

# Editorial Page

## United Fund Drive

Klamath County's United Fund campaign, over the \$100,000 hump and better than two-thirds of the way to meeting the quota, proves people here want to help their less fortunate neighbors.

The progress of the drive also illustrates the military has again put a solid shoulder to the wheel. Leaders of the Kingsley Field division of the campaign reported late last week that they had raised more than 100 per cent of their quota. Hats off to solicitors and contributors alike. They've done an excellent job.

The Special Gifts Division also warrants a pat on the back for going over the 100 per cent mark.

The fact that collections this year are running ahead of last indicates that when people have the money they are willing to part with it for worthy causes like the United Fund.

However this is no time to let down. Officials of the vital campaign have explained that the goal, \$148,311 for 1964 is more than 16 per cent greater than this year's budget so from here on out the going may be tougher if some of those low on the pole don't begin coming through. Divisions which still haven't reached 50 per cent of their quotas: Large firms, Downtown II and County.

## A Lesson For Youth

President Kennedy's great sacrifice — giving his life for his country — should be a history lesson never to be forgotten by the youth of this nation. The late leader of our country not only died as a martyr but once before came within an eyelash of losing his life during World War II. The PT boat he commanded was cut in half by an enemy destroyer. Part of the crew was lost and young JFK swam to safety and at the same time rescued a buddy.

In recent times too many of our young people — and with plenty of assistance from their elders — have been figuring ways to beat the responsibility to their country. They're not secretive about it. They openly seek some means of staying out of the service like it was the accepted thing to do. Some try to conjure up a physical disability or are hopeful that they have some defect

which would prohibit their putting on the uniform. Others use a teen-age marriage as a crutch to help them avoid a summons from the draft office.

We take off our hats to the youngster willing and ready to serve the nation; to accept the discomforts of a regimented life in the military; the readiness to leave his home and the fun of living in his own neighborhood. Somewhere along the line they have learned their responsibility to their country; that freedom isn't God-given . . . that it must be earned; that the United States didn't become the greatest nation in the world without people giving their lives to preserve it.

We're sick of hearing someone tell us how they, or their son, connived to stay out of uniform.

Cheers for the young man who wears his uniform proudly!

## A New Hand At The Door



## Letters To The Editor

### Lee Oswald?

Here on this earth it is not possible for us to be equal in the eyes of our fellow men, but in death and before God are we not all equal? Is the soul of any one man more important to God than the soul of any other man?

The tears have fallen like the rain throughout our land and countless prayers have been offered for the soul of John Kennedy, for his wife and for his children. This is right, for he was a great man. Perhaps our sorrow is not as bitter, our prayers not as fervent, but we have not forgotten Patrolman Tippit, his wife and his children. This is right, for while he may not have been a great man, he was a brave man.

What of Lee Oswald? How many tears have fallen and how many prayers have been offered for the soul of this poor wretched man, for his wife and for his children?

Is this our mistake? Is this our opportunity?

Naomi M. Bean, 221 Washington Street.

### Poor Taste

The writer takes three daily papers and two news-week type magazines.

Up to a point I also believe, the public is entitled to all the news fit to print. However there is a point where freedom of the press ceases to be a virtue.

The body of our assassinated President was hardly cold when the questions asked by represen-

tatives of the press were not only senseless, unnecessary and tasteless, they were downright cruel. They must have been heart-breaking to the Kennedy family. They also must have been most embarrassing to the newly sworn in President and to the legislators interrogated.

I refer to the many times this question was asked in various wordings: "Do you think that President Johnson with his long experience and forceful drive will be able to pass Mr. Kennedy's favorite bills better than Mr. Kennedy could? Do you think he will be more proficient? Then Sunday afternoon Howard K. Smith and a couple of legislators spent a half hour rehashing the same subject.

I, for one, do not believe it was either the time or the place for that discussion. If that is "Freedom of the Press" I personally will gladly see that freedom curtailed and some long needed consideration of the parties directly affected substituted in its place.

Another brilliant bit was asked by the gentleman who asked Mrs. Richard Nixon, "What are you going to say to Mrs. Kennedy when you meet her?" "Tell me how do they get that way?"

R. H. Cook, 4710 Hilyard Ave.

### BARBS

A compromise is when the whole family goes to the movie Dad didn't want to go to.

Work hard, gals, until you've earned enough money to burn. Then you'll have no trouble finding a match.

Even for the wealthy man a home is a flop house after a hard day's work.

A stingy man who never gives to worthy causes just gives himself away.

So is the cost of Christmas shopping, General Sherman.

Come winter and anybody worth his salt will throw it on icy sidewalks.

It's great to be out in the woods in the fall getting close to nature, but when it rains it's too close.

There are still a lot of one-party lines and the one party is either a teen-age son or daughter.

It indicates you haven't much to give when you give up too easily.

An insurance company considers golf one of the most dangerous sports. Maybe not if you forget the 19th hole in the clubhouse.

### New Chapter



## WASHINGTON REPORTS . . .

# Kennedy, LBJ Disagreed

By FULTON LEWIS JR. WASHINGTON—In a Congressional career that spanned 14 years, John Fitzgerald Kennedy disagreed frequently with Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The two found themselves on opposite sides of the ideological aisle on no less than 264 roll call votes. Some were trivial; others were not.

On the average, the two men disagreed on one out of every four votes taken in the House and Senate. They differed often on farm policy, taxes and civil rights. Foreign aid and national defense were areas where the two often were opposed.

So were those fields of labor and public works, housing and tidelands oil. But there is hardly a subject from A (airports) to Z (zinc) over which the two were not in dispute at one time or another. The issues run the gamut from antitrust and banking to control and the District of Columbia; from the economy, education, and fireworks all the way through gas, highways, and loyalty oaths to subsidies, trade and waterways.

The two were in opposition eight times on Civil Rights, the first time in 1948, when Johnson cast his vote in favor of "separate but equal schools" and Kennedy cast his against.

In 1957, Johnson voted to strike Title 111 from the pending Civil Rights bill. Kennedy insisted such a move would remove the bill's heart and soul.

In that same session, Johnson voted to send the Civil Rights bill back for seven days to the Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Mississippi Democrat James Eastland. Kennedy voted no.

On one of the first votes in 1958, Johnson lined up with the South in opposition to a limitation on Senate debate. Kennedy disagreed, favoring an end to Dixie filibusters.

Later that year, Johnson voted against confirmation of Wilson White as Assistant Attorney General in charge of Civil Rights. Kennedy voted to confirm White, thought a militant foe of segregation.

In August, 1959, Kennedy voted for an amendment designed to cut off foreign aid to those nations who practiced racial and religious discrimination. Johnson voted no.

Three times in 1960, the two opposed each other on civil rights. Again Johnson opposed and Kennedy backed Title 111 of the Civil Rights Act. Johnson voted against and Kennedy for court-appointed referees who would supervise the registration of Negroes in areas where they were barred from voting.

In a key vote, Kennedy voted to cut off a Southern filibuster that threatened passage of the Civil Rights Act. Johnson voted with the South.

The two opposed each other frequently on tax bills. Johnson usually voting with the conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats. For instance, Kennedy twice opposed the 27 1/2 per cent oil and gas depletion allowance. Johnson on both occasions supported the allowance.

On June 20, 1960, Kennedy voted to impose a 20 per cent withholding tax on stock dividends and bank interest. Johnson voted no. On that same day, Johnson voted to liberalize business accounts and Kennedy opposed him.

In a key vote in 1955, Johnson and Kennedy split on support of the Nationalist Chinese. Although both men were hospitalized at the time, Kennedy was paired for and Johnson against a move to exclude Quemoy and Matsu from the Formosa resolution which authorized the President to use American forces to secure and protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and related territories against Communist attack.

On five separate occasions in 1954, Johnson voted to limit the treaty-making powers of the President. Kennedy opposed him on each vote.

On key appointments, Johnson supported Scott McLeod as ambassador to Ireland and the conservative Albert M. Cole as head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Kennedy opposed both of the Eisenhower appointees.

On public housing, Johnson voted with the conservative bloc against Kennedy three times from 1957 to 1959. In 1957 Johnson opposed and Kennedy supported the construction of 400,000 additional public housing units. In 1959 Kennedy favored the appropriation of an additional \$450 million for urban renewal. Johnson did not.

Whether President Johnson will move his administration toward the center, as his Congressional voting record would indicate, is unknown. He has vowed to continue the Kennedy program. He realizes that he is comparatively weak in the Northern industrial areas. He will be under heavy pressure to alter his moderate image, to become a militant New Frontiersman.

## IN WASHINGTON . . .

# Turning Back On Future



By RALPH de TOLEDANO When President George Meany of the AFL-CIO warns that automation is a "curse" that could bring the United States to "a national catastrophe," he sounds like the Luddites who attempted to break the machines which ushered in the Industrial Revolution. Or, perhaps, like the theoretician of error, Karl Marx, who was convinced that industrialization under capitalism would bring endless and increasing misery to the working class—the "proletariat" to him.

Both Marx and those who tried to stop the course of industrial progress were wrong. The machine, which seemed certain to put millions out of work and debase humanity, instead ushered in an era in which the living standards of white collar and blue collar workers have risen steadily—and in which the gap between the high-income and low-income groups has steadily closed.

Automation, a word but 15 years old according to the sociologists, has now replaced the bogaboo of mechanization. The word, however, means different things to different people—and the best economists in the AFL-CIO (when they are not talking for publication) will admit that many of the fears expressed at negotiating sessions are groundless.

Why then is Mr. Meany attempting to turn back the clock? History and experience have shown that increased mechanization—and that, basically, is what automation consists of today—does not depress the economy, but on the contrary stimulates it. The many machines being used which "automate" office work, for example, have added to employment.

With few exceptions, moreover, the authorities agree that whatever dislocation may be caused by automation, it is temporary. Men are put out of one kind of work, but they are usually reabsorbed by the labor force. Only in such industries as coal mining, where the miners for the most part refuse to leave the towns which fringe the coal fields, is there persistent unemployment. And this is caused more by the decline of coal as a major fuel than by automation.

What bothers labor's leaders is not the eventual effect on the economy but the immediate effect on their unions. As the nation automates, the nature of the labor force changes drastically. White collar workers, hard to unionize, become the dominant unit. The blue collar worker, still the backbone of present-day unions, is edged out. The unskilled find it hard to find jobs.

As a result, the trade unions are shrinking in membership and, perhaps more fearsome to the labor leader, losing their political hold. It will take some

time before the politicians come to realize this. There is always a lag in political thinking. But when they do, it will be a bad blow to the AFL-CIO and to all organized labor.

The effect of automation is really not an economic one but a social one. An automating society puts high value on skills that come with education. Eventually, it will create a middle class "proletariat" which will find itself resistant to the appeal of the union organizer.

This shift in the nature of employment comes at a time when labor is beset by another problem: the shift from production to service. By that I mean the steady decline of production workers as compared to those in service industries.

For the labor leaders, this

means another loss in membership. It is the production unions which filled the trade union ranks. The service industries are being invaded by James Hoffa of the Teamsters, but with no real success. In time, the unions may find ways and means to apply a compulsory-union principle to service industries, but so far the formula has not been found.

Mr. Meany's panic can be understood. But those who write his speeches know that in an economic sense automation is a boon, moving ahead toward days of less and less physical drudgery or mental monotony for those who produce the nation's goods. It is also our answer to the growing threat of foreign competition in the world market.

## Continuity Keynotes Mrs. Johnson Reign

By BRUCE BLOSSAT

WASHINGTON (NEA)—Claudia (Lady Bird) Johnson, the new First Lady of the United States will present an image to the world not unlike that of the late Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mrs. Johnson possesses much of the same buoyancy and outgoing personality of that earlier First Lady so noted for her zest and mobility.

As wife of the Vice President she would appear in the slums of Athens and then turn up at a school lunch program in Cyprus pouring milk for children.

She has stood in the "chow line" with Peace Corpsmen in Puerto Rico, rolled Red Cross bandages with senators' wives in Washington.

She can dash through a crowded schedule with aplomb, exhibiting at 51 the energy of a woman much younger.

Mrs. Johnson's devotion to her role as hostess will, of course, be put sharply to the test, now that she takes up residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Her social activities in the past have reflected not just a sense of duty, but an honest pleasure in meeting people.

She recalls earlier times when as the wife of young Congressman Johnson it meant much to her to be drawn into higher circles.

Later, as wife of the Vice President, she wanted it to be the same for others. Her entertainment lists have included not only foreign guests and dignitaries but young Washington wives and friends from Texas.

Few women it is believed here in Washington, find as much satisfaction in constant political appearances. Out of her staggering speech-travel schedule in the 1960 campaign, for example, she took time to tap a vein of 25 cousins during

a train trip from Washington to New Orleans.

It is unlikely that Mrs. Johnson will make any serious changes in the decoration which Jacqueline Kennedy so painstakingly carried out in the White House.

It is true that the mistress of the nation's most celebrated residence does have a fondness for paintings of western landscapes—decoration which has added a touch of the Texas mesquite to the Johnson residence in Washington's Green Spring Valley.

It is probable that some of these nostalgic items will find their way into the house on Pennsylvania Avenue.

The residential portion of the White House, however, is sharply distinct from the formal or so-called public wings. It was here in the state dining room, the East Room and the others that Jacqueline Kennedy brought her refined and loving touch. It seems doubtful that these changes so well known by now to millions of Americans will be altered by the charming woman from the Southwest.

A continuity of style can be expected elsewhere as well. Americans grown accustomed to the image of the Kennedy children and the image of youth in the White House can regard the progress of the Johnsons' two teen-age daughters, Lynda Bird and Lucy Baines.

Where small Caroline Kennedy would celebrate her birthday with dolls and toys, the Johnson children can be expected to dance in flowing, corsaged gowns—like any other American teen-agers at a prom.

The Johnson girls mirror the vital youthful spirit of their mother. And if the White House can be expected to take on a western touch, it will be in the personality of warm and expansive Lady Bird Johnson.

## WASHINGTON NOTEBOOK . . .

# Stories Of New President

By WASHINGTON STAFF

WASHINGTON (NEA) — In the spring of 1958, the then Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Baines Johnson was called to the White House by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. As their conference broke up the President pointed to the big leather chair behind his desk and remarked, "One day, Lyndon, you'll sit in that chair."

"No, Mr. President," the senator replied, "that's one chair I'll never sit in. I wouldn't trade desks with you for anything in the world."

President Kennedy generally went out of his way to praise his vice president as a "loyal and faithful friend." On one occasion he told a Democratic dinner, "I must say that the merger of Boston and Austin was really the last merger the attorney general has allowed, but it has been one of the most successful."

One of Johnson's lesser-known duties as vice president was to act as a one-man watchdog over House Speaker John McCormack at press conferences following White House legislative conferences.

The Speaker, whose job was to acquaint waiting reporters with the agreed-upon version of the private talks with the President, tended to stray into political body traps with regularity. Johnson eventually developed the habit of standing behind McCormack's right shoulder to whisper intensely to the Speaker when he was about to tread on dangerous waters.

To new President Johnson, common sense has a special meaning. As a senator, he said: "One of the wisest things my daddy ever told me was that 'so-and-so is a d---d smart man, but the fool's got no sense.'" By sense, Johnson meant the art of knowing what is possible and how to accomplish it.

He does not waste time on lost causes and he realizes that hot issues are rarely settled by victories for the extremists on either side. He has been contemptuous of the crusaders among his former Senate colleagues.

"All they do is fight and fight," he once said, "and get 15 Senate votes." As for himself, he once noted, "I would rather win a convert than an argument."

The President's wife Lady Bird (the former Claudia Taylor of Karnack, Tex.) admits

his sense for efficiency. When the family moved into "Lees Ormes," Perle Mesta's former Washington home, Mrs. Johnson went to considerable trouble anglicizing the interior of the house, in addition to changing its name to "The Elms." New wallpaper, bookcases, Texas paintings and a hi-fi system were added.

When asked what her husband thought of the redecorating, Mrs. Johnson replied: "All the furniture he wants is something comfortable enough to put his feet up on."

The President as a senator made a practice of hiring married couples when he could get them. A shrewd bit of amateur psychology, it resulted in a smooth-running office. "It's literally one big happy family, and the result makes for the

best teamwork and loyalty I've ever seen," said one former aide.

Johnson proscribed rigid hours for his staff, the men working every day but Sunday and the women getting Saturdays off only twice a month.

"People used to ask me why I don't have ulcers when just about everybody who works for me does," the President once said. "Someone else answered, 'H-I, he just gives 'em.'"

On Page 274 of the Washington telephone directory is this notation: "Johnson, Lyndon B., Hon., 4040 32d av. . . WO 6-4030." What makes this listing even more incredible is that, as vice president, Johnson himself often answered the phone.

One of his cardinal rules was that it should always be answered on the first ring.



## STRICTLY PERSONAL.

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

The senseless murder of the President was a mirror we were forced to hold up to ourselves—and we did not like, or believe, the image that we saw.

"How could it happen here? In this day and age? In our country? I thought such things happened only in history. In Europe. Somewhere else and long ago."

These were the reactions of Americans. They bespeak a tremendous ignorance and delusiveness about ourselves. For, as I have written many times in the past (and have been assailed for so writing), we are a violent people who do not know the range and force of our primitive feelings.

Why should it not happen here? The last three Presidents out of four have had assassination attempts on their lives. Nowhere in Europe is this true: in most such countries, the chiefs of state walk about virtually unguarded.

In this day and age? This is the age of the most ferocious war the world has ever known, the most bloody dictatorships, the gas ovens, the concentration camps, the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by a "peace-loving" nation.

In our country? Why not, with our staggering homicide rate, our casual and callous auto fatalities, our shocking prevalence of firearms, our

frontier relish for combat and conflict, our contempt for courts, our cynicism about the effectiveness of orderly processes.

If anyone still doubts this, consider the cry of applause that went up from the crowd gathered outside the Dallas jail when it learned that the presumed assassin of the President had himself been shot down.

This reaction, is, to me, more appalling and more revealing than anything else in the whole nightmare of the weekend. Here was a man not known for sure to be the killer. He had not confessed, not been brought to trial, not defended, not sentenced. And he was killed while in the very hands of the police.

And the crowd outside shouted its approval of this bestial, stupid and irrational act. This is frightening, this is disgusting, this discloses the profound failure of our society to instill in its citizens any real sense of civilization, any idea of the meaning of law and justice. This is what turns our country into little better than a jungle.

If this dreadful murder of a President makes us see ourselves more clearly, makes us re-examine our feelings, makes us determined to purge the violence within each of us and all of us, it will not have been in vain.