

# Editorial Page

## First Moon Stage Is Greater Trust

Sober second thoughts on President Kennedy's proposal for a joint U.S.-Soviet moon venture suggest that the immediate fruits, if any, are likely to be limited to the diplomatic field.

It may be, in other words, a way of measuring the intentions and attitudes of the two great powers at a time when, for reasons not wholly clear, certain halting steps are being tried toward a thaw in the cold war.

We now know what we did not know when the President included this proposal in his United Nations speech: a Russian scientist broached the idea of a joint moon trip in a September talk with NASA's deputy administrator Hugh Dryden.

The President later communicated with Soviet Premier Khrushchev to learn whether the scientist was speaking for the Kremlin.

Kennedy's decision to include this matter in the speech evidently was a last-minute choice. That he did so surely is a convincing sign of our earnestness in the search for means of easing East-West tensions. Moscow can hardly be unimpressed.

Viewed practically, however, the moon proposal is at this moment a much more dubious proposition. Space specialists studying the notion since the President put it forward make a number of points.

They think it would slow down rather than speed up the great rocket leap to the moon.

Our space officials and engineers—operating just within the limits set by our own space technology—often argue for months and even years over various vital technical

alternatives. The general feeling is that to weave together American and Soviet techniques might take far longer.

They do not say such technical co-operation would be impossible, only that it would be extremely difficult and require a maximum amount of mutual good will.

All the problems involved would be more complicated rather than less.

As small examples, there are the language barrier and the fact we and the Russians do not use the same system of measurement.

Our specialists move from this a far bigger obstacle. Much space technology remains secret military information, since it is obviously impossible to separate many of the technical factors involved in space flight.

The question therefore arises how we can expect to achieve without first lowering major military barriers through some plan of disarmament.

That presumes a level of U.S.-Soviet collaboration and an easing of the crisis mood which goes far beyond the limited test ban treaty undertaken as a shaky first step.

The fact that the President made the proposal for a joint moon trip may help to increase mutual trust and confidence between two great powers caught for long years in dangerous conflict around the globe.

Yet, ironically, the proposal's practical worth may depend on our first attaining a much greater level of trust and confidence than now exists.

Whether that can be managed is really the central question.

## "Well, We're Not Fanatics About Saving Money"



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

## No Time For Cutting Back National Spirit

WASHINGTON—Another October finds an immense change in the American mood from that of October of a year ago when we stood at the brink of nuclear war over Cuba.

Determination and sensible fear sensibly suppressed; but determination above all—these were in the American mind. The new October has arrived with anxiety largely gone and a new and understandable, but also largely unsupported, hope and optimism hanging over most of the nation.

We were right a year ago to stand fast as a country in settled resolve to meet unavoidable peril in the spirit of men prepared to die rather than surrender, even though happily the dice of history turned our way instead of against us.

But we are wrong now, as it seems to me, in having rushed over, in a single twelvemonth, from the thick but notably rational gloom of October, 1962, to the very nearly irrational, best-of-all-possible-worlds attitude prevalent in October, 1963.

The partial nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union, though a defensible enterprise and though just possibly some herald of a true easing in the cold war, has not yet either ended that war or given any assurance whatever of the identity of its eventual winner.

From much that is happening now, however, one might suppose that if the worst was not already past, then a good bit of the worst was in sight of being over. So we talk happily of wheat sales to the Russians—an appealing notion no less to hard-line conservatives than to soft-line liberals, for conservatives are traders and trade is an honorable underpinning of the very capitalist system itself.

We talk of cutting back on our multibillion-dollar space program—and this is good to hear by both sets for different reasons. The conservatives naturally would like to save the money. The liberals have long been resentful at those billions being set aside for the moon when it all might be spent on dozens of earthly welfare schemes hatched or in incubation.

But wheat deals with the Russians, no matter how momentarily helpful to our farm supplies undeniably strengthen the Russians where they are weak. Have we waited for 17 years for this weak spot in our dash in now to fill it—about, apparently, demanding anything in return save the price of the wheat itself?

And should we really reduce the space appropriation even though it is quite true that the

Every child knows that stagnant waters become poisonous, but we fail to apply the same consequences to stagnant minds; unless the mind is permitted to circulate freely and is continually renewed from fresh sources, it becomes not merely dull but positively toxic.

Imposture fails when it most succeeds: the man who has fooled absolutely everybody must be the most lonesome and wretched creature on earth; for the true self must be shared in order to experience any joy.

Grave and prudent deliberations about marriage generally don't fare any better than hasty decisions, as Samuel Rogers remarked a long time ago: "It doesn't much signify whom one marries, for one is sure to find out next morning that it was someone else."

What is it totally impossible to know from even the most intense readings in history is whether people in remoter ages were as happy as we, happier or less so; all such statements are guesswork.

A thought for the day—The English novelist, Jane Austen, said: "Those who do not complain are never pitted."

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Late? I couldn't resist a smile last night when I read a front page spread in your paper about District Attorney Dale Crabtree's warning that his office would "prosecute gambling whenever and wherever it may be found." Why warn them?

Anti-gambling laws were in effect the day Mr. Crabtree took his office to prosecute all violations against the State of Oregon. Is he telling us now that he has violated this oath for the past few years regarding gambling?

Anyone who is interested must know that card games, punch boards, and so forth have flourished in this town for the past months and years, and surely the District Attorney is not so naive that he was not aware of this situation. Why this sudden good example to our youth?

Upstate, I have heard many times that in Klamath Falls the law will be on your neck for a bad check, speeding, or over parking, but this is the place to commit your crimes of violence. Why worry about a cake walk when the major crimes aren't too vigorously prosecuted?

Organized gambling is a vicious thing and it brings hardships to many homes. Violators should be severely punished. However, harmless fun night games that most schools, clubs, and churches plan for charity won't breed any Al Capones. When money was being raised for the new hospital last year, some of it was raised by so-called lotteries. If Mr. Crabtree was so all-fired righteous, why did he allow that? Why now all of a sudden?

Ben Dettzel

## Concerned

All this lovey-dovey over communism that I hear lately from Washington is beginning to scare me.

While Dictator Khrushchev (not Premier Khrushchev as used in Washington) talks about peaceful co-existence, I hear that the word has been changed to peaceful cooperation.

Many people seem to forget that the Sino-Soviet split was only on how they would further spread their ideology over the world (U.S. included) whether it be by the atomic bomb or by Khrushchev's cancerous growth that spreads its tentacles into everything that freedom stands for. The ultimate result is the same.

Now I hear that we are going to ship wheat to them. Dictator Khrushchev put all of his men and money into atomic bombs and space achievements to make a big spectacular propaganda show for the world to see. But his domestic achievements seem to be falling behind. Now I suppose that good old Uncle Sam will pitch in and help him out. Dictator Khrushchev says that he'll even pay for it. That's a switch!

I wish that all of you would turn to radio station KJAD at 6 p.m. for a few evenings and listen to some documented facts that are aired. Just another person who hates to see our freedom slip slowly away.

Charles F. Bridges, 6611 Alva Avenue.

## STRICTLY PERSONAL



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Purely Personal Prejudices: It's a puzzling and fascinating correlation, but has anyone noticed that it's the insensitive people who always drop in for a visit at the most inopportune times, who are the most sensitive about being slighted or treated with less than regal hospitality at such times?

Speaking of history, it is an arrogant mistake to assume that our age can be understood by us if past ages are not—just as an adult cannot be fathomed without penetrating into his childhood; or, as Ortega so felicitously put it: "The song of history can only be sung as a whole."

Taken all in all, if a man is dull he is considered "decent," even though he merely lacks the courage of his fantasies.

The greatest danger to society does not come from demagogues who lie to others, but from fanatics who lie to themselves; thus, self-deception is the most serious of human flaws, and all genuine social reform must begin with individual insight, or it becomes corrupted and ineffectual. (If Hitler, for instance, had been simply a politician, and not a psychopath who believed his delusions, the German people could not have been enticed into such mass folly masquerading as "reform.")

The principal difference between the wise man and the fool—and perhaps the only real difference—is that the former learns from the mistakes of others, while the latter learns, slowly and painfully, only from his own mistakes. If at all.

It is much easier to hold to a negative than to a positive position; for every one person who knows what he stands for, a hundred know only what they are against—and can orient themselves only in opposition to something.



## EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . . Nothing Consistent About U.S. Policies

By PETER EDSON

Washington Correspondent Newspaper Enterprise Assn. WASHINGTON (NEA) — If you're a little fuzzy on just what U.S. foreign and domestic policies are at the moment, don't let it worry you and wait a minute.

All programs are subject to change without notice and you may have to unlearn everything new you learn, substituting for it something newer.

This has happened half a dozen times on big issues in the last fortnight. As Al Smith said, "Let's look at the record!"

1. As of mid-September, you could write it in boxcar letters that the United States was committed to getting a man on the moon before the Russians and never mind the cost.

Then the President spoke at the United Nations and surprised everyone in his administration by saying that the United States and Russia should cooperate in space to save money.

2. Until recently, it was American policy to have no trade with Communist countries—except Yugoslavia and Poland—if it would do them any good.

But today deals are cooking to sell surplus wheat not only to Russia but also to the satellites and maybe even Red China. Even Congress seems to be going along on this.

3. Since the test ban treaty was signed, there has been a move on in Washington to cut down U.S. forces in Europe because Russia was being so friendly they wouldn't be needed.

West German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder made a hurried visit to Washington, however, and then it was announced in Bonn that the U.S. would not cut European forces.

4. All summer long, the Kennedy administration has insisted it wanted both a tax cut bill and a civil rights bill enacted this year. But after the last White House conference with congressional leaders, they announced that civil rights should come first and that

if Congress couldn't pass a tax cut this year, it would have a running start on next year.

A few hours later this was changed to read that the administration still wanted both this year.

5. Ever since the 1960 campaign, Kennedy has maintained that he was opposed to the AFL-CIO plan for a 30-hour work week to increase employment.

Resting at Palm Springs after a strenuous, overtime non-political work week campaigning for reelection, the President announced, "We're going to find the work week reduced."

6. On foreign aid, the policy of cracking down on friendly countries that become unfriendly is now so confused you can't make heads or tails of it. Take these cases:

—Indonesia gets in a row with Britain and the new Federation of Malaysia. The U.S. cuts off further aid to Indonesia. This fits the pattern of announced policy.

—When President Ngo Dinh Diem of Viet Nam—or more specifically his brother and sister-in-law—began to upset U.S. policies in Southeast Asia and make dirty cracks about American second lieutenants, congressmen demanded that aid be suspended. But it wasn't.

—When Dominican Republic generals gave a heave-ho to Juan Bosch—the first democratically elected president to be supported by the U.S. since 1924—aid was promptly cut off and American ambassador John Bartlo Martin was called home.

But now the Dominican military junta has issued a strong statement in support of U.S. opposition to Fidel Castro's Cuba. So the betting is about even that the new provisional government will soon be back on the dole, if a proposed Senate investigation doesn't stop it.

These are only a few of many examples.

The whole situation adds up to irrevocable, iron-clad policy with a built-in, two-way stretch to give it flexibility.



## WASHINGTON REPORT . . . Book Lashes Change In Kennedy Attitude

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

WASHINGTON—If man is by nature a political animal, as Aristotle once observed, then John Fitzgerald Kennedy must be King of the Jungle.

This is the central theme of a wildly controversial new book, among the nation's best sellers, which could well exert a significant influence on the outcome of the 1964 Presidential election.

"JFK: The Man and the Myth" is a critical portrait of our President, the work of veteran newsman Victor Lasky. Republican strategists are so optimistic that they think Lasky's book will have as great an effect on the voting populace as did Harriet Beecher Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

That book turned millions of Northerners against slavery and, historians say, may have helped touch off the Civil War.

But GOP National Chairman Bill Miller is probably right when he says the Lasky book may well deal a major blow to the Kennedy chances for re-election.

More than 100,000 copies have been sold so far and Lasky's publisher, the Macmillan Company, expects to peddle more than a quarter million by November, 1964.

In his meticulously documented, 833-page opus, Lasky probes the political mind of a President who hires crowd psychologists to analyze the screams of teen-age girls at Kennedy rallies, of a President who as a Representative told a Harvard audience in 1950 that he:

a. could see no reason why we were fighting in Korea;

b. thought sooner or later we would "have to get all these foreigners off our backs";

c. supported the McCarran Act and thought not enough had been done about Communists in government;

d. respected Joe McCarthy and thought he "knew Joe pretty well, and he may have something";

e. had no great respect for Dean Acheson or indeed any member of the Truman Administration;

f. was personally happy that Richard Nixon had defeated Helen Gahagan Douglas for U.S. Senator in California in 1950.

Lasky tells of the Kennedy flip-flop, a guaranteed vote-winning maneuver.

In 1960, Richard Nixon was described by John Kennedy as a hatchet man, taking the "low road" in his campaign for the presidency. Ten years earlier, Kennedy had personally delivered a campaign check for \$1,000 to Nixon's office. The story, originally uncovered by Robert W. Richards, ace Washington correspondent for the San Diego Union,

has never been denied by Kennedy.

—In 1963, foes of foreign aid are attacked as shortsighted, irresponsible politicians of the partisan right. Reporting on a Far East "inspection trip" in 1959, Rep. Kennedy ripped into the principle of foreign aid, saying: "The vision of a bottle of milk for every Hottentot is a nice one, but it is not only beyond our grasp, it is beyond our reach."

—In 1960, a review of Richard Rovere's biography of Joe McCarthy appeared in the Washington Post. Author: John Kennedy, who ripped McCarthy as a weatherman responsible for an ominous climate of fear throughout the country. He was not so outspoken when McCarthy's popularity was high, particularly in Catholic Massachusetts.

A campaign contribution from father Joe Kennedy to Senator Joe McCarthy was meant to keep McCarthy from endorsing Kennedy's opponent in the 1952 Senatorial race, Republican Henry Cabot Lodge.

Kennedy wrapped himself in McCarthy's cloak by stating: "This is the tragic story of China, whose freedom we once sought to preserve. What our strong men have saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away."

He lashed out at "the Lattimore and Fairbanks" for losing China. He and McCarthy were more than colleagues. The Wisconsin solon spent long times in the company of Kennedy and his father in Florida, Massachusetts, and Washington.

When vote on the censure of McCarthy came, Kennedy was in the hospital. Even after he returned to the Senate, Kennedy refused to say how he would have voted.

There are other issues on which Kennedy has taken every possible position: rural electrification, TVA, economy in government, federal aid to church schools, governmental encroachments on enterprise, the B-70 bomber, Cuba and the Cuban exiles, Laos and summit conferences, to mention a few.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—When was the U.S. Military Academy opened at West Point? A—July 4, 1802.

Q—In what book of the Bible is there reference to a man's name adding up to the number 666? A—This is found in the 13th chapter of the Book of Revelation.

## IN WASHINGTON . . .

### Britain's Socialist Heirs



By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Harold Wilson, the prime minister of Britain's "shadow cabinet," has already received the blessing of the Kennedy Administration. To hear New Frontier ideologues talk, he is the greatest British invention since the Spillfire. And it has been made known by the White House circle that it likes Mr. Wilson and admires his brilliance.

Brilliant he is, but there are aspects to his character and to his program which, it might be assumed, would give our leaders a certain amount of concern.

Barring a tremendous reversal of public opinion in Great Britain, Mr. Wilson and his Labor Party will take over the government at the next election. And with them comes a new foreign policy that will make France's Charles de Gaulle look like an American stooge. For what Mr. Wilson is quietly working for is a "grand coalition" of socialist governments which will edge the United States out of Europe and set up a neutralist counterforce to the so-called Western alliance.

The British Labor Party is counting on a victory by the Socialist Mayor of Berlin, Willy Brandt, who is off and running for Chancellor Adenauer's job. Few are certain of Herr Brandt's electoral future now that the Christian Democrats have begun to show sudden new energy. But Mr. Wilson believes that an Anglo-German bloc can pin the tail on Uncle Sam's donkey.

As of this writing, he has not yet gotten Mayor Brandt's assent to see eye to eye with the Labor Party's open support for the demilitarization of Central Europe. Being somewhat closer to the Communists than Mr. Wilson's Cloud Nine, they are more practical.

Although you will never read this in State Department handouts, "shadow prime minister" Wilson is disposed to pull his country out of the NATO alliance and to come to a bilateral agreement with the Soviet Union on such matters as atomic control (the British socialists tend to a policy of unilateral disarmament disguised as a step toward the "relaxation of tensions.") Mr. Wilson argues that by maintaining its nuclear force, Great Britain has lost its independence—one of those zany twists of logic which these days pass for statesmanship.

The socialism that Mr. Wilson triumphantly sees as "sweeping Europe" will create a new climate of hostility to the United States. By insisting on the recognition of the Communist regime in East Germany, it will cause strife among the NATO powers. And it will bestow upon these nations swept away by his tide the kind of economic "solutions" to problems that almost bankrupted the British in the postwar years.

That Mr. Wilson, like much of the British Labor leadership since the death of "shadow prime minister" Hugh Gaitskell, is pretty starchy about Americans can hardly be considered a secret in official Washington. That the State Department knows where he stands on issues affecting our security is also fact. Yet by beaming at his every word, the administration seems to be offering its support and undercutting Prime Minister Macmillan in highly dubious fashion.

The State Department also knows that Mr. Wilson frowns on the Western alliance as a consolidation of military power against the Soviet colossus. This,

to the fussy Laborites, is a reactionary attitude. The sole value of the alliance, they and Mr. Wilson believe, is as a debating society which can arrive at "understandings" with the Soviets.

What the ambitious and ironic Harold Wilson will do to Britain's economy is another question. He is already talking of ushering in the age of automation by a vast "planning" program which will "create ten million new jobs" in the next years. If he means an expansion of the bureaucracy, he may succeed. But no government has yet been able to spur the growth of the economy by "creating" jobs. Employment rises for a complex of factors, but government spending, as we are finding out, is the costliest method and the one least likely to succeed.

Great Britain's economy is Great Britain's problem, not ours. But Great Britain's foreign policy directly affects the United States. The spread of socialist governments, led by a hostile Britain, means only trouble for the U.S.—and it can be the signal to the Soviets to put aside their jolly "peaceful co-existence" for a new version of Stalin's adventurism.

## BERRY'S WORLD

