERSONAL.

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Is the Negro a man, or is he not a man? This is the root question that the times have put to us, and we must answer it unequivocally. For this is, at bottom, what the current race conflict is all about.

Either the Negro is a full-fledged human being, and a complete American citizen, or he is less than a human being and incapable of citizenship.

If we believe the first, the Negro must be assured of all his civil and legal and human rights. If we believe the second, the Negro should be stripped of citizenship and made a ward of the state. No middle course is possible.

Most Americans, on both sides of the issue, refuse to face this central point. The Negro should be treated just like everyone else—no better, no worse—or else he should be confined to a reservation, returned to Africa, or sent back to slavery.

Any other "solution" is just hypocrisy and foolishness, and only postpones the ultimate day of reckoning. Is the Negro a man, or is he not a man? Once we answer this question honestly, all the other answers will fall into place, painfully but surely.

I happen to believe he is a man (though grievously flawed by centuries of abuse), created by the same God who created the rest of

us. To treat him any differently is, to my mind an act of profound impiety.

Those who think otherwise should not make concessions they do not believe in. They should not hide behind the deception of "separate but equal" schools or any such other mumbo-jumbo. They should frankly ask that the Negro be assigned to a sub-human status in our society.

If we do not think the Negro is a man, we should both ignore his "rights" and absolve his "responsibilities." If he cannot live anywhere, work anywhere, eat anywhere, go to school anywhere—then he should not be asked to pay taxes, to fight for his country, to give his time, his labor or his loyalty to enterprises in which he cannot fully share.

The white man has made the Negro what he is, and has kept him where he is. Nobody knows how far the Negro can go up, because he has never had the chance; we only know how far he can go down—and it frightens us terribly—because we have pushed him down. We have refused to let him live decently, and then we accuse him of the sin of indecency.

Do we think the Negro is a man or not a man? We can no longer squirm and back away from this crucial question. For already having postponed it so long, either answer we decide upon will bring anguish to millions.

BERRY'S WORLD



"Another astronaut to see you, Mr. Getty. He wants to know how much you want for 'your little place here!'"

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What was the original purpose of the Mason and Dixon Line?

A—It was surveyed by Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon in the 18th Century to settle territorial disputes between the proprietors of Maryland and Pennsylvania.