

Editorial Page

Your Help Needed

The Chamber of Commerce is launching a searching inquiry into what is needed to make Klamath County a better place in which to live and do business.

This commendable move will get underway on Wednesday, December 4, when the first of a series of meetings is scheduled with members of the chamber on this subject.

The plan calls for 40 members to be invited to each meeting at which each person present will be asked the question: "What, in your opinion, is the single most important project, activity or thing, which, if carried out by the Klamath County Chamber of Commerce, would make Klamath County a better place in which to live and do business?"

There should be little argument with the program itself. Rather, it should evoke some thoughtful suggestions that could serve as guideposts, not only for the Chamber of Commerce, but for other organizations of the community as well as for all the individuals of this area.

Each of us is quick to voice his gripes, his complaints, and to ask "Why don't they

do this . . . or why don't they do that?"

The "they" we refer to is, in too many cases, just a nebulous someone or something that should do something about the complaints we voice.

Actually, the "they" we refer to so loosely is ourselves. We are the ones who make a community what it is. We are the ones who make it a worse or a better place in which to live.

So actually the Chamber of Commerce is talking about our problem. It is seeking ways to make our community better.

You don't have to be a member of the Chamber of Commerce to lend a hand in this project. All you have to do is give the issue some good, level-headed thought, and then jot down your suggestions and send them along to this newspaper. We'll see they get in the right hands if they merit consideration.

A community is no better nor worse than the people in it.

It will progress no faster than those people want it to progress.

How about you lending a hand to improve your community?

Cutting Red Tape

Anything that reduces the amount of red tape connected with international travel is likely to be beneficial, so Washington's decision to permit oral baggage declarations at international airports by overseas travelers is a commendable sign.

After Jan. 1, travelers arriving by air from overseas will not be required to fill out the usual detailed customs declarations unless articles purchased abroad exceed in value the \$100 exemption per person.

Instead of the written declaration, travelers will fill out a pocket-size identification card with name, address, flight number arrival date and accompanying family

members. The card will be handed out to customs agents, who will determine whether imported articles are subject to duty.

Treasury Department officials hope that the new system will further encourage foreigners to visit the United States, thereby helping to reduce the balance of payments deficit.

Although the plan applies initially to air travel, it will also be tried experimentally on transoceanic ships arriving at New York. If this proves successful, it will be extended to all ports. Whatever the plan's effect on foreigners may be, most American travelers undoubtedly will welcome it.—Houston Post

Booze And Budgets

(Eugene Register Guard)

Problems of public finance being what they are in this state right now, Oregon's cities and counties can have little more than a forlorn hope of getting larger cuts from state liquor profits.

But the cities and counties do have some new, impressive, expert opinion to back up their long-argued contention that they are being short-changed by the state. Rutgers University investigators have reported that one-third of all U.S. arrests are for drunkenness. Furthermore, excepting only parking and non-drinking offenses, 60 per cent of all arrests are directly related to consumption of alcohol.

Oregon law gives the state monopolies on retail liquor sales and upon taxes relating to the liquor industry. But the state turns over to cities and counties only about one-fifth of its liquor take.

Our cities and counties obviously need larger law enforcement budgets than they would if Oregon still had prohibition. But, as long as our state government remains as financially dry as it is now, units of local government will undoubtedly remain lowly paid enforcers of state liquor laws and undercompensated members of all the breaches of public peace which stem from drinking.

Our Safety Lies Only In The Law

By BRUCE BLOSSAT

The people of the United States of America must surely be repelled now at the sickening cost exacted from them by the strains of violence and extremism which have run through this country for at least a century.

In 100 years, four presidents have died at an assassin's hand. Attempts were made to kill four others. Thus 8 out of the 29 presidents we have had in that span have felt the perilous presence of the fanatic.

This is a land whose whole being, whose crucial liberties, can find lasting safety only in the quiet orderliness of the processes of law.

What happens to that peace and that order when a president—the highest symbol of these vital elements—is struck down by violent means?

What happens, too, when his

evident assassin is killed by another extremist before the first fanatic can be tried according to law? The answer is simple. The fabric of freedom is gravely torn. Decisions that belong in the courts, in the legislative halls, in the voting booths, suddenly are made in the streets.

No nation, least of all this one with its unexampled traditions of liberty and democracy, can comfort itself with the repeated claim that violence and extremism infect "only a small minority" of its people.

The great truth, increasingly clear in these dark hours after the killing of both President Kennedy and his assassin, is that the blood of us all as free men of good will is contaminated when these evil elements flow without check.

And they do flow freely in this country, despite all our fine pretenses to the contrary. Too

many Americans in their hearts and minds approve resort to violence to achieve purposes both private and public.

Perhaps this comes basically from our youth as a country, from the frontier character that so long has marked much of our life.

Certainly, however, this unseemly endorsement of extremism takes strength from the selfish indifference, the calculated permissiveness, the flabby moral fiber which underlie our turbulent, complex, growing society today.

Not enough Americans appear to care deeply about preserving the very heartland of the freedoms they enjoy—the core of law and order.

We cannot even summon up sufficient concern to strike an effective blow against a television world which, in almost childlike simplicity, shouts at us

daily from its screen, in program after endless program, that to inflict death or injury by violence is a proper course to wise decision in a free land.

Too many Americans, while loftily decrying violence, preach hate, discord, open defiance of law, disrespect for the practitioners and upholders of law.

All too many of these find it not enough to attack fairly, by orderly means, policies and actions they dislike and would seek to change. They go beyond to place in a garish spotlight of personal hatred the individuals who conceive or promote or defend what these people do not approve.

In the United States in the past three years, there was altogether too much talk of "hating Kennedy." Even today, as he lies buried on a grassy hill, removed forever from the great struggle, there are men among

us who say he deserved his violent end or who cannot be troubled by his death because they disapproved what he stood for. If, then, we as a people are to gain any lesson from the President's death and the equally horrible assault on his assassin, we cannot stop with putting in fuller check the fanatics who do these twisted deeds.

We must speak out, as Chief Justice Earl Warren has just said, against those who "spread the venom which kindles thoughts of violence in others."

We must find a way to make a whole nation, in its unfolding maturity, care more than it has ever learned to care up to now about disarming in fact and in spirit not merely the violent extremist, but all who lend him critical support by preaching the hatred which feeds his dark purposes.



IN WASHINGTON . . .

Mr. Johnson's Image?

By RALPH de TOLEDANO

As President Johnson quickly takes hold of the reins of government, he faces the most important political decision of his career. It is one that Washington has been discussing so long since the first terrible shock of John F. Kennedy's assassination began wearing off.

Which image will he present to the country?

If Mr. Johnson follows his own impulses and his own bent, he will rapidly emerge as the most liberal President since Franklin D. Roosevelt. He will also win over the Northern liberal wing of the Democratic Party in a way which President Kennedy never did. And he will inherit the Negro vote which has gone to his party in Presidential elections since 1932.

A study of Mr. Johnson's record, ever since he was elected to the House of Representatives on April 10, 1937, has been one of consistent support of strongly liberal policies. In fact, he owes his rapid advancement in both House and Senate to his fervid espousal of the New Deal program and the yeoman work he did in behalf of FDR.

He did as much for President Truman and, since 1961, has used the office of the Vice President to cement bonds of friendship and common interest with Negro civil rights leaders. In fact, Mr. Johnson stands to the left of the late President on Negro rights. Unless circumstances intervene, he can be expected to push far more vigorously for the legislation now before the Congress than did his predecessor.

There will be many who urge President Johnson to demonstrate immediately his devotion to the ideology of the northern liberals. Their argument: that this is the only way to hold on to the big urban centers of the North which, in the past, have

given the Democratic Party its electoral pluralities. Without the industrial states, it is being said, President Johnson cannot win election on his own in 1964.

But there will be—and already are—counter pressures. Politicians of both parties have been making some very careful studies of the 1960 and 1962 election results. Many of them are convinced that the South and Midwest, not the industrial states, will be the pivot of the 1964 election. And it is precisely in these areas that President Johnson's liberalism will hurt him most.

These two areas of the country, along with parts of the Pacific Northwest and Mountain states, are the core of American conservatism. In the South, Mr. Johnson's prestige has sunk very low and it is possible that control of Texas, the President's home state, is no longer his.

The President will be told that he must mend fences among conservatives, that he must at the very least create an image of moderation. But this is easier said than done. In fact, there are perils and difficulties to either a liberal or a conservative stance. Each has its in-built disadvantages and will lose him support. The most likely course, at this writing, is the liberal one.

Mr. Johnson has always been a very sure-footed strategist. But as President, he is suddenly removed from the ordinary levels of political discourse. He must make his own decisions and, whatever his advisers may believe, make them alone.

The sudden quiet which surrounds a leader at the moment he assumes the Presidency is an amazing phenomenon—and it has an immediate effect on the man who stands in the eye of the Washington hurricane.

The Presidency took an essentially liberal man like Herbert Hoover and made of him a conservative. It took an essentially conservative man like Franklin D. Roosevelt and caused him to point this country in the direction of neo-socialism. It took an insignificant politician like Harry S. Truman and gave him great stature. And, conversely, it took a man of decision like Dwight D. Eisenhower and made him indecisive.

What the alchemy of the Presidency will do to Lyndon B. Johnson will be the great story of the months to come. How he develops will determine the future of the Democratic Party and heighten the struggle within the Republican Party. It will make its mark on history, both now and in the year to come.

Third Assassination



WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

Fair Play For Cuba Committee Lives On

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

WASHINGTON—Lee Harvey Oswald is dead.

The Fair Play for Cuba Committee is not. Their headquarters are located in a dingy office at 709 Broadway, New York City. Their front door is marked with a Cuban flag and the words, in Spanish, "Cuba, Free Territory of the Americas."

Chief occupant of the musty office is Vincent Theodore Lee, a one-time seaman who is the committee's third national director. The group was born in April 1960, and labeled a Communist front by a Senate subcommittee one year later.

In a recent appearance before that body, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Lee repeatedly invoked the Fifth Amendment. He refused to answer questions about Communist membership or funds supplied him by the Castro government.

He was not always so reticent. Earlier he had told a reporter for the Tampa Times "he was not concerned about Communist influence in Cuba and did not care if there were any Communists among the Fair Play for Cuba Committee membership."

Fair Play's creator is Robert Taber, an ex-convict who served time for armed robbery, auto theft and kidnapping. He toiled as a CBS newsmen when he used Cuban dollars to organize Fair Play in 1960.

Taber left the States in 1961, one step ahead of Senate prob-

ers who sought him for testimony. He arrived in Cuba with \$10,000 in Fair Play funds and went to work for Castro's news agency. He returned to this country earlier this year but has not been active in Fair Play work.

Fair Play's second national director was Richard Gibson, a Negro and self-styled Black Nationalist. Senate records show that Gibson was a freshman at Kenyon College in Ohio 13 years ago. He vanished just before the end of his spring term, leaving behind a tuition bill of \$579 which has not yet been paid.

Gibson, too, refused to answer questions before the Internal Security subcommittee, then left for Algeria where he now serves the people's revolution of Ahmed Ben Bella.

According to Sen. Thomas Dodd, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee had 7,000 student members before it was one year old. Chapters were set up at colleges from coast to coast.

The Internal Security subcommittee, which has conducted a searching investigation of the organization, reveals that Joanne Grant, one of the country's top young Communists, helped organize Fair Play in 1960.

In Chicago, the Fair Play show has been run by John Rossen, who has refused to deny under oath he is a Communist. On Jan. 2, 1948, The Daily Worker, official Communist organ, identified Rossen as Communist Party organizer for Southern Illinois.

Another Fair Play operative working out of Chicago has been Dick Criley, identified by the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1959 as a Communist. Called that afternoon to the stand, and given an opportunity to deny the allegation, Criley took the Fifth.

In Los Angeles, Fair Play is a joint operation of the Communist and Socialist Workers parties, both of which are listed as subversive organizations by the Attorney General. Dorothy Healy, Communist Party organizer for Southern California, has been active in Fair Play.

One of the organization's most energetic workers was Robert Franklin Williams, a North Carolina integration leader who fled to Cuba when sought by the FBI for kidnapping in 1961. He now speaks hatred over the facilities of Radio Havana.

A number of prominent people lent their names in a newspaper advertisement to Fair Play in its earlier days. These include playwright Truman Capote, novelist James Baldwin, critic Kenneth Tynan, authors Norman Mailer, and Jean-Paul Sartre. They no longer support the group.

WASHINGTON CALLING . . .

Opportunity Faces LBJ

By MARQUIS CHILDS

WASHINGTON — If President Johnson faces a challenge almost unparalleled in scope he also has an opportunity such as few men in our history have been given.

That opportunity is to convert the shock, horror and humiliation of the events of the past few days into a swift, constructive forward movement. The nation in a state of shame and shock over this unspeakable blow is surely ready to accept a powerful initiative.

The stagnant, foot-dragging Congress has been an expression of the frustration and bafflement in the country. It has seemed impossible to bring about any resolution of the deep and embittering divisions. President Kennedy had become reconciled, outwardly at least, to postponing the key pieces of his legislative program—the tax cut and the civil rights bill. This is all that remained of a bold and comprehensive series of proposals the youngest President ever to serve in the office had advanced, beginning with his first State of the Union message.

At the last press conference he held Kennedy spoke of an "18-month delivery" for the two pieces of legislation which were imperative before the start of the Presidential campaign. But there was no assurance in view of the sit-down strike of Southern committee chairmen and the certainty of a filibuster conducted with all the resourcefulness of such an implacable enemy as Senator Richard Russell

of Georgia that action could come by March or April.

President Johnson in his years as majority leader was a master of the legislative process. The protégé and close ally of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, he knew as well as anyone in this century how Congress worked and how and why it failed to work. While his methods were sometimes rough and he often left bruised feelings in his wake, he got results.

That is his great advantage at a critical moment in the nation's history. Already there is talk in Congress that since the two major pieces of legislation are stalled in committee it might be well to get on with neglected housekeeping such as the long-delayed appropriation bills for most of the government departments and then go home. Before Kennedy's assassination Congress had been scheduled to stay until Dec. 29 and break up for Christmas recess.

The logic of the situation may dictate an interval in which the new President pulls together the many tangled threads of the incredibly difficult task he has inherited. But the danger is that such an interval will efface the memory of what the country has just been through. The partisan passions, for the moment stilled, will revive and the same fractious pieces frozen into the old immobility.

This immobility was in part concealed from the world by the vigor, the outward confidence, the high style and good humor of the late President. Those

aware in other capitals, however, of the heavy responsibility America carries have long been disturbed and uneasy at the prospect of an unresolved dilemma carried into a Presidential campaign stretching out for a full year.

Absorbed as we are in our own concerns, our own political entanglements, it is hard for most Americans to realize how closely everything that happens here is followed and analyzed. The shock of the President's assassination, climaxed by the fantastic lawlessness of the murder in the police station of the accused assassin, has been very great. Twenty-four hours after Kennedy's death was flashed to the world this reporter spent an hour and a half in a telephone link with London, Paris and Hamburg, Germany, discussing the late President and the new President with informed observers in each country, both journalists and high-ranking political figures.

The questions to the American participant came thick and fast. Who is this man Lyndon Johnson? Will he alter the foreign policy of President Kennedy? Is this a crushing blow to American liberalism? Will the fact that the accused assassin was a Marxist touch off a new and more virulent extremism of the right wing? A new and more dangerous test in Soviet-American relations?

The words President Johnson speaks to the nation and the world can supply many answers. But deeds, and immediate deeds, will speak louder than words.

THEY SAY . . .

Through their unlawful dealings—theft, gambling, usury, extortion, bribery, blackmail and murder—underworld kings have grown into a dominating force on the national scene.

—J. Edgar Hoover.

Why the devil should I bury them the capitalists? Their own working class will do it.

—Nikita Khrushchev, addressing workers in Yugoslavia.

BERRY'S WORLD



"No, I'm not worried about being late for the party . . . It was all over an hour ago!"

STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS



"If we survive this crisis of war," said the man across the dinner table, "if we do not annihilate ourselves, and the world becomes more or less stable—then what do you think is the primary, and most important, problem the human race should concern itself with?"

I assumed he expected me to answer in some grand socio-politico-economic-philosophical fashion, but I did not. "Children," I said. "The problem of children."

He seemed astonished. "How can children constitute the primary problem? Are you suggesting we must start with their education in order to make the world a better place to live in?"

"Nothing so banal as that," I replied. "I am suggesting that

we devote more of our efforts to study babies from the moment they are born, to learn exactly the nature of the process of maturation, to know which stimuli and which influences are beneficial and which are harmful."

"Don't we know enough of that yet?" he asked.

"Hardly anything. We have barely scratched the surface. We are spending billions to investigate outer space, and pennies to look into the essential structure of the human being from birth to maturity."

He thought I was being captious or perverse, but I was not. To me, there is absolutely no hope for future development of the human species unless we unwrap the mysteries of infancy and childhood. For it is in the earliest years that we go wrong, through ignorance, through willfulness, through impatience and arrogance and love that is not only blind but deaf, dumb and lame as well.

Which forces, which treatment, which emotional and social climate would best produce the kind of human beings we would like to see—human beings generous and flexible, responsive and alert, poised easily and delicately between strength and tenderness?

As yet, we can only make some shrewd guesses. Our samples are too small, our experiments too brief, our expenditures too scanty. The amount of superstition is enormous compared with the amount of fact. Our children are still riddles to us; as infants, they are even more enigmatic. We do the most damage without knowing we are doing it at all.

Yet, since man is a creature continually making himself (and sometimes unmaking himself), it seems evident to me that the conscious "making process" must begin much earlier than it does if we are to turn out people in the future who are capable of sustaining and ennobling human life. Perhaps we cannot, but if so, then the socio-politico-economic-philosophical problems will remain where they have always been.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Friday, Nov. 29, the 33rd day of 1963 with 32 to follow.

The moon is approaching its full phase.
The evening stars are Jupiter, Saturn and Venus.

On this day in history:
In 1890, the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy played the first Army-Navy football game at West Point, N. Y., with the final score: Navy 24-Army 6.

In 1945 Yugoslavia became a federated republic after Marshal Tito read a proclamation to the constituent and national assemblies.

In 1948, opera was telecast directly from the stage of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City for the first time.

In 1960, Nelson Rockefeller announced he would seek a second term as governor of New York in the 1962 elections.