

Editorial Page

It's Your Community

Our own United Fund appears to have become the victim of circumstances not of its own making.

The goal is a reasonable goal and one that a community this size should successfully reach, but as of now it's a long way from this goal.

However, resistance to giving for anything these days has mounted greatly over the past year. The average citizen feels that everything and everybody has a hand in his pocket. He resents the level of taxation, no matter on what level of government, and his feelings of charity toward his fellow man suffer accordingly.

It is important, though, to put our giving into a proper perspective, and to make our charitable efforts as selective as possible.

The United Fund is a community service effort. Admittedly, some of the money collected goes to agencies elsewhere in the state, but by the same token, there are many

Klamath Falls people who benefit from these agencies in a very direct, necessary manner.

In our opinion, one of the most important works of the United Fund is the financing it provides for boys and girls work in the community.

In this world of confusion, corruption and conflict, it is imperative that we give as much leadership and direction as possible to the efforts of our youths. They represent our hopes for a better tomorrow.

The old cliché "charity begins at home" was never truer, and never more applicable than it is today.

It is vital that we support our community effort in this United Fund drive. Don't wait for a volunteer worker to contact you. After all, these workers are taking time away from their jobs, already, to try to make this fund drive a success.

This community effort is an effort by your community to meet the needs of your community. Give it your best effort.



GOLDWATER FAMILY — Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) who may oppose President Kennedy in the 1964 Presidential elections is pictured with his family in a recent photo. Left to right, daughter Joanne (Mrs. Thomas B. Ross); Goldwater; sons Barry Goldwater Jr. and Michael; Mrs. Margaret Goldwater and daughter Peggy Goldwater.

Goldwater Hesitating

By HARRY FERGUSON
United Press International
WASHINGTON (UPI)—Every four years candidates for president go through a ritual dance and at the moment Sen. Barry Goldwater is doing what our grandparents called "the hesitation waltz." You act like you are about to take a step but don't quite do it.

Goldwater will announce in January whether he is a candidate for the Republican nomination for president. If he says no, it will be the biggest political upset since Harry Truman defeated Thomas E. Dewey. On the basis of all available evidence we are going to assume that Goldwater is running for president right now and is running hard.

And running in front. Every political poll shows him ahead for the GOP nomination, along with an unscientific one this reporter took on the sidewalks of Washington. It was an attempt to find out why Goldwater is leading, and 10 persons who favored the Arizona senator were questioned.

—Four said because he was against the income tax and two of them said he favored abolishing it.

—Four said he would get tough with Khrushchev and the Communists, and one of them volunteered the opinion that Goldwater planned to send the United States Marines to Cuba to throw Fidel Castro out of office.

—One said "Goldwater isn't afraid of anybody and that's what we need to clean up the Kennedy mess."

—One said she had been for Nelson Rockefeller before his divorce and remarriage but switched to Goldwater because "he is a good family man and a good father."

Obviously some of the senator's followers have a hazy or downright erroneous idea of what he stands for. Goldwater has no intention of abolishing the income tax and it is highly unlikely that if he were elected president he would order the Marines into Cuba without provocation.

There is nothing unusual about voters being confused on the issues and, in fact, professional politicians rate the candidate's overall image far above his pledges. Dwight D. Eisenhower writes in his current memoirs that he was shocked after winning the presidency told him to forget about the platform on which he ran.

The image Goldwater projects at the moment is that of a hell-for-leather, fearless man out of the West. Lyle C. Wilson, United Press International's vice president for Washington, who has seen politicians come and go, rise and fall, for more than 30 years, analyzes Goldwater's political appeal this way: "He sounds like a forthright, earthy politician who doesn't take himself too seriously. He gives the appearance of not being afraid to stand up and be counted. He seems to have a real enthusiasm for slugging it out with Kennedy."

Goldwater strides on to the political stage at a time when many Americans are showing stress and strain from the day-to-day pounding of events. A recent Gallup poll documented this vague dissatisfaction with the state of the nation when it asked citizens of many countries whether they were satisfied with their position in the world. Fifty-one per cent of the Americans interviewed were dissatisfied. The happiest people were in Switzerland, West Germany, Denmark, Norway and France.

We Americans build up hope that the nuclear test ban treaty means a thaw in the cold war and then our hopes are chilled when the Russians blockade the Berlin highway. We are promised a reduction in taxes and

the next thing we hear is that we may not get one because Congress cannot agree on details. We are cheered by Khrushchev's removal of missiles from Cuba, but apprehensive when we learn Russians are still on the island.

Our home town, whether north or south, lives every day under the threat of racial dissension and perhaps violence. We are irritated by the sting of iodine applied to minor wounds caused by Madame Nhu's practice of biting the hand that helped her. We yearn for a clear-cut victory somewhere over somebody. We doubt the ancient maxim that half a loaf is better than no bread.

More than any other man in political life Goldwater has been promising us a quick and sure cure for our frustrations. William Rees-Mogg, political editor of the Sunday Times of London, wrote on a recent tour of the United States that Goldwater symbolized for many of us an unconscious desire to return to the previous century and specifically to the Western frontier. The issues were simple for our forefathers in the West,

the federal government was lenient and far away and, within the boundaries of farm or ranch, every man was pretty much a king.

Goldwater looks like a frontiersman. He is tall, lean, tanned, an active outdoorsman and pilots his own plane. Even his speech has a ring of the old West. "I'm a poker player," he said while discussing the presidency. "I'm sitting with a pair and I don't know what the draw will be. If it's a good one, I'll say yes." His speeches are punctuated with occasional "hells" and "damns" and the other day a woman in Medford, Ore., gently suggested to him in a letter that this was no way for the next president of the United States to talk.

Goldwater's political opponents have noted this back-to-the-good-old-days appeal. Sen. Jacob Javits, a Republican from New York who doesn't agree with Goldwater on many things, put it this way: "He kind of satisfies a hankering for five-cent beer and a five-cent cigar. It's good old fashioned conservatism of another day, but it doesn't belong today."



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

"A university does great things," wrote Cardinal Newman a century ago, "but there is one thing it does not do: it does not intellectualize its neighborhood."

Little has changed in the intervening hundred years since he penned his famous book, "The Idea of a University." We send our children to college, in increasing numbers; and they return home, presumably educated to a greater or lesser degree. But nothing happens to the neighborhood.

I visit dozens of colleges during the year, many of them situated in small or middle-sized towns. In most of them, there is an absolute minimum of contact between town and gown; what goes on at the school rarely affects the townspeople, unless sex or drinking are involved.

One of the purposes of a university is not to turn out technicians, like a trade school, but to change the climate around it, to permeate the surrounding atmosphere with some of its attitudes and values.

But what is the point of sending a young person to college if the world he returns to has no continuity with the world he has just been graduated from? It only serves to make college seem frivolous, irrelevant, and "academic" in the most sterile sense of the word.

Of course, colleges put on plays and hold art shows and offer lectures to the public; but these are just the cultural trappings for parents and alumni and possible donors. "Look how well the children are doing," such projects seem to say. "Don't they deserve a pat on the head?"

And one reason that college students do not take the institution seriously (except for getting passing grades and a diploma) is the isolation in which the university exists: a make-believe world for four years, sealed off from "reality," and to be visited again only on Class Day, if at all.

This is not the students' fault, nor the townspeople's. The university itself seems afraid of propagating ideas, of challenging accepted beliefs, of involving itself in the actual life of the larger community. Rather than a preparation for life, colleges too often seem an avoidance of it; as a result, students

are graduated not only ill-prepared in their subjects, but also totally unequipped to cope with reality.

If universities cannot intellectualize their neighborhoods, at least to some degree, then their influence on the social current is negligible, and their pretension to significance is absurd. If they refuse to exercise their force on society, then society will sweep them away disdainfully in times of crisis, as the Nazis swept away the proud ruins of German scholarship with contemptuous ease.

Thoughts

But we impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God, which He decreed before the ages for our glorification.—1. Cor. 2:7.

Knowledge is the only instrument of production that is not subject to diminishing returns.—J. M. Clark.

For he has somewhere spoken of the seventh day in this way, and God rested on the seventh day from all his works.—Hebrews 4:4.

As we keep or break the Sabbath, we nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope by which man rises.—Abraham Lincoln.

As we take just and full measure of all authority, let neither time nor the times press us so hard to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's that we neglect to render unto God the things that are God's.—A. Whitney Griswold.

Piety toward God is meaningless unless it encourages compassion toward one's fellow man.—Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein.

O Lord, my heart is not lifted up; my eyes are not raised too high; I do not occupy myself with things too great and too marvelous for me.—Psalms 131:1.

After crosses and losses, men grow humbler and wiser.—Benjamin Franklin.



Doubt, Uncertainty Shroud Recent Vote

By MARQUIS CHILDS
WASHINGTON — All the wishful omens read into this week's election cannot disguise the fact that it was really more of the same. We are seeing the politics of a dead center of doubt and uncertainty.

What we have may not be good enough but what we are likely to get will possibly be worse. The present pause reflects the same narrow division which in 1960 split the popular vote by a precarious hairline margin.

Most of the comment has been to the effect that the returns show President Kennedy has a tough job ahead to be reelected. Far more obvious is that any man who serves in the office of the Presidency after 1964, whether his name is Kennedy, Goldwater, Rockefeller or whatever, will find it difficult, if not impossible, to get even a minimum of agreement on what must be done in the nation and the world.

Above all, in the racial conflict the pressures for change—change profoundly disruptive of the separate way of life long taken for granted—are part of the shadow of doubt. The Kentucky election is perhaps the sharpest reflection of this fear. The Republican candidate, Louis B. Nunn, attacked the retiring governor, Bert Combs, for his order desegregating businesses serving the public, and his position was compared to that of Senator Goldwater. The Democratic candidate, Edward T. Breathitt Jr., narrowly squeaked through in a state that normally goes to the Democrats in elections for state office.

Almost no one here in this stagnant capital speaks except in a private whisper about the fear of what can happen in the months just ahead. It is the fear that the immovable object, namely Congress, will collide head-on with the irresistible force that is the fierce first wave of the Negro civil rights movement. On this collision course the results are entirely predictable.

Already an angry muttering can be heard often from sources where it would have been least expected. The top command of the United Auto Workers Union, which has led the way in integration and other "progressive" directions, is getting the word from the grass roots. Phrased in far more blunt and brutal language it is: "Don't push this Negro equality

business any harder, it's gone far enough.

The fear of what the coming months can bring has very real dimensions. If Congress by late February or March has not passed a civil rights bill roughly the equivalent of the one reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, containing public accommodations and fair employment provisions, the prospect is for widespread civil disobedience. However reluctant moderate leaders may be, they will be unable to stand off the young insurgents.

Airports, railway and bus stations will be put under siege. In an atmosphere of frenzy and near hysteria violence will generate more violence. This is not a nightmare invented to put pressure on a dragging and unhappy Congress. It is the perilous shape of things to come as seen by those close to the advanced wave of Negro leadership and who would if they could forestall it.

White voters could be alienated in large numbers throughout the North. And, as a result, all current calculations on the outcome for November of 1964 would be thrown off. A Republican candidate would hardly have to utter a word since the ins would be blamed and the outs would be the beneficiaries.

In short, all bets would be off. It is hard to recall a time when, 12 months before a Presidential election, the elements that can determine the outcome should still be in uncertain suspension and in a sense beyond the power of even an incumbent President to influence.

That the Philadelphia election is a register of this uncertainty seems questionable. Above all, Philadelphia is more of the same. The Democrats in control of City Hall have fallen into the same posture of favors in return for pelf that for so long plagued the Republican machine that owned the city. And the Republicans suffered from the chronic ailment that General Eisenhower so often bewailed—a lack of able candidates willing to start at the pick-and-shovel level and build an organization.

But candidates, parties and elections to one side, the pressing question is how long the nation can pause on the present narrow plateau of indecision with all hands reluctant to confront the rocky road ahead. The 1964 election can hardly be another wait and see. The waiting time is nearly at an end.



Solons' Pay Raise Costs \$650 Million

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON — Hard-pressed Congressmen, who must scrimp and save to make ends meet on their \$22,500 a year salaries, have hit upon a sure-fire way to beat the high cost of living.

Meeting behind closed doors, members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted themselves \$10,000-a-year pay increases.

They rejected by an overwhelming vote an amendment offered by Pennsylvania Rep. Robert Corbett that would exempt Congressmen from a any federal pay hike.

In a generous mood, they offered the Vice President, Cabinet officers and federal judges the same pay increase they voted themselves. They increased federal salaries in every branch of government by an average of six per cent.

Cost to the taxpayers: \$630 million a year.

Unable to understand the logic of these Congressmen is Sen. John J. Williams, who calls the self-approved salary hike of almost 50 per cent fiscally irresponsible.

"Surely no private company would give a 50 per cent salary increase to its top executive officers and directors when the management had produced but six balanced budgets in the past 30 years."

Williams has offered an amendment that would postpone Congress' pay hike until it comes up with a balanced budget. Joining with him in co-sponsoring the amendment are two Senators, Colorado's Peter D. Mannick and Ohio's Frank Lausche. The maverick Lausche will win few new Senate friends with this analysis:

To that argument I say balderdash."

He scoffs at the idea that a raise of \$10,000 a year is necessary for federal judges, who now make \$25,500.

"For every judicial vacancy that exists on the federal bench in Ohio, I have at least 30 applicants for the post. And let us not forget that the judges are not only remunerated liberally but also receive other benefits."

Lausche disputes the view that federal employes are underpaid. He cites official statistics to show that federal workers in his state, for instance, receive 35 per cent more money than state employes. A nationwide study shows the average federal employe takes down \$113 a week, the average state employe \$82.

Note: Congressman Paul Findley, Illinois Republican, has served notice that he will submit an amendment to the committee — approved bill that would put off any federal pay hike until the national debt has been cut back to \$300 billion.

The debt now stands at \$307 billion and the Administration wants the debt limit raised to \$315 billion. Explains Findley: "Under my amendment, every federal employe involved in the pay bill would have a strong personal incentive to cut back on federal spending to help make possible a reduction in the federal debt. This would be especially true of Cabinet officers and Congressmen who would have a hefty \$10,000-a-year pay boost at stake."

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—Is there a religious order called the "Dunkers?"
A—The name "Dunkers" has been popularly associated with German Baptists, or the Church of the Brethren. The word "dunker" comes from the German verb meaning to dip or immerse.



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

Civil Rights Revolt

By WILLIAM S. WHITE
WASHINGTON — The profound fact established by the scattered off-year elections, notably in Philadelphia, New Jersey and Kentucky, is that a new political situation is developing in the white North and Border states which could clearly endanger President Kennedy's re-election next year.

What is now done with and about that situation—along with what is done to calm the increasingly bitter Presidential rivalry within the Republican party—will determine the outcome of 1964.

Partisan Republican claims of vastly meaningful gains in those elections put the case too strongly — but only in the use of the superlative "vastly." Partisan Democratic claims that all is well with that party, and with the President's prospects, are almost unrelieved moonshine.

For the implications of the majority race in Philadelphia, a typical example of those great urban complexes which will re-elect or defeat Mr. Kennedy, have in simple truth tolled a warning bell for him and his party. That a sitting Democratic mayor, James Tate, barely survived an obviously weak Republican challenger, James McDermott, is bad enough. That the victory was by the smallest margin for the Democrats in 12 years is worse. That Tate came through with a 61,000-vote plurality out of more than 700,000 cast, whereas Mr. Kennedy in 1960 carried the city by 331,000 but nevertheless was able to carry Pennsylvania

by only 116,000, tells its own story.
But worse of all from the Democratic viewpoint is the fact that examination of the returns indicates voting on strictly racial lines to a degree rarely if ever before shown in American politics. Briefly, Negro wards gave Tate almost the sum total of the thin margin of his victory, whereas some traditionally Democratic white wards went for the Republican McDermott.

What this means is this: A Northern white voter reaction against what are felt to be extreme Negro demands, and undue Democratic submission to those demands from the White House down, is undeniably on the move. And it is on the move precisely in those urban citadels on which Democratic Presidents live or die in the years since the old Solid South has become disenchanted. For something of what was seen in Philadelphia was seen, on the same election day, in Boston.

To be irresistibly immodest about it, this columnist predicted such a Northern white reaction months ago; and a man seeing his predictions come true must beware the temptation to overstate their significance. It is necessary, therefore, to put the thing in focus. While President Kennedy has had a shocking warning—most of all that an urban tendency to vote white or black might become general in the North and so create a catastrophic white national dominance — there is much more to the tale.

It is not too late for the President to draw back from public identification with extremist Negro demands. In fact, some faint signs of such withdrawal have already been seen — or scented — here. And, then, there is the other critical part of the equation—the capacity of the Republicans to come together after their Presidential nominating convention.

The destructive attacks of one Republican aspirant, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, upon his rival, Sen. Barry Goldwater, plainly raise two perilous prospects for the G.O.P.: A shrill bolt within the liberal wing of the party should Goldwater be nominated; a sullen sit-down within the right wing should Rockefeller be nominated.

Moreover, even should neither bolt occur and Goldwater, the front-runner, come through in an atmosphere of apparent party unity, his chances would be poor in any event unless something is done soon to arrest the growing impression, even among basically friendly conservatives, that the Senator is too impetuous and too nationalistic in foreign affairs. I found indisputable evidence of this impression in a recent visit to such a supposedly firm Goldwater area as Texas.

If Goldwater backers simply deny its existence they will do him a disservice. For regardless of all other factors—even including civil rights—this impression, and this alone, could smash his candidacy, before or after the convention, precisely as it smashed the candidacy of Robert A. Taft in 1962.

Letters To The Editor

Bad Bills

We would like to call attention to three bills presently before Congress which are of vital interest to everyone in the West and especially in Klamath County. These are bad bills and everyone should write their congressmen urging their defeat.

One, Land and Water Conservation Bill, S. 859. This is a misnomer. It doesn't conserve any land or water but seeks to tax everyone, by means of a car sticker costing three to five dollars, who enters any government lands. Over 52 per cent of our state belongs to the federal government. Klamath Falls is surrounded on all sides by government lands, national forests east, north, west and south of us and great hunks of B.L.M. land and Taylor grazing land, bird and animal refuges and national parks. We can't go any place without getting on federal land. Because so much of our state is owned by the federal government our taxes are high, and our taxes support roads, state and county, to and through these federal lands. We think it grossly unfair to tax us further to enter lands which by their very location cannot be avoided.

Two, the Udall Bill, H.R. 255. This is a political pium and a land grab of major proportions. This would empower the Secretary of Interior to sell any government land which he decided the government doesn't need. These lands would be appraised

by appraisers of his choice and sold, not to the highest bidder, but to the person or persons he deemed the most responsible. Since he chooses the appraisers and the buyers, any of our public domain could be sold to political friends or relatives for a

fraction of their value. This could be a powerful weapon for any party in power and an opportunity for graft the like of which we have never seen in this country.

Three, the Wilderness Bill, S. 4. This seeks to set aside 60 million acres, a land area the size of eight states, into a vast wilderness area, where no roads could be built, no motor vehicles could enter, no logging could be done, no grazing could be done, no prospecting or mining could be done, just a vast waste land of no use to anyone except, any of these privileges could be granted at the discretion of the Secretary of Interior or Agriculture, but without public notice and to those who happen to be in favor with these dignitaries. Instead of the multiple use of the public domain this bill would create more political plums to be handed out to a favored few.

Moreover, wherever people live within the boundaries of these wilderness areas they could be forced to move out. Most of these vast wilderness areas would be taken out of the West, probably some out of our own state.

These three bills are dangerous and bad. They take away your rights and your money. Please write your congressmen, Ullman and Morse, and do it immediately. Urge your friends to write. If enough protest is received in Washington the bills can be defeated. This is your fight. Make it a good one.

George and Lillie Lewis.

Almanac

United Press International
Today is Wednesday, Nov. 13, the 317th day of 1963 with 48 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Those born today include Scottish novelist Robert Louis Stevenson, in 1850.

On this day in history:
In 1927, the Holland Tunnel, running under the Hudson River and connecting New York City with Jersey City, N.J., was opened.

In 1942, the Japanese fleet suffered a heavy naval defeat while attempting to retake United States' positions in the Solomon Islands.

In 1954, the Soviet Union invited European nations and the United States to attend an all-European security conference.

In 1960, Turkish President Cemal Gursel announced he had abolished the ruling National Union Committee and formed a 23-member committee to prepare a return to democratic government.