

ALTON F. BAKER JR.
Editor and Publisher
EDWIN M. BAKER
General Manager
RICHARD A. BAKER
Managing Editor
ROBERT B. FRAZIER
Associate Editor
A. H. CURREY
Associate Editor

The Register-Guard's policy is the complete and impartial publication in its news pages of all news and statements on news. On this page, the editors of the Register-Guard offer their opinions on events of the day and matters of importance to the community, endeavoring to be candid but fair and helpful in the development of constructive community policy. A newspaper is a CITIZEN OF ITS COMMUNITY.

Published every evening and Sunday morning by the Guard Publishing Co.

12A EUGENE, OREGON, MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1962

A New Club of 'Free' Nations?

Herbert Hoover, man of peace, has called for the formation of a "council of free nations" to act, as he says the United Nations has not acted effectively, to preserve world freedom in those blessed spots where there is freedom to be preserved. It's an appealing idea. But, in a measure, it has already been effected. Furthermore, it would not replace the United Nations as an international symphony. And, unless a miracle should occur, it would soon become as scrappy as the United Nations itself.

Already we have several little clubs of the type Mr. Hoover may have in mind. We have NATO, CENTO, SEATO and more. The Communist world has its Warsaw pact group. Each of these was formed, as the United Nations itself was formed, primarily to further the self-interest of the member nations. But not all nations are like the United States, with an interest in all quarters of the globe. Would NATO partner Iceland be interested in Viet Nam, which is SEATO's concern? How would SEATO partner Thailand feel about the two Germanies, NATO's problem? The Organization of American States is quite concerned right now about developments in Argentina. But how much does CENTO partner Turkey care?

The idea of a concert of "freedom-loving" states is also questionable. Who loves freedom? Do the Portuguese? Salazar says so. How about the Congolese? Which Congolese? Can the Congolese and the Belgians be in the same "freedom-loving" club? How about the freedom-loving Indonesians and the freedom-loving Dutch? The United Nations, we need to remind ourselves, is by definition an association of "peace-loving states." That's a laugh, to be sure, but that's what the charter says.

Clubs tend to ignore realities in an effort to make the association as pleasant as possible. Assuming that an organization of the kind Mr. Hoover favors could be set up, it would ignore a massive reality. Many nations aren't freedom-loving. The new organization could be a power bloc, but it would not function as the United Nations was meant to function, as a world symphony.

Not a Cinch

Oregon's election this November will be "more than a local show." So says the New York Herald Tribune, one of the most influential Republican voices in the country. The Trib isn't talking about Wayne Morse, either. It's talking about Gov. Mark Hatfield, a man whose career "got well off the ground but never quite into national orbit." A Hatfield victory, says the paper, would put him in great shape for a spot on the national ticket in '64. A defeat would spell the end. The Trib calls Oregon's governor "a man of youth, intelligence and promise."

Oregon Republicans are not unimpressed of all that the Trib says. The trouble is that they may be a little too complacent. They may feel Hatfield has the election all wrapped up in his contest against Attorney General Bob Thornton, a man who has never had much political appeal for anybody but the voters.

Complacency is out of place. Mr. Thornton is a formidable opponent, as witness the three successful campaigns he waged with only lukewarm support. He's an opponent to be reckoned with.

Mr. Hatfield's greatest drawback is that he is the incumbent governor. He has a record to defend. And Oregon voters are exceedingly tough on their governors. Only one governor in all the state's history has served two full terms, and he was a Democrat who achieved this distinction nearly 70 years ago.

Oregon voters tend to hold the governor responsible for all that goes wrong, to credit him with nothing that goes right. This is manifestly unfair to the governor, any governor. The same voters, acting on their own or through the Legislature, have consistently refused to give the governor as much power as he ought to have if he is to be held responsible for the events of his period in office.

Not that the United Nations recognizes realities all the time either. The one-nation-one-vote system ignores the fact that some nations are bigger, stronger, richer and more able to offer leadership than others. It is as if a symphony were composed of only one of each instrument—one bass drum, one violin, one trombone, etc.

And the United Nations ignores another reality. Some important forces in the world are unrepresented. The man from little Mauritania casts a vote. But there is nobody to cast a vote for Red China, one of the giants of today's world. Yemen, which is "rushing headlong into the 13th century," has a vote. But powerful, rich West Germany does not. Neither does Switzerland, always an important nation when the going gets rough. However, there are calculated reasons for ignoring these realities. And, through the United Nations, we still face the greater reality, the reality that nuclear doom hangs ever over all our heads.

It's too easy to see things in the light of current circumstances. Every American now eligible to vote was born in an age when the great struggle was between "freedom" and the awful forces of fascism. His children are growing up in an age when the great two-way struggle is between "freedom" and communism. The truth is that there are not two sides to the world struggle. There are many. They blend and separate. Tomorrow's great struggle may be between forces that are unrecognized today, as international Communism and Nazism were unrecognized a century or more ago. We still do not know if Russia and China are eventual partners or foes in conflict. We still do not know the direction of the "third force," the force that may be guided by India, Indonesia and much of Africa and Latin America.

Those who like clubs might find a pleasant association in a "council of free nations," whatever that is. But such an organization would not match the United Nations, imperfect though it be, in recognizing and coping with the realities of a troubled world.

Every time the Legislature assembles somebody drags out the old crack that "the governor proposes and the Legislature disposes." This is true. But not enough Oregon voters realize it. They blame the governor, ignore the legislators.

One of the main chores facing Oregon Republicans this fall will be to help voters recognize where the responsibility for the successes and the failures lies. If they fail to get this message across, they will have done worse than fail to promote a distinguished political career. They will also have contributed again to the loss of a good governor who was caught in a web of circumstances he could not, by law and custom, control.

Bouquet

An admiring reader mails in a copy of a Register-Guard editorial with the notation, "You gullible fool," scrawled across it.

This calls to mind the time Abraham Lincoln received in the mail a single sheet of paper containing only the word "fool." He observed, "First time I ever got a letter that a man signed and forgot to write."

Retirement

President Eisenhower is still adjusting to the problem of being an ex. Said he the other day of people like himself, "You have gotten so accustomed to facing decisions about Formosa or Laos that... there is a sort of a feeling of 'What can I do?'... Suddenly you realize you can't do anything..."

Grover Cleveland, as an ex-president, put it this way: "I feel like a locomotive hitched to a boy's express wagon."

Roscoe Drummond

South America Real Land of Crisis

BUENOS AIRES — At the very moment when the Alliance for Progress holds some flickering hope that things can be better, a deepening crisis is being written across the whole face of the Western hemisphere.



Drummond

est source of danger to the free world is not in Africa or in Asia, however doubtful these areas may be; it is in the Western hemisphere.

The United States is wrapped up in it inescapably—for better or for worse—in its dangers, in its potentials, in the heroic, tardy, prudent, and uncertain effort called the Alliance for Progress.

Its purpose: to turn economic despair into hope before economic despair turns Latin America into nearly total turmoil.

Calamity is not certain, but success is far from assured. At this stage there are danger signals everywhere I have been in Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Brazil, which embrace nine-tenths of the continent and more than half of its exploding population of 214,000,000 people.

I do not mean that the picture is all dark, that all is lost. It is still within reach of a massive mutual effort to speed economic growth and begin to close the gap between concentrated wealth and widespread misery before it is too late. But the race between a better life and restless frustration has been going on for a long time and frustration is leading by several long laps.

In trying to look at the whole face of the hemisphere as it slowly, hopefully begins this effort, here's the sum of the forces that makes its success so imperative, its failure so tragic:

ASSET—The past decade has brought a steady disappearance of the old-style dynastic and military dictatorships. Only three remain—Paraguay, Haiti, Nicaragua. Added to them is the repressive outthrusting Soviet-orientated Communist dictatorship of Fidel Castro. There are many shortcomings in the new regimes, but this victory over most of the Latin American dictatorships is a significant step forward and proof of the passion for freedom of all Latin American peoples.

OBSTACLE — The new Latin American democracies are the targets of terrific social tensions and political stress before they're ready. In Argentina and Brazil the military have asserted substantial power and in Peru the new junta is dominant.

The liberal Betancourt government in Venezuela is being battered from left and right. The conservative Alessandri government in Chile is fighting for its life against the growing power of the extreme left. None of the new democracies is secure.

OBSTACLE — Weak and embattled governments, seeking to make democracy work, face most formidable economic and social problems — mounting inflation, rising prices, declining export income. Conditions are getting worse, not better. Per capita income has ceased to grow in nearly every Latin American country and dropping in some. The result is economic

stagnation and ominous mass discontent.

OBSTACLE — If the Alliance for Progress is not merely going to enrich further the already wealthy, then great social reforms are widely needed. Those who want to maintain completely the status quo will resist these reforms and often the governments are largely controlled by those who want little change.

In the face of these fantastically formidable obstacles, can the Alliance succeed adequately and in time? Candidly, no one really knows.

One thing is clear: this is a momentous struggle against poverty and dictatorship. If the underprivileged, underpaid, long harassed people of Latin America cannot find a way to achieve economic hope by democratic means, they will demand it at any political cost and accept any political system they think will benefit their lot.

The only visible consequences of failure by the Alliance for Progress are widespread Communist dictatorship or widespread military dictatorship — or both.

Copyright, 1962, New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Peter Edson

How's Your Crystal Ball Today?

WASHINGTON (NEA) — In all the talk about businessmen's lack of confidence in the Kennedy administration, one of the principal criticisms has been

that the President is getting the wrong advice from the wrong kind of people.

At first there was confidence in Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, a Republican right out of Wall Street.

Lately there has been some uneasiness that he is being too flexible in supporting Kennedy programs.

When Dillon took over at Treasury he found that he had no economic staff. Former Secretary George M. Humphrey had abolished it. He didn't believe in economists. "They can't tell you where you're going," he used to say. "All they can do is tell you where you've been." And, "If anybody knew all the answers, he'd soon have all the money."

Anyway, Dillon took his problem of having no economists at Treasury to President Kennedy.

No Publicity Either Time

He suggested that Seymour Harris of Harvard, his old professor and adviser, be called in. This was done. Harris assembled a group of academic economic consultants — now numbering 37.

When about 30 members of the group met at Treasury June 27, they heard seven papers on the domestic economy and one on the international outlook. All were gloomy. Twenty of the 30 business indicators were down.

No specific recommendations were made on what ought to be done about it. No votes were taken. Policy making was left to the politicians and administrators. But the consensus of the meeting was that there should be a tax cut. Cuts of from \$6 billion to \$10 billion were mentioned. The implication was that the cut should be made quickly.

One Treasury skeptic at the meeting is reported to have whispered to the man in the next chair, "If these economists were so wrong last November, why should we think they are so right now?"

The question was put to the panel out loud. The answer that came back was, in summary: "Well, we didn't anticipate the stock market slump."

Logic Checked Out

This highly revealing report recalls a column which the late, great Fred Othman wrote toward the end of the 1957 recession. He had sat all day in the old Supreme Court chamber in the Capitol, listening to one expert after another tell the Congressional Economic Committee that the business outlook was terrible and that Congress ought to do something about it, without specifying just what.

Fred came back to the office and wrote a piece which began, "The recession is all over." His logic was that any time you get economists to agree on something unanimously, they're all wrong. As it soon developed, Fred was right.

Anyone interested in checking out this Othman theory of economics might file this piece away for six months or a year and see how things turn out.

If it develops that the administration advisers were all wrong, then business indeed would be justified in telling the President to hire some new advisers.

In the Editor's Mailbag

Defends Senator

EUGENE (To the Editor) — The Register-Guard editors should have attended the recent Eugene Young Democrats reception for Wayne Morse. Perhaps, then, they would not have been so hasty in quoting a Florida editor in opposition to Morse's stand on the satellite communications bill and AT&T control.

The phrase, "Senator Morse and his filibustering friends" is a loaded statement—as if to say that filibustering is always evil, as are all who use it. Anti-filibuster resolutions are introduced regularly into both houses, but have always died for lack of support. All senators and representatives must find the filibuster useful. Is filibustering, then, bad only when certain people use it?

Nor is Morse merely "denouncing AT&T" in this issue. The administration has tried to pressure this bill through Congress, and the Morse minority wants further consideration and possible amendment.

The Senate opinion which Morse represents is reasonable. He wishes to conduct the satellite communications system on a government contract and lease basis rather than handing it over to AT&T alone as the Senate Republicans and the Democratic majority leader now desire, or establishing complete government operation as Estes Kefauver suggests.

There are many arguments against the "hand over" approach:

1. The international disputes that might arise could not be adequately settled between a foreign country and AT&T. Khrushchev would laugh in the face of a private enterprise, but would take care if the project were under government contract.

2. The billions of taxpayers' dollars now invested in launching equipment AT&T needs for any satellite program must be protected by effective government regulation.

3. Satellite launching involves military secrets. Does AT&T have its own FBI?

4. The AT&T low-altitude satellite system will be outdated in two or three years. Will they re-invest?

5. The present bill includes no amendments regarding reduced rates for government information broadcasts to world trouble

spots—as Morse has called for.

The filibuster may be "obstructionist" but, as here, it can be used in the public interest. If the Register-Guard wishes to disagree with Morse's position on this bill, I would like to see a more complete exposition with accompanying facts.

GALE ROID
1450 Golden Ave.

Medic-Alert

TURLOCK, Calif. (To the Editor)—I would like to call your attention to several unfortunate and incorrect statements regarding various types of medical problem identification made in a recent column by Dr. Joseph G. Molner.

In referring to Medic-Alert and its program of providing stainless steel and silver medical identification bracelets, emblems and medallions, Dr. Molner alludes to them as "charm bracelets." He also states in the same column that "most jewelry stores now have something of that sort available."

For the record, the Medic-Alert emblems and bracelets are not a product, but a service. As a non-profit, charitable organization, the Medic-Alert Foundation provides these emblems as part of and as an instrument of its service to those with hidden medical problems.

These emblems bear an engraved warning of the wearer's particular medical problem along with the serial number under which the member's medical record is filed in the central headquarters in Turlock, Calif., and the emergency telephone number of the foundation. The information in these files is available on a 24-hour collect call basis to physicians

and other authorized personnel in emergencies.

Secondly, the Medic-Alert emblems are not "charm bracelets" and cannot be obtained in jewelry stores.

As pointed out by Dr. Molner in a previous column, the Medic-Alert Foundation is endorsed by numerous state medical and nurses associations, law enforcement agencies and countless other organizations. International in scope, Medic-Alert has sister organizations in Canada and Australia, and chapters in 16 other countries.

While I can appreciate Dr. Molner's position of not favoring any one group, it is a gross misstatement of fact to associate the Medic-Alert emblems and program with costume jewelry which incidentally may provide some sort of medical identification.

STAFFORD GARRETT
Medic-Alert Foundation
Managing Director

The 'Why' of Rain?

EUGENE (To the Editor) — Here is something different; let's see if you will go for it or just watch it go by.

In the Civil War in the 1860s, a large battle with lots of shelling was noted to often bring a rain in the summertime.

In World War I, remember "the mud" of Flanders Field and others.

Now note the damp days of this spring and summer and the worldwide atomic blasts.

Does it mean anything, or is it just a coincidence?

I have tried a time or two lately with "something different" but didn't click, so this is just one more try.

J. M. NIGHSWANDER
Rt. 3, Box 404

James Marlow

Kennedy's Cabinet Quiet, Hard-Working

WASHINGTON — President Kennedy's Cabinet — compared with some of the more outspoken members of President Eisenhower's Cabinet — looks like a bunch of silent Sams.

Each president is free to handle his Cabinet as he wishes. Eisenhower gave his more status as an institution than Kennedy by meeting with

it often. He even took it on television with him to talk to the nation.

Kennedy may meet with his Cabinet members individually. But he puts a great reliance on his White House brain trust. And no one in his Cabinet or brain trust has shared the spotlight with him, or tried it.

Almost from the moment he became Eisenhower's secretary of state in 1953, John Foster Dulles was a great force unto himself without hesitancy in making high policy pronouncements.

In a Professional Way

Not so with the present secretary, Dean Rusk, a rather self-effacing man who runs his job like an expert technician, leaving the big statements to Kennedy.

Dulles was in continual conflict with his critics. Rusk so far has had practically no critics and his only conflict seems limited to the Russians, and then only in a quietly professional way.

But very early in the Eisenhower administration Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey became a dominant figure with little reluctance in stating policy, a very conservative one, which became the hallmark of Eisenhower's years.

The Time Was Noisy

Atty. Gen. Robert F. Kennedy, the President's brother, may be a symbol of the young-in-heart to many people. But he has operated a lot more quietly than Herbert Brownell, Eisenhower's attorney general.

The times and circumstances, though, were different for Dulles and Brownell. They took over at the peak of the McCarthy era and its hunt for Communists inside and outside government. It was a noisy time.

Still, they overheated some of their problems. Dulles, for example, was so anxious to pacify McCarthyites with State Department morale there. And Brownell made some harsh attacks, some thought far too harsh, on the previous Truman administration.

A Big Difference

The Kennedy men—from the President down—have done extremely little sniping at the Eisenhower administration.

The two presidents each lost one Cabinet member before they had been in office two years: Martin Durkin, Eisenhower's secretary of labor; and Abraham Ribicoff, Kennedy's secretary of health, education and welfare.

There was a big difference in their going. Angry Durkin, a former labor leader, accused Eisenhower aides of breaking an agreement to try to soften the Taft-Hartley Act.

Ribicoff, it has been said around Washington, was never

'Babysitting' New Welfare Law Draws Critic's Ire

From Congressional Quarterly

WASHINGTON — The new welfare law puts the United States government in the "babysitting business."

That's the opinion of Sen. John Marshall Butler, R-Md., who objects to provisions of the law to earmark federal child welfare funds for allotment among the states to help them set up child day care facilities.

If true, the sitting fees are well worth while, according to welfare officials who claim they will reduce the number of mothers on relief, and cut down on juvenile delinquency.

Day care facilities are centers where working mothers can leave small children. They are not owned by the states, but must be state-licensed and are usually financed largely by state welfare funds. The present capacity of all licensed day care facilities is only 185,000 children.

Going on Relief Preferred

During hearings on the welfare bill, administration spokesmen testified that more day care centers could be an important factor in helping welfare clients to become self-supporting and thus decreasing the number of persons on relief. They said that currently women prefer to go on relief rather than leave their children unattended or in inadequate facilities.

Under the new law Oregon can receive \$275,134 for child welfare services. If it matches the funds from its child welfare services money, it will receive \$48,075 to set up child day care centers in fiscal year 1963 and \$96,569 for day care in fiscal 1964.

The new law requires the states to give priority in providing day care to persons on relief or members of low-income groups. If there are remaining funds, children from moderate income families can also use the centers. Children of welfare families are admitted to the centers free; the states must determine what fees may reasonably be charged to other families.

Day Care Controversy

In objecting to day care, Butler said: "If the government wants to help mothers, let it reduce expenditures, tighten its administrative belt and stay out of the baby-sitting business."

On the other hand, Federal Children's Bureau Chief Katherine B. Oettinger has labeled the current lack of day care facilities "a national disgrace." She said that the few existing facilities are often so poor that they are psychologically damaging to children. She said the new law would provide a "valuable tool" for improving the quality of day care.

And Mrs. Louis Ottenberg, leader of a District of Columbia campaign to obtain matching funds for day care, said the highest rate of juvenile delinquency occurs in homes where the mother works and the children are left unattended. She said the alternatives to day care are to keep a family on relief or to let the mother go to work and then "pick up the tab for the cost of delinquency."

© 1962, Congressional Quarterly Inc.

Carmichael

I'VE NEVER DATED A GIRL WHO WAS SO POSSESSIVE--- AND STRONG---



MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all the local news printed in this newspaper.
MEMBER OF THE AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS
Services United Press International
WILLIAM WASHMANN, News Editor
DONN L. BOYHAM, City Editor
ROSS G. JOHNSON, Advertising Director
JARR FUGLE, Circulation Manager
ROBERT K. BERTSCH, Promotion
W. B. JOHNSON JR., Auditor