LAS VEGAS ISRAELITE

PHONE 870-1255

Jack Entratter, Trude Feldman, Barney Glazer, Al Kirschner, and Jay Tell

2nd Class Mail, Las Vegas, Nev.

Member American Jewish Press Association

Member of Worldwide News Service

New in 5th Year of Continuous Weekly Publication

700 High a price

It is too easy for an American to offer Israel advice on how to react to Egyptian provocation. Still, if we can accept Israel's charges that Egypt violated the cease-fire by moving missiles into the restricted Syez Canal area, then Premier Golda Meir's government stands convicted of a negligence that endangers its citizens and even the security of the state. The missiles should have been bombed into oblivion when discovered thus giving notice to the United States, the Soviet Union and Egypt that a cease-fire is a cease-fire only when all parties to the cease-fire observe it.

Turning to America for help because of-American pledges is to forget the past. One need only remember, as the Russians do, that in 1957, after being forced to remove its troops from the Sinai by American pressure, Israel was assured by President Eisenhower that the Suez Canal would be opened to Israeli shipping. Again in 1967, when Egypt closed the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping, American, England and France assured Israel that the maritime nations would break the blockade -- a blockade that was finally broken not by the maritime powers but by Israeli arms. And in 1967, while the world waited to watch the second Jewish holocaust in one generation, despite American pledges to protect Israel, when the war came, America took no action.

It is true, we have since heard that is Israel were in danger of losing the war, the United States would have intervened to prevent her destruction. This is possible. But judging by the record, and the record is all we have to judge by, when the need was great, America took no action.

It is to be hoped that Mrs. Meir's government will not barter Israeli blood for American good will and that of the Western world. The price would be too high. The good will, too fragile.

Crime: Who Fights 9t?

By ROBERT E, SEGAL

The past few weeks have witnessed still more political maneuvering in Washington over appropriations to fight crime while our American cities -- where assaults and handbag snatching and burglary proliferate -- cry out in anger for more funds with which to check such outrages.

It's quite apparent that the overwhelming proportion of crimes known to police occur in metropolitan areas -- perhaps as much as 93%. Yet the government has insisted on distributing the precisous crime fighting funds on the basis of population instead of on the

DAYENU BY HENRY LEONARS



"And your main duty as Ambassador to that country will be as speaker at all Jewish Fund Banquets."

Copr. 1963, Degrans Production

basis of amount of crime. The great cities of the land, hard pinched for tax money and beset by a frightening growth of thefts and homicides, must have millions of dollars more and soon to keep the lid on.

But Congress, considering a three-year extension of the 1968 Crime Control and Safe Street Act, has taken an inordinately long time to move on the crisis plaguing urban areas. A part of the delay is the struggle over lodging too much or too little power in the federal government; a part comes over the extent of demand for matching funds from states and municipalities. Sure, enough tax money has poured into Washington and enough cries have gone up for backing police and tightening the processes of prevention and arrest. But the funds have not been flowing back into the cities while those who crack heads and rifle homes and grab purses grow bolder daily.

Two commissions established by President Johnson not long after he became President worked diligently to help gear up America's approach to the rapid growth of misdeeds, a heavy degree of lawbreaking by young people, and the acceleration of fear and dismay characterizing victims and potential victims. Yet long after the Safe Street Act became law, critics in Congress were justifiably complaining that the insufficient funds appropriated were being used to build bureaucracies. Plans sketched out on paper abound; the flow of what little money has been made abailable into the cities seems to stop short of circulating where action is needed.

An FBI report for the first three months of 1970 showed that the national crime rate had jumped 13% over the same three months in 1969. Robbery and larceny, so terrifying to city dwellers, are on the rise in all sections of the country. Underpaid police officers are frustrated by swift getaways available to daring offenders, quite a few of whom are addicts in need of more cash to meet the inflated price of drugs. And still the money to fight crime in the seemingly efficient and enlightened way prescribed by competent study commissions is not coming in sufficient amounts to locales where the need is most pressing.

Another gloomy aspect of the picture is that the President and his Attorney General have made certain proposals in S-30 so offensive to constitutional rights that some of the most conservative lawyers in the nation are rasing warnings against harsh, dragnet proposals. So-called "dangerous special offenders" as well as judges considered too lenient by Washington, would be roughly dealth with, and serious questions have been raised about blows in store for the first, fifth and fourteenth amendments.

Beyond this concern lies disappointment over society's failure to begin to work hard enough on factors contributing to the tidal wave of crime in the cities -- slum conditions, poverty, poor schooling, a lack of sufficient vocational guidance, an alarming insensitivity to the need for innovations in combatting the drug menace, and an eminous forecast regarding unemployment.

TELL TALES

"One Man Plus The Truth Constitutes A Majority"

BY JACK TELL



(Continued from Page 1)

tainly is."

We're sick and tired of synthetic candidates placing their names on the ballot and then blasting their phoney platform contentions, hoping an apathetic voting public will be gullible enough to place them in office. Well, for their information, the public is aroused this time and is in no mood for nonsense. Too many things are happening in so many areas that affect all of us, from the generation gap to the population explosion; from pollution to crime in the streets; from war expenditures to shortages for poverty relief; from drugs to neglect to provide proper education faci-lities; etc. The public is getting fed up with contamination that could begin, any minute, to snuff out lives, with pocket shortages that deprive us of those luxurious necessities it has become accustomed to, with fear for their own and children's safety lurking everywhere.

The times they are a changing.

We refuse to be insulted any further by a man who, because he posted a filing fee, has a delusion he can feed us a lot of crap about eliminating pollution, freeing us of crime and saving us from drug pushers who are making addicts of our children. The next time you hear a shoe salesman turned politico, who promises all or any one of these hoped for achievements, if he is elected, walk right up to him and call him a dmaned liar, unless he states exactly how, and when and where, he will fufffill his promises.

Men , tried and true, experienced with knowledgable backgrounds in coping with these evil blights on our existence, are doing everythingpossible to dent the current trend. True, they are not making much headway. Possibly we have to ride it out until these waves of hysteria burn themselves into oblivion. But, at least, those versed in the vicious practices and conditions, know some of the pitfalls and workings of the enemy they are fighting. What does a Johnny - come - lately, newcomer know about the intricacies of the problem he promises to solve?

This does not mean that all those in office deserve to remain. It means that those who know their business and have proven their capability, should be re-elected. It means that those who spout generalities, who puff their stuffed shirts with meaningless promises they have failed to fulfill in the past, those wh are complacent and are resting on their laurals without offering new and better views of what they will do in the future, should be ousted if a better man appears in opposition.

Now, as never before in the history of the democratic process in America, the voting public is aware that not only the future comfort of our living, but also the very destiny of our existence depends on the men we elect to lead us. Time is running out for all of us, and if something doesn't change very soon, it may be the end.

This may sound calmitous, but it happens to be true. The only answer is alertness on the part of the voter. The men we elect are the men we expect to bear the responsibility of saving us. We need leaders now, more so, than ever before. We cannot afford to be represented by non-entities. Time is running out.

in addition to big grave conditions, like pollution, crime and drugs and others, there are many small grave conditions that the public is rising against and indignantly demand relief. We're talking about automobiles that don't run, appliances that won't work, utilities that can't operate, and a host of other insults to our cash purchases, down to paper bags that fall apart before you reach the parking lot. The advertising of products without regard to truth and the overwhelming abuse of licentouous propaganda to sway our sentiment, are definatly on the wane. It is up to our elected officials to see that we get what we pay for. The time has arrived where the public will settle for nothing less.

Don't you agree?