

Editorial Page

Oregon Not Alone

Oregon voters need not think they are some kind of a fiscal Frankenstein because they turned down the recent oversized tax increase proposed by the legislature.

This state was one of 22 that rejected one or more tax proposals during the year.

In North Dakota, voters rejected five increased levies enacted by the legislature.

Nevada voters turned down a one per cent increase in the sales tax.

Sales tax increases were also turned down by the voters in Connecticut, Iowa and Rhode Island. Newly proposed sales taxes were rejected in Idaho, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and New Jersey.

An increase in the income tax law was turned down in Iowa, Massachusetts and New Mexico.

In 22 states the voters, the lawmakers themselves or the governors turned down some 40 to 50 proposals to increase tax yields. Altogether, the amount turned down represented about \$945 million.

However, the net result was still a losing battle.

While voters were rejecting some \$945 million in new tax proposals, other states were adopting new taxes totalling \$1,036 million.

Some of the new types of taxes adopted included a one per cent tax on all highway and bridge contracts in Alabama; one per cent gross receipts tax on subscription television in California; a five per cent tax on sales, use and storage of sporting equipment in Florida.

A tax levy at the rate of 8-100ths of one per cent of gross revenue of public utilities in Illinois; a five per cent severance tax in forest products in Hawaii; a five per cent of net income for banks privilege tax adopted in Kansas; a 10 cent per pound tax on colored oleomargarine in Minnesota.

A privilege tax of four per cent of value of motor vehicles in Nevada; a 10 per cent excise tax on cigars and tobacco products at wholesale level in North Dakota; a one and one-half per cent gross receipts tax on soft-drink bottlers; a \$10 per table tax on billiard tables in Texas, and a license fee on small loan companies also in Texas, and an individual income tax filing fee of \$2 in Wisconsin.

There seems to be no end to the rapacious appetite of the spenders as they reach and reach for more areas to tax and tax.

While 22 states rejected their efforts this year, it will take more than that to call a halt to spendthrift government at the national level.

Because, the amount saved in the 22 states (about \$945 million) is slightly more than the Senate is trying right now to lop off the president's foreign aid requests.

The states, you see, are only pikers when it comes to taxing. Uncle Sam is the giant spendthrift of them all.

Until the time comes when something can be done directly by the people on this tax Frankenstein, the efforts of the states to hold the line are something akin to spitting against the wind.

Keeping The Spanish Bases

(New York Times)

The 1953 United States military agreement with Franco Spain has been extended for another five years. A few sweeteners were thrown in, or simultaneously announced, to make it seem that the United States was giving the Generalissimo something for permission to keep on using the air bases and naval base that cost this country more than \$500,000,000 to build — not to mention the economic aid that, accompanying the military expenditures, has also exceeded an additional half billion dollars during the past decade.

Many Americans and Spaniards feel uncomfortable about this continuing relationship with the Franco dictatorship. But the Pentagon considers the bases, especially Rota near Cadiz, to be militarily valuable. This is a technical matter on which the Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy Administrations have all agreed. Once the decision was made, the price had to be paid. Part of the cost was to assume a posture of friendship despite the widespread political criticism in the United States — not to say abhorrence—of the Franco regime. Thus, for ten years, the Franco Government has received important economic and financial support from the United States. As an added bonus, the international standing of the Franco regime has been immeasurably enhanced by this American connection.

The 1953 treaty terms provided for an automatic extension for five years from Sept. 26, 1963, but General Franco evidently wanted more than a mere extension, because last January he asked for a reconsideration of the agreement. In real terms he seems to have got nothing. There is to be a joint United States-Spanish consular committee on defense that will meet in Madrid, but meetings have all along been held in Madrid without formality. In addition, the Export-Import Bank announced its willingness to consider new financing in excess of \$100,000,000, but Spain's economic situation and credit standing are easily good enough now to get such credit in any case. The same old bitter pill—that 1953 military treaty—has been given a new sugar coating.

Of course, these are not ideas. Ideas are what come out of the head. Nobody can put them there, although a good education can stimulate them, organize them, and give them a solid basis in reason. When Heine asked his coachman, "What are ideas?" the coachman pondered a moment and answered: "Ideas? . . . Ideas are the things they put into your head." Even today, most people might answer as the coachman did, for our formal system of education seems to consist of things put into our heads — names and dates and battles and multiplication tables and the three principal sources of raw material in the Malayan Peninsula.



WILLIAM S. WHITE . . .

Congress Needs Defense

By WILLIAM S. WHITE
WASHINGTON — What's the matter with Congress, and especially the Senate, and why isn't it "doing more?"

There are several answers.

The session has been far too long, the President having asked for too much, and it looks that the present Congress will still be sitting here struggling with old problems when the new Congress is called to assemble next January. Members, therefore, are tired and irritable—and unduly afraid of a bitter and sustained attack on Congress, as an institution, that is not being met by Congress itself with courage or common sense.

This strictly bipartisan assault comes from an odd collection. There are political theorists who believe both the Senate and House are mere horse-and-buggy nuisances which should be retired to some dusty national museum while the White House — so long as they like its current occupant — runs all the show. There are violently "pro-Kennedy" men who think anything the President proposes is unarguably good and thus that any Congressional resistance, or even delay in meeting his demands, is unarguably "obstructive" and evil.

There are other well-intentioned people who, through long brainwashing, have come to believe that Congressional performance is to be measured like industrial production or the sales rate of liverwurst at the supermarket. So many things jimmies off the assembly line this month; so many packets of sausage across the supermarket counter.

In many minds the sole standard of Congressional achievement has come to be how many bills have been passed in what period. This extraordinary foolishness wholly overlooks the fact that negative inaction on unwise proposals is quite as unwise as positive action on wise proposals — and also happens to be the constitutional obligation of an independent constitutional body called Congress.

And, finally and most important, there is a highly articulate splinter group within Congress itself which for two years has been making its own wild attacks on the very constitutional body to which it asked to be elected.

These fellows in nearly every case are disgruntled legislative failures in a forum where their political abilities fall short of their ambitions. Unable to impress their colleagues, they look about for the reason. Invariably, they find that reason not within themselves but within the "shortcomings" of Congress itself. It is "archaic." Its rules needs vast, if somewhat ambiguous, "reforms." It is run by some sinister "establishment."

They are like second-rate ball players who blame everything in sight—the manager, the umpire, their associates, the rules—for their embarrassing inability to hit more than 150. In sports, nobody is fooled by such fellows. Sour grapes, in ordinary life, are sour grapes, and few need a degree in advanced horticulture to know them for what they are.

When, however, attacks upon the institution of Congress come from among presumably responsible members themselves, they stir the interest of the outside citizen and, finally, his support. Quite understandably, he cannot believe that men elected to Congress would demean it without cause. After all, this is no Friday night ball game and beer and hot-dog romp.

Nevertheless, Congress generally not only has failed to answer these attacks from within. Worse, too many members who know better give shamefaced and crawling countenance to them, lest they be branded as not "modern" enough. To cite a notable example, Sen. Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania has made a positive career of denouncing the Senate in which he sits and of complaining in private of the better committee assignments unaccountably given to others, without once being challenged on the center of his philosophy.

But when a good man of Congress like Sen. Thomas Dodd of Connecticut blows up in momentary frustration to criticize not Congress but simply some leader or leaders of it, the roof falls in upon him. What Congress needs is to pull up its socks and defend itself as part of the constitutional structure of this country. It is often wrong and it has all the human shortcomings of a human assembly. But it is surely not always wrong. And in defending its constitutional independence, it can never, never be wrong.

Sees Government As Spendthrift Giant

By HARRY FERGUSON
WASHINGTON (UPI) — Sen. Barry Goldwater regards the federal government as a spendthrift giant who devotes too much time to poking his big nose into the private affairs of the taxpayers who support him. He wants the giant to flex his muscles a bit and slap down the Communists.

"The farmer is told how much wheat he can grow," Goldwater says. "The wage earner is at the mercy of national union leaders whose great power is a direct consequence of federal labor legislation. The business man is hampered by a maze of government regulations, and often by direct government competition . . . increasingly the federal government sets the standards of education, health and safety."

It would require a small book to set down in detail Goldwater's entire political philosophy.

But here is a summary of how he stands on the big issues today.

FOREIGN POLICY

Favors breaking diplomatic relations with Russia and all other Communist governments. Lukewarm toward the United Nations and would advocate withdrawing if Communist China were admitted. A tight blockade against Cuba, establishment of a single Cuban government in exile and the equipping of a Cuban exile army. Supplies and equipment to be supplied by air by the United States if the exile army attempted to overthrow Fidel Castro. Foreign aid is too "scatter gun" and should utilize a "rifle approach" aimed at specific areas where we could gain advantage over the Russians. Approves of technical assistance to foreign nations and the concept of the Peace Corps. More foreign aid money should be put into loans,

less into grants. Against the nuclear test ban treaty.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Goldwater personally is an integrationist. The Goldwater Department Store in Phoenix employs about 25 Negroes and as adjutant general of the Air National Guard he was instrumental in desegregating the organization. Opposes the civil rights bill now before Congress and believes there are already enough laws on the books if the executive branch of the government would only enforce them. Favors leaving, as much as possible, all civil rights matters to the individual states within the framework of the Supreme Court decision on schools, and would not go any further than "moral persuasion."

TAXES

Opposed in theory to the graduated income tax but, re-

alistically speaking, realizes it cannot be abolished. Opposes any tax reduction without a substantial cut in federal expenditures. Believes the proposed top corporation tax of 48 per cent is too high and the top of 70 per cent on individual incomes is confiscatory. Believes present tax laws are too complicated and favors a complete new tax code. Strongly favors reduction in federal expenditures and deplores trend toward giving more power to federal government which he says has been going on for 30 years. Believes the agricultural program would be one of the best places to cut federal expenditures.

WELFARE

Does not favor repealing any of the existing welfare programs, but would bar the introduction of any new ones. Would try to persuade the states that they should gradual-

ly take over the welfare program because they can do it cheaper. Social Security should be made "flexible and voluntary." A man who thought he could provide better retirement for himself should not be forced to pay Social Security taxes.

LABOR

Union leaders have too much power derived from federal legislation. Would not propose a national "right to work" law but has an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law giving the states the right to decide whether there should be an open shop. In the absence of state legislation calling for a union shop, there would be an open shop.

POLITICS

Would support a liberal Republican for president in 1964 and would expect liberal Republicans to support him if nominated.

A Visitor To The Smoke-Filled Room



STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

When Heine asked his coachman, "What are ideas?" the coachman pondered a moment and answered: "Ideas? . . . Ideas are the things they put into your head."

Even today, most people might answer as the coachman did, for our formal system of education seems to consist of things put into our heads — names and dates and battles and multiplication tables and the three principal sources of raw material in the Malayan Peninsula.

Of course, these are not ideas. Ideas are what come out of the head. Nobody can put them there, although a good education can stimulate them, organize them, and give them a solid basis in reason.

Education, if it means anything, is a drawing out; it is not a pushing in. The human mind is not a sausage casing into which we can stuff knowledge; and, usually, the harder we try to stuff, the more resistance we encounter. This is why so much formal education is a waste of time and energy.

A human being is a repository of ideas; the whole trick is to get these ideas out in the open, to test them against reality, to expose them to other ideas, and thus to sharpen and toughen them.

The greatest flaw in formal education, in my opinion, is that

it has little respect for ideas and too much for information. Children can get easily bored with information, when it seems to have no relevance; but they are excited and interested in ideas.

I vividly remember how the subject of zoology was ruined for me in school by teachers who were concerned only with classification and memorization of insects and such. No attempt was made to relate the subject to the other links in the great chain of life. Any real curiosity was considered almost an impertinence. As a result, the bright students quickly lost interest, and only the dutiful parrots scored high marks.

Nor was this merely a defect in the teachers. It was, rather, their general attitude toward learning in my day; there is some evidence that it has improved a little, but still not enough. The "dropout problem" is largely economic and social—but a part of it is also pedagogical, in that dead teaching turns students away from the classroom and toward more animal aspects of the human scene.

Every child's mind is teeming with ideas. Too often these ideas are systematically throttled or strangled in the school system, which looks only for the "right answers" that are in the back of the book. What is in the back of the head is rarely encouraged to move to the front.

We want to take our hats off in a salute to Bill Sweetland, departing publisher of your newspaper. The undersigned are but a few of his many admirers, all of whom regret to see him go from our wonderful high country and from Oregon — because he has served well this community and this state.

Sometimes people gloss over public service by private citizens and make the terrible error of thinking that only folks on the public payroll serve the community, state and nation. Sometimes we fail to appreciate service such as Bill has rendered because we are individually so busy raising a family, pursuing our hobbies and earning a living. Sometimes we think a newspaper is just a news-gathering and news-dispensing medium, supported by advertising. A newspaper can be just a business—but Bill's newspaper has been more than that. His kind of publisher sets the community to looking at itself. He examines our relations to the state, the nation and the world. Bill's editorials stimulated readers to look, to think, to reappraise and to act. They were incisive editorials which could not always win a popularity contest; yet if you read them with real understanding, you recognized that they were kindly too. Critical? Yes!—constructively critical!

We citizens of Klamath Falls are not losing a stay-at-home editor and publisher. Ever since he came in May, 1960, Bill has been all around town. Soon he will be all around in Chester, Pa. That is his way. It is a good way for a man who is willing to become a servant of the community. A good servant can certainly become well-informed about those whom he serves. A publisher must be well-informed—to be a good pub-

lisher. Bill has seen Klamath Falls in many different ways, including the viewpoints of seventeen worthwhile organizations which recently received his letters of resignation. They will all miss him.

Few men in Klamath Falls have accepted so many speaking engagements in so few months. Many times Bill spoke on behalf of our new hospital. He was well-informed about it because he has served on the hospital committee of the Klamath County Chamber of Commerce and he was also a member of the board of directors of the Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital. Bill was a director of the chamber of commerce, of United Fund and of Community Concert. He was a founder of the Klamath Symphony and of the Herald & News parade to put Christ back into Christmas. Bill initiated the Christmas party at the Klamath Nursing Home. Bill is an active Rotarian. Bill is in many things; he is many persons; a founder, a mover, a hard worker, a servant of the public whom he loves. We're gonna miss Bill!

Recognition of his talents came early in his residence here in Oregon and he was promptly appointed to the state's Constitutional Revision Committee. Bill was also appointed to serve on a regional Recreational Advisory Board of the United States Forest Service. Both of these important groups learned a thing or two from our Bill because — more than most members—Bill does his homework. He attends the meetings. He makes the field trips—like the one to Waldo Lake, high in the Cascades (and beautiful—and valuable to us all). How many who have lived in Oregon much longer than since 1960 have ever been to Waldo Lake—how many, among numbers who profess to be out-

doorsmen? Ask about Bill's hobbies? Fishing? Hunting? Perhaps he hasn't had time; possibly he has been too busy in serving all of us, to serve himself through personal recreation.

Bill Sweetland is a family man whose six children are: Bill Jr., 19; Chuck, 17; Ruth, 12; Brian, 11; Mary Beth, 9; Judy, 4. Bill attends church and supports his church generously, in keeping with his basic principles. Family, church, community, state, country — these are the important concerns to this serious, devoted hard-driving man. Don't forget that he also displays a sense of humor which many of us have seen in moments of serious debate with him. Recall some of his many delightful columns, "Nothing Special." Therein we found a homey approach to everyday affairs. There he was calling attention to sometimes overlooked values in things and people around us; reminding us what a privilege it is to live among similar and dissimilar folks in this community which is basically peaceful, favored, thriving and sometimes humorous as well.

Goodbye to you, Bill Sweetland!

We wish you well. We declare that you have earned our good wishes.

Signed:
James D. Monteith
G. Nicholson, M.D.
James F. Silwell
Rev. Robert C. Groves
Vern Owens
Harry Bolvin
Carroll Howe
Fletcher F. Conn, M.D.
Noel Flynn
Mike Balsiger
Donald Bauer, M.D.
George T. Callison
Bob Goshall
Norman Duffy
Chuck Bailey
Robert E. Veatch



WASHINGTON CALLING

Too Much Uranium

By MARQUIS CHILDS
WASHINGTON — How much nuclear killer capacity is enough? In shaping the new defense budget this is a deeply puzzling question Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara will in the end have to put up to President Kennedy.

A big industrial development with payrolls in a half-dozen states depends on continuing to produce fissionable material for nuclear weapons. Yet, as it is often put, we've got the stuff running out of our ears.

Secretary McNamara would like to cut back production. The Atomic Energy Commission is agreeable to some cutbacks. But the decision is complicated by a proposal bound to generate pressure as the results of a cut are seen in a loss of jobs, the mothballing of plants and the dispersion of highly skilled technical staffs.

The proposal originating with Sen. Clinton Anderson (D., N. Mex.), chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee, is to stockpile plutonium. The raw material, uranium, would be mined, processed at great cost and put back in the earth.

On the face of it, with a present capacity to destroy every target area in the Soviet Union several times over as the President has stated at least twice, this would seem to be a lunatic form of make-work. But the astute Anderson makes a case for the stockpile.

It is true, he says, that there is a large oversupply. In the United States arsenal are many old-fashioned nuclear bombs so

big that they would not be dropped under any circumstances. If these were remade and the fissionable material put into up-to-date weapons we would have at least a 10-year supply.

But the big surplus is in "yellow cake"—uranium oxide being processed from uranium by mills such as those of the Kerr-McGee Company under long-term contracts. What Anderson contemplates is a cutback in the mills, leaving a few large, efficient plants like that of Kerr-McGee to go on turning out "yellow cake." This, together with the huge current surplus, would be processed into plutonium that keeps indefinitely.

"We might," as one expert put it, "want to take a look at it after a thousand years."

Plutonium in the stockpile could be made up very quickly into bombs and warheads. Anderson points out. It would also be available for peacetime uses in power reactors if and when nuclear power production comes to be more nearly competitive with other power sources.

That would mean maintaining Oak Ridge in Tennessee, Savannah River in South Carolina and Hanford in the state of Washington in operation in part if not in entirety. Hanford has a payroll of 8,000 and while this is small as compared to Boeing it is important to Washington.

The scale of the overkill in America's nuclear arsenal produces highly technical and violently emotional arguments. In his courageous speech last August calling for substantial cuts in arms spending Sen. George

McGovern (D., S.D.) was content to use the phrase "several times over." But along with other members of Congress he has heard the presentation of Professor Seymour Melman of Columbia University who contends that overkill is 1,200 times what is necessary to destroy all Communist target areas.

The Pentagon says that such far-out figures are based on the impossible assumption that every single nuclear weapon would be used. They ignore the destruction of a part of the arsenal in a Soviet first strike. And they also overlook the fact of a wide disparity of weapons, including tactical battlefield weapons, not all of which would be zeroed in on the major target.

But certain Pentagon officials are deeply concerned with a stockpile so overflowing that storage has become a major problem. An indication of this was the deliberate leak last summer that defense would like to cut back its weapons requirements with the Atomic Energy Commission by a billion dollars.

During the fiercely fought controversy over the nomination of former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce charges were put in the record showing the interlocking relationship of powerful financial interests, including Kuhn-Loeb and the Rockefeller, in uranium. The late Sen. Robert Kerr (D., Okla.), through Kerr-McGee, was a major figure in this gold rush. It was part of the complex that brought abundance with the inevitable growth of deeply vested interests.

BERRY'S WORLD



"If I become a 'Grammar School Dropout', will you marry me?"