

Editorial Page

Same Sad Political Story

It appears to be the same old record being played again and again on the battered juke box in the legislative halls at Salem.

The House thinks one way, the Senate another, everybody takes pot shots at the governor, and the attorney general continues to try to run the state with legal opinions.

What started out as a simple special session that could solve the state's fiscal crisis with a couple of bills has turned out to be a full blown carbon copy of the elongated session which the state was subjected to earlier this year.

The statement of Attorney General Robert Thornton Monday that, in his opinion, the governor has no power "to make selective reductions in expenditures," has thrown the session into even a more troubled turmoil and has, no doubt, prolonged the session needlessly.

But, this ruling is typical of prior rulings of Thornton who appears to rejoice in the role of being an obstructionist.

Let it be said to the credit of the legislature, they have been in session now for about 10 days and have managed to pass one measure. That one authorized the speed-up in the collection of state withholding taxes from employers who withhold \$100 a month or more from their employes.

This will pick up an estimated \$12 million revenue on a one-shot basis.

A second measure which gives the governor power to cut the basic school allotments is also on the way through the torturous twists of the legislature and, unless held up by Thornton's ruling, may become law.

The Senate is to be commended for its

stand that the voters meant "no new taxes" at this special session, and have stood fast on this score.

However, not so commendable is their apparent stand that they will approve no bill which proposes to cut their \$250 monthly salary.

If the legislature now has to go into a full fledged review of the budget and attempt to make selective cuts, it could be a special session that might rival the regular session.

Already, this legislature has the dubious distinction of having been the longest in the history of the state.

The tinge of politics that surrounded the regular session has become a rainbow in the special session. The Boardman issue is a case in point as Democrats maneuver to discredit Hatfield's administration.

It also serves as a convenient smoke-screen to shroud the time and money-consuming fight that has raged between the House and the Senate throughout this 1963 session.

We would suggest that they get on with the job and go home.

Despite Thornton's ruling, the governor can still be given the power to make the cuts he has suggested. All the legislature has to do is adopt the schedule of cuts which Hatfield has recommended.

But first, apparently, we have to wade through the old, old sales tax and cigarette tax battles, be subjected to political tirades by die-hard obstructionists, and, after a somewhat lengthy interval, we then get the few measures needed to solve the problem and the special session ends.

It's a sorry sight, certainly not one befitting lawmakers.



THE GLOBAL VIEW . . .

Opportunity Knocks

By LEON DENNEN
RIO DE JANEIRO (NEA)—In every Latin-American Communist Party there are today growing numbers of "activists" who consider Nikita Khrushchev and his supporters as traitors to the Marxist-Leninist cause.

In this situation lie opportunities for both the U.S. and Red China. Thus far, Mao Tse-tung seems to be taking better advantage of it than Washington.

Peking's propaganda is driving hard and making some progress in capturing the minds and hearts of these activists—mostly intellectuals, students and young army officers.

But a pro-western Brazilian political leader told this reporter:

"If only the United States knew how to take advantage of the Communist split, democracy might still have a chance in Latin America."

Carlos Lacerda, governor of the state of Guanabara and an able politician, said: "The fight among the Communists offers a golden opportunity to strengthen democracy in Latin America."

Lacerda is one of the most outspoken opponents of President Joao Goulart, whose regime is supported by the pro-Russian Brazilian Reds. The pro-Chinese Reds oppose Goulart whom they regard as "Moscow's man."

Regardless of how the direct Khrushchev-Mao conflict comes out, the split among Latin American Communists will go on for a long time.

Even East European journalists who accompanied Yugoslav President Tito on his Latin-American swing conceded the Moscow-Peking rift is reflected in rising dissension on this continent. One Iron Curtain newsman who spent years as a propagandist in Latin America said:

"The pro-Chinese view of immediate revolution is particularly strong among leftist intellectuals, students and young army officers. Friends who once greeted me as a comrade-in-arms now denounce me as a traitor to Marxism-Leninism and a Russian imperialist."

The contempt of the pro-Chinese intellectuals for "revisionists" Khrushchev and Tito was even stronger than their hatred of the United States, the Red newsman said.

are literally deluging Latin America. The Chinese radio propaganda which goes under such titles as "The Panorama of the New China" and "China Builds Socialism" makes a special point of the "anticolonialist" and anti-American similarity between the problems of China and Latin America.

The Russians are trying desperately to counter Mao's attack with their own barrage of radio propaganda and through placing Soviet agents in all Latin American countries.

Moscow's latest broadcasts to Latin America are a clever mixture of raw political propaganda and programs that would have a greater audience appeal.

A program entitled "News of Soviet Science and Technology" contains much interesting information about scientific developments in Russia and gives the impression that the Soviet Union is far ahead of the United States in all branches of science.

Alongside Russia's and China's radio propaganda there are the so-called "native" programs which originate in Latin America. The president of the Rio de Janeiro Chamber of Commerce recently complained to the minister of justice about subversive Red propaganda systematically broadcast by a Rio radio station in violation of Brazil's communication laws. The station is closely linked to pro-Communist Congressman

Leonel Brizola, President Goulart's brother-in-law.

The reply of the minister was typical of conditions in Brazil. He told the business leader to worry less about Red propaganda and more about the "conspiratorial activities" of Governor Lacerda. The latter is anti-Communist and pro-United States.

It is the consensus of specialists on communism that the pro-Russian Red parties remain in control of the situation in Latin America and seem to command a greater following than the newly risen pro-Chinese groups.

Agents of Fidel Castro, who seems to have one foot in the Russian camp and the other in the Chinese, are now trying to act as go-betweens. They are spreading rumors that a conference of Latin Communist leaders is to be held soon in Uruguay to settle the controversy.

But specialists on communism see little chance that the feud between the pro-Russian and pro-Chinese factions, which has reached violent proportions in Brazil, Peru and Mexico, can be settled in the foreseeable future. Instead, they believe, such a conference might even widen the differences.

The question is: Will the United States with its hordes of Information Agency officials and CIA agents roaming Latin America, grasp the opportunity and take the ball away from the Communists?

BERRY'S WORLD



"Maybe he'll be President some day . . . listen to that 'mandate for change.'"

"Open The Door, Richard!"



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Certificate Offer New Voter Gimmick

By FULTON LEWIS JR.
WASHINGTON—As a wealthy Chicago banker, John S. Gleason contributed \$1,000 to the Citizens for Kennedy-Johnson in 1960.

Now, as chief of the Veterans Administration, Gleason is once again doing his part. He and the Chief Executive have dreamed up an ingenious program to win the electoral support of 1.2 million more Americans.

Widows of former U.S. servicemen are now receiving letters signed by Gleason that read: "President Kennedy holds in such high esteem those who have served our country in the Armed Forces of the United States that he has inaugurated his Presidential Memorial Certificate program a certificate bearing his signature is furnished to the next of kin."

They are urged to fill out an enclosed card and mail it to the President at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. They will receive in the mail their individual "Memorial certificate which reads: 'The United States of America honors the memory of . . . This certificate is awarded by a grateful nation in recognition of devoted and selfless consecration to the service of mankind in the Armed Forces of the United States.'"

It is signed, "John F. Kennedy, President of the United States."

The program is pursued with deadly earnest by Gleason's men. Regional managers of the Veterans Administration recently received letters from Washington asking them to "exert every effort" to insure success of the program.

Congressman Bob Dole, Kansas Republican, feels the program is blatantly political. He notes the \$60,000 cost to the V.A., which could better spend its money elsewhere. For that sum it could pay one year's compensation payments to 20 totally disabled service-connected veterans. It could provide educational benefits for 45 children of veterans killed in action. The widows of 38 servicemen who died in action could

be paid death benefits for one year.

In the average Veterans Administration hospital, 73 veterans could be hospitalized for a period of 30 days. Nursing type care could be provided for six months for at least 18 aged veterans now occupying beds for acutely ill veterans.

Note: Representative Dole says this is not the first time the Veterans Administration has lent its facilities to the President for a little politicking. During the last Congress, a bill was passed which the rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans. Veterans were informed of their good fortune in the following note that accompanied their monthly checks:

"President Kennedy has signed a law increasing service-connected compensation rates for disabled veterans."

On another occasion, the V.A. paid ahead of schedule the dividends due on government insurance policies. Veterans learned this when they received the following missive from Washington: "The V.A. is paying ahead of schedule the 1961 dividend on government life insurance as part of the President's program for advancing the economy."

The President, who insists a tax cut is necessary to spur the economy, has not always felt that way. In the early months of his Congressional career, in 1947, Representative Kennedy voted against a \$4 billion tax cut three separate times. He cast his vote against a \$5 billion cut in that same Congress on two other occasions.

During the Republican 83rd Congress, when Kennedy was a freshman senator, a tax cut of \$7.1 billion was proposed. How did Kennedy vote? He didn't. He paired his vote. When his name was called, the Junior Senator from Massachusetts said: "If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote nay."

The tax cut—largest in U.S. history up to that time—passed despite Kennedy's opposition.



STRICTLY PERSONAL.

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Following my recent piece on Einstein and Freud (in which I pointed out that Einstein did not believe that "everything is relative" any more than Freud believed "everything is sex"), a college student in Maine asked me to elaborate on Einstein's position as I did on Freud's.

Einstein's theory of relativity was restricted to the physical field. Time and space are relative to the observer. Except for the speed of light—used as the ultimate measurement—there are no "absolutes" in the physical universe, as was believed until 1900.

What happened, however, was that Einstein's physical relativism was illicitly transferred to other fields. Since he apparently did away with absolutes in physics, some of his semi-educated devotees immediately proclaimed that all absolutes had been banished from human thought.

He was speaking of the behavior of blind matter and energy. They spoke of the behavior of human beings and societies. They denied any such concepts as "goodness," "truth," "freedom," as having any objective meaning whatsoever. Ethical values became a mere matter of personal preference, like preferring vanilla ice cream over chocolate.

But Einstein himself did not believe this. He did not draw

such fallacious human consequences from his physical theories. Indeed, he was extremely "old-fashioned" in his ethical beliefs, just as Freud was personally "moral" in his private standards of conduct.

Not only did Einstein reject the shallow attitude that "everything is relative," but he even spent the latter years of his life looking for more coherence and unity in the universe itself. When he died, he was working on a "unified field theory" which would reconcile and integrate the various and conflicting aspects of the cosmos as we know it.

In a letter to his colleague, Prof. Max Born, Einstein once wrote: "Raffiniert ist der Herr Gott, aber boshaft ist Er nicht;" or, in effect, "I cannot believe that God would choose to play dice with the world." The universe is incomprehensible to man, he added, but "the presence of a superior reasoning power . . . informs my idea of God."

This is not to say that he was religious in any traditional or conventional sense of the word. But it is to say that he did not regard creation as a matter of chance, of statistics, of accident, or of anything but a purposeful plan. He literally believed in a universe, not a multiverse. Whether he was right or wrong, it is foolish and ignorant to cite Einstein as the great apostle of "relativity."



IN WASHINGTON . . .

State Dept. Deceit—II

By RALPH DE TOLEDANO

Because the facts in a matter like the Otepka case get hurried in the verbiage of debate, I am continuing the publication of the record. Three State Department officials testified that they had no knowledge of any wiretapping of the office of Otto Otepka, chief security evaluations officer of the department who was fired for cooperating with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Here is the July 29, 1963, testimony of David I. Belisle, special assistant to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, and his subsequent "corrections":

"Q. Do you have any information with respect to the tapping of the telephone of Mr. Otto Otepka?"

"A. No, sir. . . . Q. Did you have anything to do with the placing of a listening device in Mr. Otepka's office?"

"A. I did not, sir. . . . Q. Did you know if this was done?"

"A. I do not."

Now Mr. Belisle's letter of Nov. 6, 1963: "I would like to amplify my responses . . . by stating that Mr. Reilly (Mr. Belisle's superior) mentioned to me the events (concerning the interception of conversations in Mr. Otepka's office). He mentioned these events to me only after the events occurred. . . . I had, therefore, no firsthand information concerning these events, and it was for this reason that I answered the questions as I did."

Now for Deputy Assistant Secretary John F. Reilly. His testimony on Aug. 6, 1963:

"Q. Did you tell Jerome Schneider to install an electric device to compromise Mr. Otepka's telephone?"

"A. No, sir. . . . Q. Did you know this had been done?"

"A. No, sir. . . . Q. Have any listening devices been installed in (Mr. Otepka's) office?"

"A. No, sir. . . . Q. Have any devices or contrivances been installed in or connected with his telephone wires . . . so as to activate his telephone and make it in a sense a permanent receiving microphone?"

"A. No, sir. . . . Q. Have any listening devices been installed in (Mr. Otepka's) office?"

"A. No, sir. . . . Q. Did you know if this was done?"

"A. I do not." Now Mr. Reilly's letter to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee—Nov. 4, 1963: "On March 18 . . . I asked Mr. Elmer D. Hill to undertake a survey of the feasibility of intercepting conversations in Mr. Otepka's office. . . . I desired to know whether this technique could be used without undue risk of detection. . . . On March 19, Mr. Hill told me that he and Mr. Clarence J. Schneider . . . had conducted a feasibility survey by connecting spare telephone wires from the telephone in Mr. Otepka's office to the Division of Technical Services laboratory. Mr. Hill told me that the system attempted had not proved successful when . . . tested. . . . I made it clear to Mr. Hill that I did not wish any conversations intercepted at that time. . . . Shortly after the

close of business on March 20, I directed Mr. Hill and Mr. Schneider to disconnect the telephone wires which they had connected. Later that evening, Mr. Hill complied with my directions while Mr. Schneider and I remained in the corridor outside Mr. Otepka's office."

All three officials, facing disciplinary action as a result of Senator Dodd's disclosures, insist that they did not commit perjury because the listening device did not work. What they were asked, however, was whether they had knowledge that such devices had been planted. Their "amplifications" make it abundantly clear that they did—and that their answers were designed, at the very least, to lead the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee astray by deceitful means. Lawyers will have to determine whether or not they overstepped the very narrow bounds of the perjury statute. But legal questions aside, they were morally guilty of the Dodd charges.

Except for Senator Dodd's exposure, the men who deceived the subcommittee would have retained their jobs, whereas Mr. Otepka would have fought in vain for reinstatement. I am certain that the Messrs. Reilly, Belisle, and Hill sincerely believe that they were protecting the State Department when they harassed Mr. Otepka and misled a committee of the Congress. But their sincerity is not at issue. What is at stake is the behavior of individuals who make Americans increasingly cynical about their government.

Letters To The Editor

No New Taxes Mandate

It is interesting to listen to the various interested parties try to analyze the referendum vote, always trying to slant it to favor their pet interest. The school people are particularly guilty of this. No doubt, many of them are genuinely misguided as to what the public attitude is toward the overbalanced school situation. But the school politicians have so successfully brain washed the public that the people feel a guilt, almost a fear, in expressing a desire toward curtailment of the schools' greedy ambitions. Underneath, however, the people feel a deep resentment at being caught in a web of pressure, much of which is being exerted by their own brain washed children.

The school politicians have been successfully able, with their shame tactics to keep this seething resentment from bursting into flame. Yet, when the people can express themselves without being individually identified, as they did in this referendum, they leave little question as to how they feel.

If the legislature is so foolish

as to rely on the results of the self selective polls conducted by various newspapers, they will just have to learn the hard way that the people mean what they say when they demand economies in the government.

The feeling of the public has been well expressed by Senate President Ben Musa (and partially concurred in by our governor) when he stated that the mandate was for no new taxes and economies in all departments of the government.

This doesn't mean that the legislature is to try to find a scapegoat consisting of a minority group, that can't defend themselves, to dump the tax load onto. Such would be the case in the one shot speed up tax for business. If more money is gained by the state, someone has to supply it. In this case the already beleaguered businesses of the state would have to further drain their operating capital to pay these taxes.

When the people ask for economies they are asking first and foremost for economies in schools, also in the highway and

other departments which have had virtual immunity from the direction of the legislature and the voter, because of their favored position of operating on guaranteed dedicated funds.

It has been said that he who has the power to tax has the power to destroy. Certainly no place could better demonstrate this than with our program of basic school support. The only valid reason for espousing basic school support by the state is to remove the financial control of our schools as far from the voters as possible. The next logical step is to take on federal aid and dictatorial controls that come with it.

It is all a vivid picture of the rot and decay that has set in in our democracy and the rapid pace with which we are giving away our liberty and right of the ballot.

Dictatorship is only a step away, while we are asleep at the switch. The people have spoken. We want no new taxes. We want economies in every phase of our government.

Fred A. Lewis, 2900 South Sixth Street.

Washington Window . . .

Election Depends On K

By LYLE C. WILSON

United Press International

There would be some formidable chance taking if the Kennedy administration conducts the President's re-election campaign on the theme of peace-and-prosperity.

The appearance of the reality of peace in 1964 will depend very much on the unpredictable Nikita S. Khrushchev. The Soviet Union's formal promises have proved before this to be all too slender reeds for leaning. The peace part of the Democratic campaign theme will be vulnerable on a day-to-day basis.

Some wild words or wild actions by Khrushchev might destroy the idea that peace actually prevails and that President Kennedy should be paid off for it at the polls. Kennedy, of course, is not a helpless captive of the Russians. The President is a pretty smart operator himself.

Discovery of the wrong kind of missiles in Cuba during the 1960 congressional campaign could have wrecked Democratic chances. But Kennedy's strong action did more than merely to cause the Communists to back down. Kennedy's actions also proved to be effective vote getters for Democratic congressional candidates.

Some hard-nosed Communist maneuver next year might offer Kennedy a splendid opportunity to make some more political hay at the expense of the Republicans. The hazard to Kennedy is that the chips are as likely to fall against as to fall with him in such a situation. If Khrushchev chose the

right sabre and rattled it properly at just the right time and the right place, he might prevent Kennedy's re-election. It was a near thing for the Democrats, in fact, last time.

The prosperity plank of Kennedy's re-election campaign platform would be equally a political hazard, if not more so. The President is well aware of that. It would not be fair to him to suggest that Kennedy proposed tax reduction legislation merely to bolster 1964 re-election prospects. But the President and his associates have been plugging the bill as a measure intended to enable the United States to avoid a business slump, further unemployment, industrial stagnation and the like.

Kennedy was telling the tax cut story to Ohio newspaper editors last week when they were White House guests for lunch. He said the country would avoid a recession if the tax bill were enacted. If the bill is rejected, Kennedy said, there might be a recession. If it came, this recession would hit in the summer of 1964. It is not necessary to be a practicing politician to understand what a mid-summer recession would do to a President who was campaigning just then for re-election. It would kill him.

So the foundation of Kennedy's prosperity plank must be laid on a tax bill which is stuck in Congress although likely to pass in some form next year. Kennedy's own words reflect the urgency with which he needs to get that tax cut through Congress to pro-

tect his re-election interests in such states as Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois and Massachusetts. The President thinks those states would be hit hardest.

Tax bill or no tax bill, there are some cracks in Kennedy's prosperity campaign plank. Unemployment has not responded to what the Democratic President and Democratic Congress have been able to do about it. Some 1960 campaign promises about unemployment remain to be redeemed.

The jobless and their friends are likely to doubt the validity of 1964 prosperity. And the Republicans will ask embarrassing questions.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Wednesday, Nov. 20, the 244th day of 1963 with 41 to follow.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The evening stars are Jupiter Saturn and Venus.

On this day in history: In 1866, the Grand Army of the Republic, composed of veterans of the Union Army, held its first national encampment at Indianapolis, Ind.

In 1945, the Nuremberg, Germany, war crimes tribunal began hearing evidence on 24 top German leaders of World War II.

In 1961, New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller went to New Guinea to help search for his son, Michael, who disappeared on a scientific expedition.