

The Oregon Statesman

"No Favor Sways Us, No Fear Shall Awe"
From First Statesman, March 25, 1851

THE STATESMAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, Editor and Publisher

Entered at the postoffice at Salem, Oregon, as second class matter under act of congress March 3, 1879.
Published every morning. Business office 215 S. Commercial, Salem, Oregon. Telephone 2-2441.

For Better Newspapers

The annual meeting of the Associated Press members in the Pacific northwest held in Portland Friday was strictly a "working meeting." The business dealt with vital matters in the development, handling and treatment of the news. The core of the thinking was the responsibility of newspapers to get the news promptly and to supply it to the public factually and decently.

Particular attention was given to the question of how to handle news dealing with offensive crimes, especially those with sex involved. Members expressed their opinion that such cases should be handled factually without cover-up or use of "weasel words" but that such news should not be exploited and the treatment should conform to common standards of decency. This means that the AP members want to continue following a conservative policy on news of this type, without going in for racy reporting designed to satisfy prurient curiosity.

A rule of "no quarter" was approved against "news barriers"—where public officials or private persons or organizations seek to shut off the news. Reporters were enjoined to "get the news" and members were directed to seek constantly to break down these "road blocks" which sensitive individuals erect to prevent access to the truth.

Both Washington and Oregon have had committees working the past two years making studies of the daily news reports of the AP, getting comments from members, and drawing conclusions as to how the press service may be improved. These studies already have brought good results and their continuance was authorized. Wendell Webb, managing editor of The Statesman, has served on the Oregon committee.

Oregon members, on the initiative of W. M. Tugman of the Eugene Register-Guard, propose to take up with the secretary of state and the legislature the matter of using modern mechanical devices in the holding of elections (voting machines, IBM card tabulating) both to reduce the cost and to speed up reporting the results to reduce the number of inaccuracies.

Here was one convention where the ruling idea was how to give more and better service to customers, the newspaper-reading public.

Yes, there was one agreeable interlude. Stewart Holbrook, prominent Portland author, was a guest speaker at the evening banquet. Once a regular and now an occasional writer for newspapers, Holbrook's witty sallies proved highly entertaining. A great lover of the outdoors, he urged editors (to no avail, he admitted) to try to stop the tide of immigration so that Portland could remain as he described it, the "nicest quiet village" that I know, and the west still a country of wide open spaces.

Our Robin-Hood Wind

Every fall we have an uninvited guest, not entirely unwelcome but always leaving us breathless and a little abashed before his great energy and utter individualism. He came last week: the first careless gusts of the storm that swept across the country and briefly had the streets of Salem paved with gold.

He's the fickle thief who devaluated the trees and scattered October's gold leaf across the drab pavements. He's a Robin-Hood wind who robbed autumn's blooming treasury, and gold-

Dulles' Loss May Strengthen Dewey

By Joseph and Stewart Alsop
WASHINGTON, Nov. 12—On Wednesday morning, after Herbert Lehman had knocked the far out of John Foster Dulles in the New York senatorial contest, one of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's ablest lieutenants summed up his conclusions. "It kind of looks like this morning as though they liked the welfare state," he said wryly, but without any noticeable gloom.

The lack of gloom may be simply explained. For the odd fact is that the sad fate of Dewey's friend and protégé, Dulles, is likely actually to strengthen Dewey's influence in the republican party. This is because the nature of Dulles' campaign for the senate thoroughly exploded the charge, hurled at Dewey by the republican right wing, that his "me-tooism" in 1948 cost the republicans the White House.

For there was not the slightest taint of me-tooism about Dulles' campaign. Indeed, Dulles took a stand well to the right of Senator Robert A. Taft. He was both more specific in his denunciations of the Truman administration and all its works, and more conservative, than any republican candidate in a great industrial state in recent history. Moreover, this was a result of his own decision. Dewey at first counseled Dulles against running. He told

Dulles that he feared the campaign might destroy Dulles' future usefulness—which itself suggests that Dewey does not regard his own political career as at an end. When Dulles nevertheless decided to make the race, Dewey promised him all-out support, on the understanding that Dulles would be his own political strategist; Dulles would "do it his own way," taking whatever stand he saw fit on the major issues.

The result was a neat demonstration of everything Dewey said in his famous Lincoln's Birthday speech, in which he challenged his "me-too" critics to carry any industrial state in the union on a back-to-McKinley platform. The further result has been to weaken the position of Dewey's enemies in the republican party.

Where does this leave Dewey? Among his intimates, Dewey still talks of forsaking politics once and for all when his present term as governor ends next year, and making some money in law practice. But Dewey is politics in his blood, perhaps more strongly than any other man in public life.

Moreover, there will be very heavy pressure on him to run for governor again next year. Senator Irving L. Ives is the only other strong republican candidate visible. The republicans will badly need a strong candidate in this key position, and Ives' senate term does not expire until 1952. If Dewey runs and wins, he will control the New York delegation to the republican convention in 1952, and he will be in a strong position to influence the convention's outcome. It is entirely improbable that Dewey will himself be a candidate for nomination again. There is only one other road open to a really important political future for Dewey. That is to be, not king, but king-maker, by backing the successful candidate.

The leading contender at the convention is likely to be Senator Robert A. Taft, since the labor groups have failed to find a strong progressive candidate to oppose Taft in the Ohio fight next year. Taft is the hero of the republican party's powerful anti-me-too faction, which so dislikes Dewey. Moreover, this is true not only because of Taft's domestic views, but because of his foreign policy stand as well. Certainly it will be natural for Dewey to throw his weight against Taft. If so, Dewey will want a candidate with great political appeal, who favors a strong foreign policy, and a middle-of-the-road domestic policy, and who hails from New York state. There is one man who answers all these requirements—General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Already there have been friendly contacts between Dewey and Eisenhower. The New York financial community, which is close to Dewey and which always strongly influences the outcome of republican conventions, is more and more enthusiastic about Eisenhower. And Eisenhower's recent speeches have themselves indicated a growing interest in domestic politics and foreign policy.

There is no use speculating so far ahead about the result of this complicated political equation. But the fact remains that a finish fight between the republican party's me-toosers and anti-me-toosers is now clearly in prospect. The further fact remains that the defeat of his friend Dulles has actually strengthened Dewey's position for this fight. And it is certainly a reasonable bet that Taft and his midwest supporters on the one hand, and Dewey, Eisenhower, and their east coast admirers on the other, will play a leading role in the coming battle. (Copyright, 1949, New York Herald Tribune Inc.)

IT SEEMS TO ME

(Continued from page 1)

disillusionment of those who had put confidence in the laws of war.

Perhaps it will be of interest to recount the progressive deterioration of international law in this field:

War is supposed to be preceded by the breaking off of diplomatic relations and the execution of a formal declaration of war. World War II began with the announcement of Hitler that nazis troops were marching on Poland, and began for the United States with the bombing of Pearl Harbor on the day the Japanese envoys had a date with Secretary of State Hull.

One of the most elaborate chapters of international law deals with the rights and obligations of neutrals. World War I began with the German invasion of Belgium whose neutrality Germany and other nations had guaranteed. That treaty, said the German chancellor, was a "scrap of paper."

One of the rules of naval warfare was that unarmed vessels should not be attacked unless they resisted, and that security should be provided for passengers and crew. Unrestricted submarine warfare (which precipitated American entrance into the first world war) brought on the phrase, "sunk without warning."

In the second world war, such conduct was taken for granted. The infant United States did its diplomatic teething on "freedom of the seas" in the wars between England and France at the turn of the 19th century. "Free ships, free goods" was the slogan. Our "rights" as a neutral were freely violated by both combatants. Again in the first world war Britain interfered with our neutral shipping, greatly to the distress of President Wilson. He set down as one of his famous 14 points proposed as a basis for peace, "freedom of the seas." But when world War II came along freedom of the seas was just an historic phrase.

Because during our civil war England had permitted the building and outfitting of the "Alabama" in its waters which scoured the seas as a Confederate war vessel, the United States was awarded damages of \$15,500,000 by an arbitration commission. In the second world war the United States though a neutral, extended all aid "short of war" to the beleaguered allies, escorted merchant vessels far into the Atlantic, and traded 50 over-age destroyers to Britain in exchange of leases to west Atlantic bases.

The laws of war called for no firing on civilians so long as they were not offering armed resistance or committing acts of sabotage. World War II saw general bombing of occupied cities as part of the business: Rotterdam, Coventry, Berlin, Manila, Hiroshima. As General Bradley said, when you bomb the factories you may bomb the people, and you may damage enemy morale. Now we have produced the B-36 whose mission is long-range strategic bombing, not of enemy forts and bases primarily, but of enemy industrial cities, factories and lines of communication.

Property belonging to subjects of an enemy state presumably is not subject to confiscation in spite of a state of war. Actually, governments in both world wars seized enemy property—some of the important secrets of industrial chemistry were sold to Americans after their confiscation as enemy property during the first world war. Private property (except that of military nature) of an occupied country is not to be seized by the invader—but how much stuff was "liberated" during the late war?

As far as observing the rules of humane conduct of war (protection of wounded, security and treatment of prisoners) they were on the whole rather well observed in both world wars, though there were exceptions when field hospitals were bombed, captives shot or starved or abused.

True, we had war crime trials following the second world war and men were executed in Germany and Japan for alleged violation of international law both in the launching of war and in the conducting of it. What effect this "new principle" in international law will have in preventing future wars is not clear. Certainly it is a standing warning against losing a war. In the case of Japanese General Yamashita, his defense attorney has just published a book denouncing the proceedings and the result of that trial, which is rather disquieting to justice-minded Americans.

Professor Arthur Nussbaum, in his History of the Law of Nations, remarks:

"From a political point of view the 14 years preceding World War I represent the end of a century that began with the Peace of Paris in 1815 and that may perhaps sometimes be looked upon as the happiest in the history of mankind. For international law it was certainly a period of tremendous progress. An important qualification must be added however: in the 20th century the law moved forward only in the sphere of peaceful relations; in the law of war heavily retrogressive tendencies came to prevail."

What has developed is the doctrine of "total war" in which whole populations are engaged and involved; the farmers who produce food for armies; the

trainmen who transport goods; the workers who manufacture all the gear of war. War then is carried to the people regardless of whether they wear uniforms and bear arms or not. The new weapons: atomic bombs, radioactivity, secret poisons, disease germs are not selective in their victims. It is scant comfort to say, as does General Bradley, that war itself is immoral. For man is a human being, sentient, with thoughts and feelings. Within nations he has succeeded fairly well in establishing codes of conduct where differences are settled peacefully, UNDER LAW. Despite the breakdown of the laws of war under stress, international law remains the hope for a peaceful world order. That law will be a product of growth both in conception, in administration and in enforcement. Failures of the past are but a challenge for greater endeavor.

HAD HER SHARE

PORTLAND-(INS)—A Reed college coed believes that bad luck "comes in threes." First, she missed her train back to school. Next she was involved in an auto accident. Finally, she discovered her purse and summer earnings of \$185 missing after the crack-up.

Your Health

Written by Dr. Herman N. Sundsten, M.D.

Hiccups is one of the very few natural actions of the body which seems entirely without purpose. It is neither a safety valve nor an adjustment process. Indeed, so far as benefiting the body is concerned, it has no value. It is simply a nuisance and nothing more.

On the other hand, it seldom does any harm except in rare, long-continued cases where it keeps up so long as to cause exhaustion.

Hiccups is the result of a sudden, hard contraction of the muscle between the chest and the abdomen, known as the diaphragm. Pressure of this contraction closes the passageway to the lungs. The "hic" sound is due to the abrupt cutting off of the indrawn breath as the vocal cords come together.

Hiccups may be initiated by nerve impulses brought to the diaphragm from the stomach, bowel, liver, lungs, the larynx or voicebox, or may result from inflammation or pressure from a tumor growth. It may come from direct irritation of the diaphragm or of the phrenic nerve which supplies the diaphragm.

Hiccups sometimes develops in

diseases affecting the brain, such as encephalitis or meningitis. As is well known, over-indulgence in alcoholic beverages may bring on an attack of hiccuping. It may be psychological in its origin, in which case it stops during sleep and sometimes while eating.

Hundreds of different types of treatment have been suggested for hiccup. A sudden slap on the back, pulling on the tongue, tickling the nose, and inhaling smelling salts all have served to stop hiccuping attacks. Holding the breath and deep breathing may be effective. Washing out the stomach or inducing vomiting may, on occasion, give benefit. Various sedative or quieting drugs have been used. Drugs which relieve spasm have also been found helpful.

Recently, a number of cases of continued hiccup have been treated with a drug known as quinine. In nine patients, in whom other methods have failed, quinine stopped the attacks in six and was partially successful in two.

In some cases of continued hiccup, cutting or crushing of the

phrenic nerve has been employed.

Fortunately, in most cases of hiccup, the simple measures are sufficient to bring relief.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
W. P. O.: Is cystitis a curable ailment? Is it a serious condition? Answer: Cystitis means inflammation of the bladder. As a rule, it is not a serious disorder and it is curable.

Treatment with sulfonamide drugs and penicillin is helpful. Sometimes, irrigation of the bladder with antiseptics is necessary. (Copyright, 1949 King Features)

Overseas Yule Mail Deadline Due Tuesday

Long queues at Salem postoffice Saturday morning heralded the nearing deadline on overseas Christmas mailing. Parcels must be sent by Tuesday to assure Yuletide delivery, the postmaster reminded.

Albert C. Gragg, postmaster, expressed gratitude for the prompt mailing. He urged that letters and cards for overseas points also be sent immediately.



Think of Thanksgiving

Think of...

SILVEIR

Silver... the synonym for gracious elegance. Your holiday table deserves the flattery of Silver. Come in and see the beautiful new designs of the nation's leading Silversmiths.



WE WELCOME YOUR CHARGE ACCOUNT

Stevens & Son

JEWELERS State & Liberty

SILVERSMITHS Dial 4-2223



Lively Building