

Editorial Page

Tax Cut? - Ho Hum!

The progress of President Kennedy's \$11-billion tax cut measure through Congress has been curious at almost every stage. It never really has had the popular steam behind it that one might expect for the most sweeping tax reduction plan in a generation or more.

To be sure, it has passed the House. And it would very likely win a favorable Senate vote if it could, in 1963, get past the roadblocks of hostile committee chairmen and time-consuming civil rights legislation.

But if the public clamor had been great enough the tax bill could well have become law long before this. It never developed.

One can hardly believe that the idea of having more money in the wallet has lost appeal for the American citizen.

If he is as money-hungry as often pictured by his detractors at home and abroad, why did he not beat on the lawmakers' doors to demand passage of the massive cut?

The answers can be only tentative.

For one thing, the real administration argument for the tax reduction is subtle and complex. The citizen, acting through his representatives, is asked to approve cuts which will materially increase the federal deficit—in order to increase prosperity and thereby multiply jobs.

But in the ordinary mind deficits and prosperity do not go together. There is no sign the Kennedy administration has sold this notion effectively. It is easy to believe the opponents of the bill made real headway with arguments that reduction has to be linked

with comparable cuts in federal spending. Sophisticated specialists in public finance keep saying that a government budget is nothing like a family budget, and therefore that it is foolish to insist that the same kind of careful balancing is required in the public sphere.

Here again, however, the feeling grows that this idea is not widely accepted or perhaps understood by the general public. The fine-spun theories of public finance experts seem apart from the everyday budget realities of the average citizen.

It is possible that among those citizens—and lawmakers—who can follow the administration argument without difficulty there are some who just don't think it is realistic.

They may believe that the cut won't stimulate the economy as suggested. Or they may feel that the steadily rising cost of government makes a climb out of a projected deeper deficit though very unlikely even after several years have passed.

On top of all these conjectures must be added another. The hurt to the economy from persisting unemployment is neither great enough nor sufficiently widespread to affect personally more than a fair percentage of the American people. Millions and millions have steady employment. To them the whole tax cut plan may seem not only unwise but unnecessary.

Somehow amid these speculations lies an explanation for the oddity that in 1963 the biggest tax cut proposed in many moons has stirred almost no popular excitement.

Shorter (Or Any) Work Week?

(The Christian Science Monitor)

When President Kennedy in California remarked that as a result of automation "we're going to find the workweek reduced," he was observing a trend at variance with his administration's own official policy.

He has resisted demands of organized labor for a less than 40-hour workweek, feeling that this is not the way to solve the nation's production problems. Yet he and others have seen the 35-hour week introduced in certain special situations without adamant employer objections.

And last week there came from the United States Labor Department a study which indicated that rising productivity, through mechanization and other technological change, is eliminating nearly 200,000 factory workers' jobs each year, besides others lost through declining output.

It is a tricky question whether shortening of hours would result in automatic spreading of jobs to more people. In many cases it gives impulse to more automation and further reduction of employment.

For many among the more than a million new workers coming into the American labor force each year the question is not how many hours a week they will work but whether they will have a workweek at all. Thousands of youths, some with families, would like not only to get on the seniority ladder but to be hired long enough to qualify for compensation if laid off.

Automation and productivity unquestionably are booms in the long run. But a high order of invention is called for in devising education, management, and personnel policies that will distribute their benefits to a widening rather than narrowing proportion of the population.



WASHINGTON CALLING . . .

Extreme Right Subsidy?

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON — To a friend and long-time associate who called on him the other day President Kennedy unbundled himself with considerable bitterness on the subject of top-bracket taxpayers and the tax exemption they use to spread propaganda of the extreme right.

The President, as the friend recalled the conversation, talked about two men, each of whom is often referred to as "the richest man in the world." One was J. Paul Getty, an oil man who spends most of his time in England where he owns a large estate and gives lavish parties. According to the President, Getty's net worth is over a billion dollars.

The second was the Dallas, Tex., oil man, H. L. Hunt, who is rated in the billionaire class. Both, according to the President, paid minuscule amounts in federal income tax last year. These are the men, the President went on, who through various forms of tax exemption and special tax allowances are able to subsidize the ultra-right on television, radio and in print.

However exact the President's figures may have been—income tax returns are by law a closely guarded secret—there is no doubt that the right-wing view is heavily subsidized. On radio and television stations across the country free taped programs are run daily assailing the United Nations, attacking the graduated income tax, foreign aid, Social Security and the other favorite hates of the extreme right.

One of the biggest tax benefits oil men enjoy is the 27 1/2 percent allowance for a wasting asset. In the tax message he sent up in January the President

proposed a sharp reduction in this benefit, which has been extended to cover a long list of minerals. The tax bill passed by the House makes a minor change in the calculation of a wasting asset.

But the reform the President proposed was largely jettisoned and along with it most of the other reforms included in the Presidential tax package. Whether the tax bill will be passed at all this year is increasingly doubtful since the House took until the first of October and Chairman Harry F. Byrd of the Senate finance committee is an adroit deferrer.

With the '64 election at hand the right wing is prepared to go all out to defeat Kennedy. The question of where "education," as defined by the tax law, stops and political propaganda begins becomes all important. The most persistent critic of the use of tax exemption for political propaganda has been Sen. Maurice Neuberger (D., Ore.).

She has made Hunt one of her principal targets, charging him with anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic and "even anti-Protestant" National Council of Churches' propaganda. In a Senate speech the soft-spoken lady from Oregon put Hunt's wealth at \$1 billion and his annual income at "around \$50 million."

"You would think," she said, "that a man with \$1 billion at his disposal and an active spleen would be willing to finance his own propaganda warfare. But Hunt prefers to let the federal government assume a substantial portion of his political crusades."

Hunt Oil Company and its food-processing and canning division, the ILLH Parade Company — commercially sponsor Lifeline propaganda throughout the country. Of course, commercial advertising expenditures are treated as a business expense and deducted from the company's income before taxes. Hunt's expressed goal is to see the \$1 billion which American business spends on advertising annually devoted to the sponsorship of right-wing propaganda.

At Senator Neuberger's urging the Bureau of Internal Revenue has begun an investigation of tax-exempt foundations to determine whether they are straying from the "charitable and educational" limits of tax deductibility into political propaganda. While this is a difficult undertaking, particularly since the lists of organizations rated eligible for exemption is as thick as a medium-size telephone book, several foundations have already been told to show why their exemption should not be removed. They have been found to be spreading propaganda rather than education.

Is it propaganda to agitate every day for the goals of the ultra-right and to intimate that anyone who disagrees is a Communist or the next thing to it? Does this help a political party or a particular candidate? Or is it in fact "education?"

Congress has directed several investigations at the foundations, one aimed to show they were sources of left-wing propaganda, another more recently suggesting they were tax havens. Enormous benefits to the nation flow out of philanthropy grounded in tax deduction. A tragedy would be if this were perverted and destroyed for selfish political reasons.

'Harry, I Don't Think You're Going To Like This One Any Better'



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Goldwater Leading In New Hampshire

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

MANCHESTER, N.H. — The distance from Washington to this New Hampshire city is not very great in miles. But as the plane begins to descend, the flaming foliage of autumn looms up like a multi-colored sea. The houses along the lightly-traveled road from airport to town are prosperous-looking, with a surprising number of two-car garages. The center of the city, like most of its counterparts throughout much of the once-heavily industrialized New England area, would win no prizes for civic beauty. And the predominant topic of conversation as this is written concerns a municipal primary in which nine candidates seek the nominations of both parties.

Yet New Hampshire may be the state in which the fate of New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller and Senator Barry Goldwater can be decided. How this state, which leads the other forty-nine in declaring its Presidential preference, casts its vote will be of prime significance to the politicians and the political analysts. The winds of March in this granitic state can blow away the hopes of one or the other of these two Republican Presidential aspirants.

A walk down the street in Manchester tells more of the shifting tides of population, voting strength, and ethnic makeup than any study of statistics. This is no longer flinty New England territory, drawing a Puritan tradition from its English past. The names on shop windows and the accents heard in passing are as frequently as not French Canadian. In any Democratic-Republican struggle, this breaks the comfortable monopoly so long held by the Grand Old Party. Like the rest of northern New England, New Hampshire is becoming a two-party state—a process accelerated by the hickering and backbiting of rival factions.

This influx of Democratic influence has had its effects on the voting patterns of the Republicans. At one time, Dartmouth was the "liberal" center of the state, but the professors buttered no parsnips where the rest of the population was concerned. Now, with the strong leadership of the late Senator Styles Bridges holding the state in line, what may be called "Rockefeller Republicanism" has made itself felt. The Dartmouth whisper has grown louder—perhaps because "Who Else But Nelse" is an alumnus of that institution of higher learning.

On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that New Hampshire, in 1960, effectively torpedoed the "dump Nixon" campaign by giving him a whopping and unprecedented write-in vote in the March primary. Vice presidential candidates are hardly the concern of the voters before convention time, but there was enough conservative sentiment — this was before Mr. Nixon had begun to waver — and organization determination to change a routine endorsement of President Eisenhower into a meaningful political demonstration.

New Hampshire has the experts believe, changed since that day, but not enough to give Governor Rockefeller any real hope. At first glance, and this impression may change after further contact with political leaders, political experts, and political reporters, Senator Goldwater is well ahead in this state. Governor Rockefeller's remarriage, unpleasant memories of the way he left his supporters leading the big law is 1959

when he declared himself out of the contest, and a "he doesn't have a chance" psychology have so far worked against the governor.

There is, of course, evidence that Mr. Rockefeller still intends to make the old college try. If money and poll takers can do it, he may yet rise like the phoenix from the ashes of his burnt-out political career. But he must win big here to survive, whereas Senator Goldwater can take a setback and still surge ahead in other primaries. He is aided now by the fact that he is a new face in the Presidential scene. Governor Rockefeller has been huffing and puffing since early 1959 without being able to set his bandwagon to rolling. The Loch-invar come out of the Southwest, to put it somewhat coyly, is a topic of conversation and the subject of considerable interest—a great asset.

All of this is, obviously, very previous. With the frost not yet on 1963's pumpkin, the weeks and months stretch out ahead before New Hampshire steps into the limelight of its Presidential primary. Much can happen to Senator Goldwater—or to Governor Rockefeller, for that matter. But it remains true that, as New Hampshire goes, so go the political pundits.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

A man I know who prides himself on being "hip" was having coffee with me when another man entered the restaurant and nodded at my companion. The man I was with barely acknowledged his greeting.

"What's the matter, don't you like him?" I asked. The man shrugged. "I hardly know him," he said, "but he looks awfully square to me—the way he dresses and parts his hair, and those rimless eyeglasses. Man!"

"That's a strange attitude for you to take," I commented. "It seems to me that you're behaving just like the squares you detest."

"What do you mean?" he looked at me suspiciously. "How come?"

"Well," I said, "what you people most dislike about the squares is the fact that they pigeon-hole life, they compartmentalize everything, and have smug easy answers to difficult questions. Right?"

"Right," he admitted, still gazing at me mistrustfully.

"If a square," I went on, "sees a man with a beard, he immediately classifies him as a 'beatnik.' If a square sees a person dressed a certain way, he allows that surface impression to influence his opinion and attitude, and doesn't even try to know what the individual himself is like. Right again?"

"Check," he said. "And so what?"

"And so this," I continued. "You're doing the very same thing, only with a reversed image. You see a man dressed a certain way and you immediately think of him as a 'button-down jerk.' You think in broad categories, too, rather than in terms of individuals. To you, anybody is a square who doesn't resemble you in dress, habits and mannerisms—even though such people may be only superficially conforming."

Rebuff

I wish to thank the Herald and News for choosing to believe that the article, "House Okays 'House-keeping' Bills But Not Until After Family Fight" worthy of front page interest. I just trust that the people of Klamath Falls took the time to read it through once and then a second time and that they will manage the time to sit down while it is fresh in their minds to write their congressmen. It is deplorable the way our tax money continues to be squandered promiscuously by those elected to office and there, supposedly, to function in our best interests.

For those of you who overlooked reading this article, the House members are busy voting in \$1.2 million for their trips, investigations and official expenses. Among items approved was an added \$600 "stationery" allowance, which boosts to \$2,400 a year each of our 435 House members may spend at the Capitol stationery store. This store boasts of such items as Christmas cards, leather goods and pen sets (fine Christmas gifts). Also, if our congressman does not find a need for the full \$2,400 during the year, he may draw the balance in cash!

Funds were voted for inquiries into research, agriculture, interstate taxes, banking and other matters. Extra allowances were provided for members' official telephone and telegraph bills and for stamps.

Recently there were 19 members of the House and Senate who returned from a trip to Belgrade, Yugoslavia, where they "worked hard" on the Agriculture Committee. Let us all inform them that they need to "work hard" in cutting down each and every one of these expenses instead of continuing to vote them in with raises.

I would urge you to write your congressmen today and let them know that you are in favor of Rep. H. R. Gross, R-Iowa, for his views on this ridiculous continued spending of our money. Naturally, the congressmen were unhappy when he took opposition to all this spending. If we permitted our children to spend promiscuously and then tightened the purse strings, they, too, would be unhappy, but it would make a better, more responsible child.

We have only to look at a couple of local issues in the past year to see what the majority of the people can do in power if they just take the time to be heard. Sportsmen were angry because of the slaughter of the deer herds, they got together and wrote articles to their legislators, had meetings, signed petitions, and they are getting results. When Oregon legislators wanted to take away our right to deduct our federal income taxes paid from our gross income, we arose in a body to be heard and forced the Oct. 15 special election. And how much

more badly our federal government needs this very treatment.

No matter how many pressing demands are upon us every day, let us, one and all, take time out right now to sit down and write our congressmen and let them know we are back of Rep. H. R. Gross 100 per cent in his continued attempts to economize the federal spending. Let us be sure and write to him and ask his continued efforts in our behalf. I feel sure this is what our editor had in mind when it was placed in such a prominent place in our newspaper.

If you are in doubt about the names and addresses of your Congressmen, please call the Herald and News.

Question: Why does Mr. Taxpayer cry about high taxation and then go to the polls and continue to re-elect the "big spenders?" Just write a letter to Morse and Neuberger and see how quickly you get a rebuff from them. The reason is simple — they haven't heard from enough taxpayers.

Mrs. Kuhlman.

Editor's Note: Addresses of Oregon Congressmen are:

- Sen. Maurice Neuberger
- Sen. Wayne Morse
- Senate Office Building
- Washington 25, D.C.
- Rep. Al Ullman
- Rep. Walter Norblad
- Rep. Robert Duncan
- Rep. Edith Green
- House of Representatives
- Washington 25, D.C.

Oh, Brother!

Re: Oct. 8 issue
I'm just a visitor to your city and find your paper so typical of the information fed to the general public by the New Frontier.

First the article by Frank Jenkins. Gold does not cost the Soviet Union \$60-\$70 per ounce. The mines and the people working them are owned by the government. It's like the deficit spending in this country. Whatever the miners are paid, they are paid with paper money printed by the government, so the actual cost would only be the cost of printing the money, cost of material. I mean—not the printer's salary. This could get complicated, but I think you can see what I mean.

Russia (buying) our surplus wheat and paying us in gold? Who thinks of these fairy tales? I doubt if the news information given you has mentioned it, but there has been a rumor for some time that Kennedy offered foreign aid to Mr. K. some time ago but they had to prepare the public to accept it before any announcement could be made. I'll give odds that this wheat deal amounts to another give-away program with the U.S. taxpayers paying the bill.

When is the general public going to wake up to the fact that our government has become one big compromise with communism. Second—the expenditures of the general fund are interesting, but they do not give a true picture of the facts. Most of these expenditures are subsidized by the federal government. I would like to know just how much manipulation there is in these figures, including federal aids, and leaving them out to give the picture presented in the article.

The welfare costs were shown as \$41,900,000. Does this include the 60-70 per cent given by the federal government? If it doesn't, this means that our welfare bill is close to \$125,900,000 and the same with the other expenditures. There is no doubt that these figures show only what the public is supposed to know.

Third—U.S. suspended Viet Nam funds—great! This is only the \$12 million commercial aid payment. What about the five other "aid" programs we are still paying?

Fourth—Maurine B. Neuberger, senator that is. What's so surprising to her that someone called her "Mr.?" No one knows better than she that probably a majority of the voters don't even know her husband is dead. And after being conditioned to the name "Neuberger" since he was a state official, has gone right on voting for Neuberger.

Her reaction to the Life Line article is a typical "New Frontier" action. Anyone who opposes them is immediately hit where it hurts the most—usually in the pocketbook. This is like the Negro congressman from New York asking for a Senate investigation of the man who ran against him in the last election.

Our senators, Neuberger and Morse, have continually "rubber stamped" the programs presented by the past and present administrations to compromise the Communists. I doubt if either are Communists, but the programs they are supporting are definitely spreading this country to socialism.

When is the public going to realize that the newspapers are feeding them only what our politicians want them to know and presenting only what is given them by "informed sources," "high administrative sources," "high official," "official sources," etc., etc. You know better than I the phrases used. If the name or the actual source of this information "given" is not important, then the article

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Tuesday, Oct. 15, the 238th day of 1963 with 77 to follow.

The moon is approaching its full phase.
The morning star is Jupiter.
The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Those born today are under the sign of Libra.
On this day in history:
In 1917, the most famous spy of World War I, Gertrude Margarete Zelle, known as Mata Hari, was executed outside Paris.

In 1943, Pierre Laval, former French premier, was executed for betraying his country to Nazi Germany during World War II.

A thought for the day — The Greek orator, Demosthenes, said: "To remind a man of the good turns you have done him is very much like a reproach."

Letters To The Editor

isn't news—it's propaganda and shouldn't be printed without qualification.

Remember, "Big Brother is watching you."

G. L. Johnson,
630 N. E. Lawrence,
Portland, Ore.

Deer Raising

I attended the legislative committee's hearings on the management of the interstate deer herd.

Practically the only testimony that was heard were the following three: U.S. Forest Service—which has no apparent interest other than timber; Bureau of Land Management — which admitted it had only the cattlemen's interest at heart, and the cattlemen.

Most of the testimony came from Stanley Johnson who controls 80,000 acres in the heart of the interstate herd and runs a thousand head of cattle. Is he interested in deer raising?

None of these interests or any of the people on the legislative committee cared to hear the real issue.

I spoke, or tried to. When I reiterated that gentleman with 80,000 acres could not possibly have the hunter's interest at heart, they struck this from the record. When I mentioned Rachel Carson's book, "Silent Spring," and the fact that the deer need water, feed and shelter, I was stopped entirely.

Now I will admit that I also have an interest. I am in the sporting goods business and believe wholeheartedly in the balance of nature. The interstate herd has declined. I have children that may say, "Were you a part of this?"

By their own admission they stated there appeared to be more experts than deer in the woods. There were a pitiful few hunters present. There will be more meetings, and hunters, you had better be there. These are your deer; nature is your private responsibility. These experts admitted they did not know. They are only to be pitied.

I am going to demand equal time which was not even allowed by a small fraction this time. This could only be considered obtaining money by false pretenses. The Interim Committee obtained \$25,000 to study the deer herd, not the demands of the BLM, U.S. Forest Service or a rancher that controls 80,000 acres. Remember there is such a thing as ecology. Every living thing is interrelated.

Andrew R. Giegler,
4230 South Sixth Street.

Warning

It seems to me that the people of Klamath County are very inconsiderate concerning this anti-gambling campaign by our district attorney.

I can remember in years past when we had district attorneys who would just wink at the gambling that was going on. So the people wanted a man elected who would uphold the laws. The governor first asked Mr. Crabtree if he wouldn't consider going to Klamath Falls to fill the vacancy of district attorney.

Now that we have a man who is fearlessly trying to uphold the law he is met with opposition. We can expect that there will be some who will endeavor to carry on their organizations with some sort of gambling.

But when the churches come in under the same spotlight it is a very sad state of affairs. Any church that has to carry on gambling to pay their bills will never be used of the Lord.

When Christ threw the money changers out of the temple, He said, "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise." The house of the Lord should be maintained only from the tithes and offerings of the people. You will be held guilty before God how you maintain the house of the Lord. Read the word of God and see the stern warning the Lord gives to those who desecrate the house of the Lord.

Let's give our district attorney the support he needs. If the shoe fits go ahead and wear it.

I am not afraid to sign my name as some have done. So here is mine.

M. L. Rogers,
2159 Wiard.

THEY SAY...

The Constitution is color blind, the Internal Revenue Service is color blind, the draft board is color blind. We must also be color blind when it comes to extending to all our citizens their rights and privileges as Americans.

—Sen. Kenneth Keating, R-N.Y.

My colleagues in the Soviet Union occasionally produce bad novels not because they are dedicated to socialist realism, but because the Lord has not given them any talent.

—Ilya Ehrenburg.