

The Oregon Statesman

"No Favor Sweeps Us, No Fear Shall Ave"
From First Statesman, March 23, 1851

THE STATESMAN PUBLISHING COMPANY

CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, Editor and Publisher

Published every morning. Business office 215 S Commercial, Salem, Oregon. Telephone 2-2441.

Entered at the postoffice at Salem, Oregon, as second class matter under act of congress March 3, 1878.

The New Order Has Arrived

President Truman's executive order applying tight military security to civilian government agencies should be received with gravest misgivings by the American public and by the press.

The White House, it is reported, only reluctantly issued the order and did so with the hope that the new censorship will operate without abuses and that newspapermen "will learn to live with it."

Our own urgent hope is that newspapermen will never learn to live with it.

We hope that newspapermen will be uneasy as long as the order is in effect. We hope the order whets their "nose for news," goads them into more intensive digging after facts, inspires them to greater vigilance than ever before, and inoculates them with the anti-toxin of courage.

This is a solemn warning: Let the press and the people be on their guard henceforth.

The New Order—an America wherein the citizens will no longer be entrusted with the facts about their government and the state of the union—has arrived. The new order means that we must take with considerable salt, if not with outright suspicion, whatever any government official may say.

This warning is no hysterical incitement to mutiny. (In these tragic times, when no man can be sure his neighbor is not a traitor, some measure of security censorship is justified. How much is the moot question.) The order does not restrict printing of information, anyway; it restricts release of information by officials. And newspapermen, who are as loyal as anybody, will, of course, comply with the spirit of the law.

But it will be their responsibility, now, to see that government officials also comply with the spirit of the law. Arbitrary power is a heady potion, and the new order gives heads of agencies and designated subordinates the power to decide arbitrarily what information is to be suppressed and what is to be released. That means that the 60-odd department and agency heads are potentially among the most powerful individuals in the U. S. It means that we are too dependent upon their honor, integrity, intelligence and understanding of the functions and philosophy of American democratic government.

If all men in government were honest, sincere, rational, we would have less reason for disquietude. But officials are human and subject to human failings—shortcomings that reporters heretofore were free to reveal. The new order makes it possible—tempts—officials to conceal their mistakes.

We remember the statements of Louis Johnson, when he was secretary of defense, that the U. S. was all set to lick any enemy. Had not such reports as the Alsop brothers exposed the pitifully weak condition of our defenses, we might still be lulled with glib reassurances—and unprepared.

Now the same strict secrecy that protects the

Pentagon can be applied to the departments of agriculture, commerce, treasury, interior, labor, justice, post office and so on. It is conceivable that we shall no longer be told very much about the wheat crop, or steel production, or the national debt, or anything else "potential enemies" might want to know. We may still be able to get government findings about the life cycle of the fruit fly, but almost anything else could be associated with mobilization and therefore withheld.

The logical result of extension of the quite reasonable military-diplomatic secrecy to the general economic-social fields is that Americans will be ignorant of their own national capabilities in the world. Royce Brier predicts in his San Francisco Chronicle column. Without pertinent facts, citizens cannot form an intelligent public opinion, nor vote intelligently. If carried to extremes, the new order could emasculate the citizenry, so that we become, like the Russian masses, mere puppets, robots, cogs.

We hope and believe that this will never happen here. It won't happen so long as we keep our eyes open, keep our traditional Yankee spirit of friendly scepticism of those in office, and make sure that the men and women we put into office are trustworthy. That, together with the vigilance and courage of the press, is the only glimmering of light as the news blackout deepens.—MWW.

The fact that a woman fasted for 62 days in a restaurant in Italy probably proves nothing more than the fact that Italy, too, has inflation. She was sealed in a glass case—which must have kept out all fumes. After all, who could resist the aroma of an Italian restaurant for 62 days?

Editorial Comment

At the beginning of this month there was great apprehension over the threat of a strike in the copper mining industry when copper stands as a critical defense metal. The fact that such a threat has passed does not command large headlines. But wage agreements have been signed which assure further steady production, for which a word of gratification is on order.

Partial credit most obviously is due to the much-discussed injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, since an application by the Justice Department for an emergency order against the strike seems to have been the turning point in its settlement.

A further source of satisfaction in the settlement lies in the indications it gives regarding the control of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union, widely regarded as being leftist. Either the Communist influence was less than supposed or it was held in check by traditional trade unionism.

There is one more ground for gratitude. This is in the evidence afforded that no such deep-seated animosity exists between employer and employee as vented itself through violence in strikes in the mining industry of the western United States 30 to 50 years ago when miners were fighting for the very right to organize. An important factor in industrial peace today is a heightened understanding that unions and managements have similar stakes in production.—Christian Science Monitor.

India Officials Seem Willing to Criticize U. S., But Reluctant to Abuse Chinese Communists

By Marguerite Higgins
NEW DELHI, Sept. 25—Premier Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, started western diplomats this month by acknowledging in various conversations that Chinese communism's advent on India's borders would cause "important adjustments" in his national defense program.

Nehru indicated for the first time that no matter how correct India-Chinese relations may be the Indians are taking very practical safeguards just in case hopes of peace prove unfounded.

Various Indian cabinet ministers have stated during interviews with me that these safeguards would include strengthening of the frontier guard system along the two thousand mile border between Chinese-occupied Tibet and India. There are also plans for the improvement of roads leading to frontier points, some of which are now inaccessible except by pack trains. The object is to insure greater maneuverability for India's army.

There is definite reason, in American opinion, for concern at what is going on in Tibet. For the Chinese conquest of the area has resulted in construction work on not one but at least a half dozen airfields for jet and other type planes. In addition there has been recently an influx into Tibet of a great variety of military transport and equipment.

Americans tend to conceive of Tibet as an inaccessible mountain plateau that can be reached only by climbing narrow wind-swept trails of the Shangri La variety. This is in great part true of the area between India and the Tibetan capital (although it is significant that the Chinese have been pushing work on what is described as the Lhasa Lucknow road) but recent reliable reports show that certain areas of Tibet are now busy with the traffic of two and a half ton trucks and jeeps bringing up military supplies. Just how these vehicles got to Tibet in quantity is something about which no one in India seems absolutely clear.

But there is one ironical certainty: much of the equipment is American, presumably having been captured either from the nationalist Chinese or from the Americans in Korea.

Although taking note of activities in Tibet, the Indians are refusing officially to be alarmed. Premier Nehru has consistently held to the belief that Chinese communist expansionist tendencies as so far displayed represent "primarily a new nation flexing its muscles."

And there is no doubt that the main conflict between India and America in foreign policy stems from differing views of the danger posed by Chinese communism and the best way of dealing with it. The respective attitudes of the two countries are also influenced by their differing internal strengths. As the Indian home affairs minister put it, "You Americans feel deeply about China and you want others to feel and act the same way. But American foreign policy is shaped by its plethora of economic resources while India's position is shaped by her lack of mobilized economic strength."

Actually what irritates American observers here the most is not—contrary to what Indians think—that India demands the right to disagree. The main point of friction is that this country—partly out of provoking her powerful Asian neighbors and partly out of the hope of influencing China to split with the Russians—has adopted what amounts to an international double standard in dealing with the Reds.

As one example: In interviewing one of India's highest ranking cabinet ministers I found that the conversation led the familiar path to the subject of Negro lynching in America. Lynching is invariably invoked when an Indian official wishes to illustrate America's "reactionary tendencies." In this particular talk I agreed that lynchings were a national disgrace but pointed out that race relations in America were being rapidly improved with lynchings averaging about one a year. Then I asked the cabinet minister, if, since India felt so strongly about lynchings, it was disturbed about the mass

executions of hundreds of thousands of persons in China.

"Oh, we don't know anything about that," the Indian minister replied. "After all we have very few contacts with China." Another high Indian official stated that executions in China "are a different matter than lynchings in America since they are not conducted for racial but for political reasons."

Another example: I asked the home minister why India had banned articles written by a Bombay journalist and which were highly critical of the Chinese communists. The minister said that the Indian correspondent's criticism had been suppressed for technical reasons—he had used a Peking dateline making it appear as if he were filing his criticisms from within China while he had actually returned from China to Bombay to write his views.

"We felt that the correspondent had made his Chinese trip under India's accreditation and that his actions constituted a breach of propriety that would offend the Peking regime."

Whatever the merits of this particular case, the Indian papers generally share the reluctance to criticize the red Chinese. As a result of this de facto double standard, the United States inevitably got more of a critical going over than does China.

But even though the facts about red China are not widely available to the Indian people, international events as well as the reports of India's ambassador to Peking (Panikkar has been more critical than is generally realized) have served to modify somewhat the attitude of India's top leaders.

The very practical plans for expediting India's defenses via a visit to Tibet are one example of this modification. Even more important, however, was Prime Minister Nehru's recent observation concerning China to a top British diplomat. Nehru said, "I am afraid that we have been too optimistic in our hopes for China. It looks to me now as if it may be many, many years before she regains her independence from the Soviet Union."

New York Herald Tribune Inc.



The Safety Valve

(Contributions to this column should be limited to 300 words. Write only on one side of paper; give name and full address. Poetry is not accepted.)

To the Editor:

Your editorial in the Sunday Statesman on the Santiam fire calls for "constructive criticism" and ends with the statement that "the only real protection is in stopping conflagrations before they get out of hand." How did that fire start? I understand that it was caused by a lumberman who blasted a stump in making a logging road. Why was that allowed? Is there no way to prevent the lumbermen from burning out this state? It will be recalled that two years ago this month, much damage was done to forests by fires that lumbermen were permitted to set in order to burn slashings. If the state forestry department is trying to keep Oregon green, why are the lumbermen allowed to keep it black?

Leonard Moser
Route 6, Box 544, Salem

More About Meters

To Whom it May Concern:

In view of the unfavorable, one-sided comments made by those of the city council as well as the Oregon Statesman, who opposed the adoption of the recent resolution to remove three meters from in front of my place of business at 198 S. Church st. I feel it only fair that the public and especially the Oregon Statesman be apprised of my position in this matter and particularly be apprised of the reasons why a majority of the council adopted said resolution.

I was in the process of renovating, remodeling and modernizing my cleaning and pressing business which I have had for the last 15 years at 198 S. Church st. Since my business was on the very fringe of the parking meter zone, with the parking meters being very seldom used, I did not think that I would be asking too much in making application with the city engineer for a permit to remove the curb, remove three parking meters in lieu thereof, not only as an accommodation to my customers but as an accommodation to the public generally in that area. Certainly I realized that I was not setting a precedent in making this request

in view of the numerous parking meters removed by the city at the request of the present owners of the two large parking lots on Ferry and High streets and on Ferry and south Commercial streets, who were likewise on the fringe of the parking meter area.

I did therefore proceed to request the city engineer for such a permit and he in turn, after conferences with the Manager, issued me a permit which authorized the removal of the curb from in front of my place of business and the removal of the three parking meters. Pursuant to the permit I expended in excess of \$400. Thereafter, I am advised that a couple of my cleaning establishment competitors who were not located in the fringe of the meter area complained to one of the city councilmen and to Mayor Al Loucks. They in turn, of course, jumped on the city Manager, and it was after that I heard for the first time that it was the city Manager's position that the parking meters were only to be removed temporarily.

... the Mayor ... now contends that the removal of these three meters is setting a dangerous precedent. I am convinced, however, that if the Mayor thought this was starting a precedent he would have opposed the removal of the parking meters by other business establishments prior to this time.

I submit it certainly would have been inequitable to have required me to put back these meters after spending in excess of \$400 pursuant to a city permit in the first instance and secondly it would have not been fair to have not upheld the action of the city officers, clothed with the apparent authority to do just what they did in this instance.

Actually, the only breach of proper parliamentary procedure which caused much comment among spectators at Monday's council meeting was Mayor Loucks' attempt to do all the talking on the different subjects presented. ... Glenn Burrig

Literary Guidepost

By W. G. Rogers
MOSES, by Sholem Asch,
translated by Maurice Samuel
(Putnam; \$3.75)

Leading a pampered life in the palace of the mighty Pharaoh, favorite of Bathiya, bearing a puzzling likeness to the Egyptians' own god Horus, Moses the prince had everything to gain if he accepted his apparent status unquestioningly, everything to lose if he yielded to his curiosity about the Hebrew slaves.

Their lot was as harsh as his was easy. Yet they esteemed him, for he had denied the rumor that he was Bathiya's son, that he had been found in the bulrushes, and he suspected that among these wretched laborers he might meet his parents. It was in fact Miriam who led him to them, and because "God had afflicted him," as he said, "with a free heart and a rebellious will," he gave up his life of luxury to join the gangs of slaves. But they would have none of his leadership, so that finally, pursued by the vengeful Pharaoh and rejected by his own people, he fled, to settle as a shepherd with Jethro and Zippora.

The familiar story continues: At God's command, Moses returns to the city of Rameses, demands freedom for the Israelites, threatens Pharaoh with plagues, cuts off the Egyptian first-born, leads his "stiff-necked" people through the divided waters of the sea that closes over their pursuers, settles them in the wilderness, wages war on the Amalekites, ruthlessly puts down the idolatrous spirit, finally deposits his charges on the border of the Promised Land, a generation after their dramatic trek started in the Nile valley.

Here are the accounts of the origin of the Passover, the Sabbath, the Ten Commandments. Here, too, is a most readable story. Above all, this translates into acceptable and credible human experience the Bible story of an inscrutable Jehovah and the servant into whose hands He put the magic rod, to whose people He miraculously fed manna.

Most modern writers, or re-writers, of Bible stories, seem to me unworthy of critical attention, seem indeed, sometimes, to be doing not only an absurd but even a profane job of popularizing. Asch is one of the few notable exceptions.

Better English

By D. C. Williams

1. What is wrong with this sentence? "Irregardless of this, we didn't get to go."
2. What is the correct pronunciation of "disaster"?
3. Which one of these words is misspelled? Insensate, insidious, incense, insensible.
4. What does the word "abject" mean?
5. What is a word beginning with per that means "boundary"?

ANSWERS

1. There is no such word as irregardless. Say, "Regardless of this, we were unable to go."
2. Pronounce first as z. 3. Insensible. 4. Down in spirit or hope. "He lived in abject poverty."
5. Perimeter.

Quote for the Day

any sense that makes survival worth while, it must learn to love, not to hate; to create and not to destroy. —King George VI

State Civilian Defense Staff

Members of the state civilian defense staff are in the field this week checking county directors and department heads on assignments given each area of the state for the organization of police and fire reserves, mobile first aid teams, medical-hospital teams, welfare teams and rescue units.

State Civil Defense Director Jack Hayes and his administrative aide, Robert Sandstrom, currently are contacting directors in western Oregon.

Two medical representatives, Dr. Robert Heilman and Frank Wetherell, are in eastern Oregon to discuss establishment of mobile first aid teams and medical-hospital teams. Richard Hatchard, sanitary engineer, is working out water supply and protection problems with area water superintendents.

Goals set up by the state civilian defense office are based on population and local resources.

16 High School Leaders Enter WU as Freshmen

A new record is established in Willamette university's freshman class this year, because 16 of its members are former high school student body presidents, according to Charles A. Paeth, director of admissions.

The ex-high school leaders represent four states and thirteen cities.

The newly enrolled Willamette freshmen with presidential pasts are: Reuben Menashe, Grant high, Portland; Martha J. Stearns, St. Helen's Hall, Portland; David Doerksen, Salem Academy, Salem; Robert Taylor, The Dalles; Donald W. Strahan, Randle; Joe Carson, Toledo; Edward Frederickson, Sandy; Robert Couley, North Bend; Keith Mirrie, Redmond; Charles A. Ruud, Woodburn.

John M. Kent, Sequoia high, Redwood City, Calif.; Robert Weichers, Shasta college, Redding, Calif.; Joanne Taylor, Eureka, Calif.; Thomas E. Whyte, Castleford high, Castleford, Idaho; Jack R. Phipps, Wenatchee, Wash.; Yvonne Van Hollebecke, Kahlolus, Wash.

Intent to Organize American Women's Party Registered

Declaration of intent to organize the American Woman's party in Oregon was filed in the state corporation department Wednesday.

A pamphlet accompanying the declaration reads: "Women have been forced to take the lead in self-defense, after waiting for some group of men to act, and waiting in vain, we refuse to give up what we prize the most, freedom, liberty and independence."

"Under republican and democratic parties you have lost your constitutional rights and are somewhat like serfs (slaves) of the state, under a joint program of socialism voted for by republicans and democrats in the house and senate in Washington, D. C."

"Net result of this combination of votes during the past 20 years has made your food cost more, your taxes higher, your rights have been taken from you, and fear grips you at every turn."

L. ROBERT BURDETTE, O. D.

And

KENNETH L. PRINCE, O. D.

WISH TO ANNOUNCE

The Opening of New Offices

As Associates in the Practice of Optometry

On October 1, 1951

802 LIVESLEY BUILDING
SALEM, OREGON

FOR APPOINTMENT
TELEPHONE 3-7582

MASTER BREAD

... is fresh bread!

ANNOUNCEMENT

In order to give even better service to our valuable friends and customers, we are increasing our personnel.

Mr. Charles Van Wormer, an insurance man of many years experience, is now associated with us in the production and service department.

RICHARD G. SEVERIN AGENCY

Every Form of Insurance

Senator Hotel Bldg. - Phone 3-4016

212 North High

GRIN AND BEAR IT by Lichty



"Is warning, comrade fortune teller! ... looking into future is not permitted ... is taking glorious leader's word for it! ..."