

Barry Must Get Ike's Endorsement

By HARRY FERGUSON
WASHINGTON (UPI) — One of these days Sen. Barry Goldwater is going to have to make a basic decision. Should he start moving from the far right toward the center of American political opinion or should he stand fast and risk the fate that overtook the late Robert A. Taft?

Neither the far right nor the far left elects an American president. The decision is made by the millions of independent voters who dwell in the middle ground. Taft, like Goldwater, was a conservative. He lost the 1952 Republican nomination to Dwight D. Eisenhower because the party professionals thought he was too conservative to win the election.

This is a big club and Goldwater's opponents will hit him with it repeatedly as the campaign hotens up. The other horn of the dilemma is that if Goldwater starts moving from the far right toward the center, he is bound to alienate the peo-

ple who now are the hard core of his support.

Letter to Goldwater from San Francisco: "The tragic picture of Tom Dewey and then again Richard Nixon agreeing to everything the incumbent administration had done and merely saying they could do it cheaper remains very vividly before us. There are millions of people who would like to be able to vote on the clear cut issues of personal freedom, sharply restricted foreign aid and our whole ridiculous foreign policy.

"Your stand in the past has been very clear, but it is noticeable that you have compromised these stands to some extent in the more recent past. I hope you will maintain a firm position and not compromise any further."

In recent years Goldwater has traveled a million miles and made 800 speeches. He has given countless press conferences and appeared on many television programs. Any man who talks that much inevitably

is going to say something he would like to have forgotten. Occasionally Goldwater unconsciously contradicts himself.

Goldwater desperately needs the approval of Eisenhower to win the nomination because the former president still is the hero of millions of voters in the middle ground. Some years ago Goldwater was asked what he thought about Eisenhower's brother, Milton, as a presidential possibility. He replied: "One Eisenhower in a generation is enough." To Goldwater's credit he does not try to wriggle off the hook today by claiming he was misquoted. But he does maintain that what he meant was that Dwight Eisenhower had rendered distinguished service to the nation and that the family should not be called upon to do anything further, especially since it was doubtful that Milton could match his brother's record.

So far Eisenhower, as far as the public knows, is neutral in the race for the GOP nomination.

He did say at one stage that he would like for Goldwater to be more explicit in what he stands for.

Goldwater recently visited the former president at Gettysburg and assured Eisenhower he would state his views fully on all issues if and when he announces he is a candidate. Between now and the announce-

ment of his candidacy will be a time of trial for Goldwater because he knows that if he comes up with a program unacceptable to Eisenhower, he will have two strikes on him before the Republican convention convenes.

Next: The men and organizations around Goldwater.



IN TOP CIRCLES — Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) and President Kennedy, who may oppose each other in the 1964 Presidential race, chat in top picture at a recent Washington meeting. Below, Goldwater, left, applauds as former President Eisenhower and Mamie arrive arm-in-arm at 73rd birthday dinner for Ike.

Editorial Page

Giving Away \$23 Million

Klamath County has shipped over \$23 million overseas in foreign aid in the period from 1945 to 1962.

We talk about raising just over a million dollars to help finance a hospital, and struggle to raise a United Fund of about a hundred thousand, but we hear very few voices raised against giving away \$23 million to foreign countries from Klamath County.

That may seem like a figment of the imagination, but let's put it in focus.

The United States has granted in excess of \$97 billion in foreign aid to virtually all countries of the globe in the period 1945 to 1962.

If you break this amount down into the 200 million estimated population of this country, you come up with a figure of about \$485 per person spent on foreign aid.

In Klamath County, if we take a population figure of 48,000, we come up with a total of just over \$23 million as our share of the foreign aid figure.

Just imagine what \$23 million could do for the needed facilities in this county. It would build seven or eight hospitals of the size now being contemplated. It would suffice to easily take care of our school building needs, and many other things.

Yet, in those 18 years, very few voices have been raised in protest against the steady outflow of money to overseas nations.

If we boil it down, we find that over the ensuing 18 years since 1945, Klamath County has sent \$10,800,000 to Europe; \$5,280,000 to the Far East; \$4,320,000 to the Middle East and South Asia; \$1,680,000 to

Latin America and about \$480,000 to Africa. Who ever said we were doing too little for our friends in other countries?

Right today, the Senate is making a valiant effort to chop down the foreign aid request of President Kennedy. The administration requested \$4.5 billion for foreign aid. That seems like a nice figure, but let's boil it down again to Klamath County.

It means that Klamath County's share of the cost of this foreign aid program for the coming year would amount to just over \$1 million!

Our share of the cost of the foreign aid program for the coming year is almost equal to the entire amount of money pledged or collected toward the construction of a new hospital here.

We find ourselves rarely in agreement with Senator Wayne Morse but on this issue of slicing foreign aid we're with him 100 per cent.

As a matter of fact, it's our opinion that Congress has been much too nice about it. The House had the courage to slash off a billion dollars, which would have saved Klamath County \$240,000, but the Senate has put part of this back in the bill.

If ever it was a time to take pen in hand and direct a note to your Congressman on this issue of foreign aid and reckless spending, now is that time.

It's not somebody else's money we're talking about, it's ONE MILLION DOLLARS of Klamath County money we're talking about.

Write to YOUR Congressmen now about YOUR money and how they are planning to spend it.

To Equalize?

(Register-Guard, Eugene)

In a far-reaching move, the Justice Department has filed a brief, as a friend of the court, in a case the U.S. Supreme Court will hear this fall. The department's contention is that all congressional districts must be of substantially equal population. If the court agrees, many states, including Oregon, may have to alter drastically their patterns of electing congressmen.

The case at issue comes from Georgia. A lower federal court has already ruled that the apportionment in question satisfies constitutional requirements. Two Georgia citizens disagree. They note that Georgia's Fifth Congressional District, which includes Atlanta and suburbs, had a 1960 population of 823,660. The smallest is the Ninth, a group of rural counties with a population of 272,154.

Nor are these Georgia extremes unusual. The largest district in the nation is the Fifth of Texas, represented by Republican Bruce Alger. It has a population of 951,527. The smallest in the nation is the 12th of Michigan, up in the Lake Superior country, with a population of 177,431. However, Arizona, Colorado and South Dakota also

have congressional districts with fewer than 200,000 citizens.

Perhaps something should be done in the Georgia case. That big district embraces two counties, Fulton and DeKalb. Perhaps Fulton, Atlanta's county, could be chopped off, leaving DeKalb to merge with others.

But in many states any further attempts to equalize the size of districts make no sense except statistical sense. Oregon is one such state. Here we have three distinct areas — Portland, Eastern Oregon and the rest of us. Portland and Eastern Oregon have one district each, the rest of us are divided into two. Mrs. Green's Portland district has a population of 522,813. Al Ullman's Eastern Oregon district only 265,164.

But how senseless it would be to hook Mr. Ullman's district to part of Portland. The interests of the two areas are too dissimilar. Others have tried other combinations to bring about a numerical parity. But none of them can follow lines of community of interest.

It's a worthy aim, and, as in the Georgia case, it is sometimes attainable. But sometimes it isn't. Let's hope the rest of us don't get stuck with a decision that was meant for someplace else.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Red Flag For Senate

By RALPH DE TOLEDANO
After 27 years of service to the government, Otto Otepka has been summarily fired. In that time, he served as the State Department's Deputy Director of the Office of Security and as officer in charge of security evaluations.

Mr. Otepka was not fired for leaking secrets to the Communists. His record is one of excellence. It is distinguished by awards for meritorious service. He was fired because he committed the one crime his bosses in the State Department could not tolerate:

He told the truth to the Senate Internal Security subcommittee.

And in telling the truth, he proved conclusively and with documentation that some other State Department witnesses had been more than a little cavalier with the facts in their own testimony.

The viciousness and crudity of the Otepka case justifies the statement of Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.) that it is "outrageous." The background of the case makes it clear that a bureaucrat, when faced with the possibility that his job may be in jeopardy, will stop at nothing.

On the very best of authority, I can state that Mr. Otepka's testimony was of the greatest importance to the security of the United States. Under oath, he demonstrated to the Senate Internal Security subcommittee that State Department security practices were extremely and dangerously lax, what individuals were responsible, and how efforts to tighten up procedures had been rudely ignored.

In giving his testimony to a duly constituted committee of the Senate, Mr. Otepka was not only doing his duty but was fully protected by United States Code, Title 5, paragraph 652 (d), which reads:

"The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States . . . to furnish in-

formation to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with."

Mr. Otepka's testimony ran counter to that of other State Department officials. In removing him from his job, however, the State Department did not charge him with perjury — nor was any effort made to determine the truth or lack of same in the testimony of other officials. Mr. Otepka was fired, as I have said, very frankly and openly for testifying before a Senate committee.

To compound the outrage, he was fired after the State Department had promised that no reprisals would be taken against him. However, prior to the dis-

missal, every effort was made to force him to resign. Though he was the last old-line security official in the State Department, this is how he was treated, according to Senator Dodd.

"They began, first, to restrict his functions."

"Then they installed a tap on his telephone. Although a State Department official has denied under oath that this was done, the Subcommittee on Internal Security has proof that the tap was installed."

"Then they began to monitor Mr. Otepka's wastebasket."

"Then they locked him out of his office and denied him access to his files, although no charge had yet been brought against him."

"No one suspected of espionage or disloyalty has to my knowledge been subjected to such surveillance and humiliation. . . . The State Department has been chasing the policeman instead of the culprit."

Senator Dodd has insisted that a 10-page memorandum on the Otepka case which he "personally delivered" to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and which was signed by every member of the Senate Judiciary Committee be delivered to all 100 members of the upper body. This is an explosive document, for it outlines fully the issues involved in the Otepka case and the information which the State Department would like to see suppressed.

Last Wednesday, the full Judiciary Committee met. Its members are up in arms. So, too, are members of other committees who see the Administration stifling the flow to Congress of any unpleasant or derogatory information. News management may not appear to be too important an issue for some Senators. But when the Executive Branch steps all over Congress, it ceases to be a Democrats - versus - Republicans issue. The prerogatives of the Senate are involved. Unless White House pressure becomes unbearable, this will be a case for the history books.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Sunday, Nov. 17, the 321st day of 1963 with 44 to follow.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The evening stars are Jupiter, Saturn and Venus.

On this day in history:
In 1800, Congress convened in Washington for the first time. The session was held in the north wing of the Capitol—the only portion of the building then completed.

In 1869, the Suez Canal in Egypt was formally opened.

In 1881, Samuel Gompers organized the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada at a meeting held in Pittsburgh.

In 1951, the pro-Soviet World Federation of Trade Unions advocated Communist infiltration into non-Communist labor organizations.

A thought for the day—American writer Mark Twain said: "Soap and education are not as sudden as a massacre, but they are more deadly in the long run."

Reporter's Tour Of Capital Vice Turns Up Raw Material

Will Washington Produce Its Own Christine?

By BILL MCCORMICK

Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — A newly arrived visitor reading about the Bobby Baker case might well gather the impression that much of the nation's business is conducted over cocktails and call girls.

He could picture Washington as a king-sized Cliveden populated by Yankee John Profumos frolicking with corn-fed Christine Keelers.

He could imagine the state of the union being shaped by frivolous floozies skylarking with rakehell dignitaries.

From its outset, the abrupt resignation of Robert Gene Baker as secretary to the Senate majority has stirred reactions, and they grow odder. Baker was once praised by Vice President Johnson as "one of my most trusted, most loyal and most competent friends."

Implications that the congressional bigwigs' helping hand had dipped into the collection plate at first barely nudged the awareness of America-at-large. They fell on ears bored by old stuff like conflict of interest.

Attitudes changed when the tale of a tasty Teuton known as Elly Rometsch became known. This 27-year-old wife of a West

German army sergeant stationed in Washington had been quietly returned to her native land when an FBI investigation disclosed she had been serving beyond the call of duty at sources for capital dignitaries.

Elly violated the code of her profession against name dropping by mentioning in familiar

terms Baker and his secretary, Carole Tyler, a lush blonde who shared her boss' town house with a female secretary to Florida's Sen. George Smathers. Smathers is a crony of Baker, the 35-year-old political prodigy from Pickens, S.C.

It subsequently developed that Baker was an organizer of the Quorum Club, a private hangout

for looking into the mores and for government figures and lobbyists and, until earlier this year, part-owner of The Carousel, a plush hotel in Ocean City, Md., heavily patronized by some of the "best people" from Washington.

The nation's eyebrows shot up — and Washington mouths slammed shut. Ordinarily gush-

ing fountains of information became The Unquotables when Bobby Baker's case was mentioned.

Elly Rometsch added mystery when she contradicted her own statements that she had known and catered to prominent Washingtonians. She said she had just been bragging when she strewed names around. Her husband, who filed for divorce after they returned to Europe, said she had been frightened into changing her story by men who flashed credentials as U.S. security agents.

This creates a good climate for looking into the mores and

morals of the seat of government.

A peek behind the scenes of Washington's la dolce vita — as the Romans call "the sweet life" — begins with the malignant private clubs. They never were as titillating as rumored. Because of criticism, many of these so-called dens of iniquity have been closed. One, run by a big airline, which attracted prizes as big as cabinet members and their wives, has been dismantled for many months and the building that housed it sold. About all that ever happened there anyway was a good fast game of bridge and an occasional collapse from an overdose of martinis.

The clubs still in operation are as sinful as a Calvin Coolidge White House dinner, including the Quorum, which is a small-sized version of any Union League Club — and about as exciting. Located across the street from the New Senate Office Building, the Q, as it is called, is a handy ducking-in spot for anyone who cannot get a drink at the Senate dining room.

The lady habitue who conducted this investigator to the "notorious" club skyly pointed



"WASHINGTON party girls operate mostly on call."

out several paintings of loosely garbed females and leered as she pointed to an unmarked door.

"That leads to a bedroom," she whispered; then turned it all by adding, "It's used for senators who pass out."

But if club high jinks are dead, prostitution is flourishing at every level, if there are levels in that profession. Washington, whose red light district once gave the world the euphemism "hooker" for shady ladies, hasn't had a regular house of pleasure for years.

When the girls set up establishments in the area east of the White House occupied by Gen. "Fighting Joe" Hooker and his troops in the Civil War, the term "hooker" was born. The joints were cleaned out during

Woodrow Wilson's tenure at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, but the name lingers on.

Washington party girls mostly operate like taxicabs — on call. "Hundred-dollar call girls are a dime a dozen," says one lobbyist who employs them. "The cheaper ones are harder to find."

Some of the girls have apartments in which they receive callers. The quarters are often shared by a like-minded friend or two.

Next: Who are the Washington call girls?



THE Q CLUB: "As sinful as a Calvin Coolidge White House dinner."