

Editorial Page

Crime Marches On

Crime — every kind of crime, from muggings to purse snatching to bank robbery to juvenile depredations to murder — constantly feeds the headlines and the news reports. It vies for space and attention with the other great problems that bedevil the world we live in, all the way from wars to what to do about the tax problem. But few of us are prepared to answer the specific questions: Is crime really seriously on the increase, or is it simply being more effectively dramatized and noticed? What kind of crime is most prevalent? Who and what are responsible? What, in the view of experts, should be done to oppose and control it?

U.S. News & World Report recently devoted a lengthy feature article to matters such as these, and presented findings and possible solutions. It is a sad and ominous account. For, as the magazine puts it, "By every measure, America is on the brink of a major crisis in crime. Rise in crime far outstrips population increase. It shows across the board — in crimes against property and in vicious assaults on persons." And it is a truly national problem, in which the smaller communities and the great cities share. Actually, crime is rising faster (comparing 1962 with 1961) in towns of 25,000 to 50,000 people, where it is up 6.9 per cent, than in cities of over a million, where the rise is an even 6 per cent. Biggest increase — 10.9 per cent — is in the 500,000 to one million population centers.

Name any crime, as U.S. News makes clear, and you'll find it prevalent. City streets are unsafe to walk on in city after city; armed robbery becomes a comparative commonplace; the upturn in bank robberies is "sensational," and "The rise in crime by youths spreads across the whole range of criminal offenses."

What underlies this grave situation,

and what needs to be done? U.S. News reporters sought answers from the FBI and from police officials here and abroad and found general agreement on four points. In summary, they amount to this:

1. As more and more people, mostly strangers to each other, crowd into the cities each individual must be held more strictly accountable for his conduct.

2. The public at large must take more interest in and give more support to law enforcement, and to the punishment of criminals.

3. Juveniles guilty of serious crimes must pay a full penalty. They must not be treated as errand children.

4. The courts must show more interest in protecting the law abiding population from the criminal element, rather than in zealously guarding the rights and privileges of the criminals themselves. One want in this category is a major tightening of the parole and probation system. This idea is based on fact, not just theory. U.S. News says, "In cities where there is a no-nonsense attitude toward crime and criminals, and where people insist upon law enforcement, streets are relatively safe."

Meanwhile, to paraphrase an old slogan, crime marches on. According to the magazine, bank robberies have almost tripled in 6 years, embezzlements nearly doubled since 1956, robberies are up 15 per cent since 1958, and assaults soar. And last year youths under 18 were responsible for 62 per cent of all auto thefts, 51 per cent of all larcenies, 49 per cent of all burglaries, 19 per cent of all forcible rapes, and so on.

This, in capsule form, is the sorry story. An ending worth thinking about is provided by Chicago Police Superintendent Wilson: "Everybody seems to be organizing today to protect civil liberties. I would like to organize the victims of criminal assaults who have been robbed and raped in our streets."

"You're Still On My Team, Lyndon... Oh, And Bring The Ball!"



Platforms Can Be A Fraud

By LYLE C. WILSON
United Press International
Recommended to the voters for their serious consideration is chapter VIII of former President Eisenhower's just published account of his years in the White House. (Mandate For Change, Doubleday & Co.)

The chapter title tells the story: "The Platform-Promises to Keep." It is a timely chapter.

A cancer in the tissue of American politics today is the malignant chicanery involved in the drafting of presidential campaign platforms. These extravagant statements of party purpose and policy tend more to obscure than to illuminate what actually is the program of the candidates and of the political parties.

Moreover, the platform writers knowingly write into the platforms promises that cannot be redeemed. This dishonesty is a fraud upon the voters and a disgrace to the American way of life. To discover this situation to exist can be a

shocker to an honest man, such as Ike. In chapter VIII, he relates that soon after his inauguration he met at the White House with Republican congressional leaders.

"In this first meeting," he continued, "I said first that it was my intention to redeem the pledges of the platform and of the campaign. To my astonishment, I discovered that some of the men in the room could not seem to understand the seriousness with which I regarded our platform's provisions, and were amazed by my uncompromising assertion that I was going to do my best to fulfill every promise to which I had been a party."

"More than once I was to hear this view derided by practical politicians who laughed off platforms as traps to catch workers."

So it was with an honest man on discovering late in life that men who were otherwise honorable were, also, crooked in their dealings with the American people. In the harsh lan-



WASHINGTON CALLING

Solons May Study Sex

By MARQUIS CHILDS
WASHINGTON—Not long ago Malcolm Muggeridge, that acerbic critic of British morals and manners, jaced into the holier-than-thou hand-wringing that has gone on over the Profumo scandal.

Prime Ministers by the score, he was bold enough to say, have been adulterers. One of the few exceptions was Gladstone, who on leaving a late sitting of the House of Commons made it a practice to pick up a prostitute and take her home for supper where he and Mrs. Gladstone questioned her about her wicked life.

This is relevant to the effort

to make a Profumo scandal here out of homespun materials without benefit of Lords and Ladies whose very names are the stuff of headlines. No one can doubt that the ingredients are readily at hand. It would be surprising if politicians were immune from the postwar drop in moral standards reflected in the high crime rate, in mounting divorce and in a variety of other less statistically demonstrable ways.

The Profumo scandal served a most useful purpose in Britain. As the sensational press fanned it up with the memoirs of Christine Keeler and others in the spectacular cast of characters, attention was diverted from the nation's deficiencies in education, economic development and other matters.

It was a grand old hay ride far easier to read about than Parliamentary reports on how Britain must train more scientists if she is to keep her place as a world power.

A similar sensation would serve here to distract attention from a fumbling and faltering Congress that now in its eleventh month has done next to nothing. Hopefully the Robert G. (Bobby) Baker investigation may blossom into something really diverting as rumors fly about mysterious houses and beautiful models suddenly removed from the Washington scene.

But, if the Baker case proves disappointing, a Kinsey-like inquiry into the sex life of both Congress and the executive branch must not be ruled out. After all, sex is relevant to many of the problems that lawmakers and policy-makers confront. An ideal chairman for a committee conducting such an inquiry would be the Senator from Arkansas, John McClellan, who combines the qualities of Calvin and Robespierre in almost equal balance.

This could go on for weeks in the winter and early spring and it would be guaranteed to titillate the public beyond any thought of such serious matters as civil rights and taxes. Recourse to the Fifth Amendment could not be ruled out, but obviously anyone using such an escape hatch would be forever condemned.

The melancholy truth is that war is the great corrupter of morals and the destroyer of standards of conduct. A relative

ly few men do the fighting and dying, a few women the waiting and weeping. For the rest it becomes a great binge in which restraints and inhibitions are conveniently shackled off.

After World War I Warren Gamaliel Harding presided over perhaps the most squalid administration in history. In that discreet day it was not until after his death that word leaked out about his youthful mistress whom he once hid in the White House coat closet. The boozing parties in the little green house on K Street went on among the insiders as large chunks of the public domain were plundered. After Harding's death Calvin Coolidge—so brilliantly labeled by William Allen White "a Puritan in Babylon"—was a handy symbol as the great bull market roared on toward ruin.

In the aftermath of World War II many instances have come to light of what declining standards mean. In 1957 a federal judge in Newark had sharp things to say about the General Electric Supply Company for hiring call girls to "entertain" customers at a dealers' convention. And General Electric was plainly no better or worse than many large organizations. One of Edward R. Murrow's most forthright—and controversial—telecasts dealt in 1959 with "the business of sex." Murrow reported that "the use of call girls in industry is pretty widespread at this time."

With a defense budget of \$32 billion, a large part of it going to industry in cost-plus contracts with some of them in billions rather than hundreds of millions of dollars, the dependence of business and labor on government for profits and jobs has become deeply entrenched in the economy. This has been the source of widespread abuse. While his innocence of wrongdoing may be shown beyond a doubt, the foolish letters written by retiring Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth, suggesting ways to help his bank, were almost enough in themselves to condemn him.

One of the few men talking about the pursuit by business of the government dollar is Edwin P. Neelan, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. With an election year coming up he is bound to be heard.



WASHINGTON REPORTS

Barry Is Target For Smears

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON—Bigots of all shapes and sizes have crawled out of the woodwork to defend "Christian heritage."

Object of their vicious smear attacks is Sen. Barry Goldwater, almost certain GOP presidential nominee. The frenzied troopers of George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party lead the campaign against Goldwater, who is half-Jewish.

A far-right sheet published in Birmingham, Ala., by the National States Rights Party has received wide circulation throughout the country. The pamphlet lists Goldwater with "Jewish espionage artists."

Bruce L. Felkner, executive director of the non-partisan Fair Campaign Practices Committee, makes this prediction about the 1964 campaign:

"Anti-Semites are underdressed by logic; they are prepared to hate on a basis of religion, ethnic background, name and even change of name; it is not necessary for their target even to be Jewish, as witness some of the scurrility directed at Eisenhower early in 1952, suggesting that the general was a part of what the lunatics like to call the 'Jew-Marxist conspiracy.'"

"Senator Goldwater was raised as an Episcopalian but his grandfather was Jewish. This is more than enough for the anti-Semite."

Felkner predicts that "placard-carrying nuts will be parading around the GOP Convention next July, handing out crudely printed tracts in streets and hotel lobbies, defacing banners and posters."

It is the more subtle form of anti-Semitism that most worries Goldwater backers. It is a worry similar to that held by Kennedy aides in 1960 who feared Republicans would subtly raise the religious issue over and over by saying in effect, "the fact that Senator Kennedy is a Roman Catholic is not an issue in this campaign."

Goldwater lieutenants now fear that some Democrats (or more sophisticated anti-Semites) will use every opportunity

to feed prejudice by apparently disclaiming it. "It doesn't matter that Goldwater is a Jew."

Several such episodes have already come to Felkner's attention. A Democratic Congressman recently wrote in a newsletter to his constituents that only in America could "an itinerant Jewish merchant's grandson" become a candidate for President.

Note: Under attack from know-nothing bigots on the lunatic right, Goldwater is hard hit by those far to his left, as well.

A recent series in the nationally-circulated National Guardian examined the Senator's "ultra-right record" and those around him. The Guardian has been labeled by the House Un-American Activities Committee a "virtual official propaganda arm of Soviet Russia."

The HUAC report said: "In the pages of the National Guardian, everything emanating from the Kremlin is humane, civilized and progressive, while the United States reeks with racial discrimination, exploitation of labor, corruption, war hysteria, and whatever else good citizens should detest."

During the Korean War, the Guardian ran stores accusing the U.S. of using germ warfare. Cedric Belfrage, editor and founder of the Guardian, was deported to England under the McCarran-Walter Act for refusing to answer questions concerning Communist Party membership.

Belfrage, now the Guardian's editor in exile, was named under oath by Elizabeth Bentley as a member of a Soviet spy ring.

In January 1956, a Senate subcommittee called John T. McManus (since deceased), general manager of the Guardian, and James Aronson, the weekly's executive director. Beth took the Fifth Amendment when asked about Communist Party activities.

Among the Guardian contributors have been Alger Hiss, Jo-

anne Grant, identified under oath as a top-ranking young Communist, and Amel Carlsbach, German Communist.

By June of 1963, Uncle Sam had sent more than \$670 million to Indonesia's Red-lining "President" Sukarno. Some \$8 million of that sum went for a recently completed, multi-lane highway outside Djakarta, the nation's capital.

Officials at the U.S. Embassy there planned to fly the Stars and Stripes alongside the Indonesian flag as a symbol of friendship at dedication ceremonies late last month.

Nothing doing, screamed Sukarno, and an embassy official took down his flag. Louisiana Congressman Joe Waggoner shot off an angry protest to Secretary of State Dean Rusk. He has received no reply.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Tuesday, Nov. 12, the 318th day of 1963 with 49 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

On this day in history: In 1920, Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis was appointed the first "czar" of big league baseball.

In 1927, Joseph Stalin became the dictator of the Communist party in the Soviet Union as Leon Trotsky was expelled from the party.

In 1940, the war crimes tribunal in Japan sentenced former Premier Tojo and six colleagues to die by hanging.

In 1951, the International Monetary Fund gave Iran an \$8 million loan to meet the financial crisis caused by the loss of oil revenues.

A thought for the day—American poet Robert Frost said: "Most of the change we think we see in life is due to truths being in and out of favor."

IN WASHINGTON . . .



Foreign Policy Dangers

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

Two events, both of explosive significance, are being pondered by foreign policy experts in Washington—and by the portent watchers along Embassy Row—as indicators of a new trend in United States diplomacy.

The first of these events has been filling the front pages of the nation: the shocking running story of a U.S. encouraged (if not planned) overthrow of the legitimate government of South Vietnam and the murder of its leaders.

The second gained little or no attention until last week — and both the Pentagon and the State Department would have preferred it that way. I refer to the recent uncalculated and unnecessary retreat of the Allied powers in their reaction to Soviet and East German harassment. It was this retreat which led to new trouble on the Berlin autobahn.

It will be recalled that the earlier incident involving U.S. forces and the East German guards along the highway to West Berlin had to do with an effort by the Communists to set down their own rules. Neither the East Germans nor the Soviets have any right, by treaty or precedent, to impose their own regulations. Yet they were demanding that in every movement of troops to West Berlin, the soldiers must dismount from trucks or buses and be counted.

This, as the U.S. promptly noted, was an encroachment on Allied rights of access and nobody's business but our own. Our commanders and the State Department said it very loud and clear. But what was shouted in the world's ear was more wind than determination. Working quietly behind the scenes, American diplomats convinced the British and the French that we should accede to the Communist demand.

Thereupon, the Allied powers notified the Soviets that in the future any troop convoy larger than 31 men would dismount for a count by Soviet and East German guards. This was described as a "courtesy" to the Communists.

As we know, this retreat from previous Allied positions has served the West not a whit. The Soviets stopped another U.S. convoy made up of fewer than 31 men, demanding a count there as well. The inch we were so ready to cede has, of course, begun to stretch into the pre-

verbal yard, though the State Department now insists that this will not be tolerated.

The importance and significance of these two events must be measured (1) as they are interpreted by the world, and (2) by what they really mean. There is little doubt from all the reports so far received here that both events, however they may seem unrelated, are being seen as an effort by the United States to placate the Soviet Union and "prove" its good intentions.

The once-firm Berlin policy, it is believed, has been replaced by one of preserving the myth that East-West tensions are relaxing. In South Vietnam, the United States has once again aided in the downfall of a strongly anti-Communist leader and opened the door to the kind of chaos which can mean Communist victory. The Philippine government has quietly let it be known that it reads this as a further sign of an American withdrawal from Southeast Asia.

If this is the appearance, at least to some foreign governments and their representatives in Washington, what is the reality? President Kennedy has so far not confided in the American people, and his tight-knit little group of advisers and confidants has not yet begun to leak stories to the press via favored columnists and correspondents. But on the basis of past words and past performance, it is possible to arrive at some approximations:

1. The President is determined not to rock the boat of U.S.-Soviet relations.

2. He considers the future of world peace a bilateral responsibility to be negotiated by the United States and the Soviet Union.

3. He believes that what is most important is the "big picture." Cuba, harassment in Berlin, brushfire wars — all these are unimportant when compared to the over-all goal of nuclear disarmament and an "understanding" between the Western and Communist blocs.

History, and the Soviet realization that a pinprick can burst a balloon far more effectively and easily than a rifle bullet, may force Mr. Kennedy to give up his present emerging foreign policy. His eagerness to "go along" with the Soviets on troop movement procedures in Berlin has led to a greater provocation. These provocations, in turn, can lead to shouting and

an open rupture which can lead to war. That is what the record has shown in the past, and all the optimistic talk of the President's advisers that the Soviets are "maturing" remains just that—talk.

Certainly the gravity of the situation in Berlin could lead to a new assessment. But so far, the President seems not aware of the peril of counting on agreements and accommodations with the Reds.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 'Fireball Citizen'

Congratulations to William Sweetland, who is leaving Klamath Falls to accept a bigger newspaper job in Pennsylvania. Congratulations to Pennsylvania upon gaining a "fireball citizen."

We at Linkville Kiwanis enjoyed having our Herald and News publisher as guest speaker on two occasions. All we citizens of Klamath Falls have enjoyed a lot more benefits from Bill's citizenship than any realer.

Let's not just let Bill depart without recognizing through your column his tremendous contributions to our city, county and the state of Oregon.

We recall his service on the new hospital board of directors, Klamath County Chamber of Commerce, United Fund, his establishment of a religious parade emphasis at Christmas and a symphony orchestra group for Klamath Falls.

Bill Sweetland served our state of Oregon on the Committee for Constitutional Revision. A committee to determine the future of public interest in Waldo Lake and on various other occasions.

While we do not always agree with his opinions we respect his right to those opinions. We feel that if there were more citizens that would show the tremendous interest that Bill Sweetland has taken in Klamath Falls this would be a much better community in to live.

Linkville Kiwanis, Wall Bingham, President.



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Antics with Semantics:

He goofed; you simply forgot; but all I had was a "mental block."

Your child's academic record indicates that he is rather on the dull side; my child's academic record indicates that "he isn't living up to his potential."

When I require statistics to buttress my position, I remind you that "you can't argue with hard facts in black and white"; but when such statistics do not support my position, I am equally quick to remind you that "figures can't lie, but liars sure can figure."

If most of the advertisements for managerial and technical help were semantically honest, they would frankly call for "Men under 35, with 20 years of practical experience in the field."

I have "initiative"; you have "brass"; he has "the knife out."

When one is getting the worst of an argument, the three most useful words are "self-styled," "would-be," and "pseudo"—as in "self-styled experts," "would-be statesmen," and "pseudo-intellectuals."

Your remark was "sarcasm," while mine was classical "irony."

According to the company spokesman, the plant made "a seasonal revision of employment"; according to the union

spokesman, the plant "laid off workers."

The alcoholic I happen to dislike is a "lush"; the one I happen to like has "a drinking problem."

When an answer to a problem is complex, those who oppose it will call it "confused"; whereas, when an answer to a problem is simple, those who oppose it will call it "over-simplified."

A poor woman who outrageously "neglects" her children is as likely as not to get haled into the Family Court; a rich woman who neglects her children is as likely as not to be elected to the board of directors of the social agency that haunts the poor woman into court.

The politician whose views I agree with doesn't change his stand because he is "consistent"; the one whose views I disagree with doesn't change his stand because he is "hide-bound," "dogmatic" and "doctrinaire."

When a man feels the necessity to say to us, "I'll put all my cards on the table," we may be reasonably sure that his normal procedure is to keep a few up his sleeve.

It is the falsest of analogies to call the human mind a "machine"—for unlike any self-respecting motor, the tongue makes the greatest number of revolutions per minute when the brain is in neutral.

BERRY'S WORLD



"I think you should know . . . I just might defect to the Democrats!"