

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.

Case of the King-Size Monkey Wrench

The cases of Ross Barnett, James Meredith, even General Edwin Walker, are back where they ought to be—in the courts. But don't expect all to be serene. David Lawrence, the columnist who is also publisher of U.S. News and World Report, has revealed a monkey wrench of the greatest magnitude. He contends, in a editorial in his magazine, that the Fourteenth Amendment, upon which the federal government's case largely rests, is illegal. This has long been a popular view in the South. Expect now that it will be taken up with renewed vigor.

The Supreme Court, Lawrence notes, has never passed upon the method by which the amendment was ratified by the states in the hectic years right after the Civil War. Here, briefly, is the chronology:

June 18, 1866—Secretary of State Seward forwards the proposed amendment to the states, 28 of which must ratify if it is to become law.

June 30, 1866—Connecticut is first to ratify.

July 6, 1866 to July 4, 1868—24 more states ratify. In this period North Carolina, Louisiana and South Carolina rejected the proposed amendment. Also in this period, New Jersey and Ohio, which had once voted to ratify, voted to rescind their earlier ratification. Thus, by July 4, 1868, the federal government needed three additional ratifications—if the "rescind" moves of Ohio and New Jersey were not allowed. If those were allowed, five more ratifications were needed.

Legislatures of the former Confederate states were packed with the scalawags and carpetbaggers of infamy and with former slaves, many of them illiterate. By July 9 of 1868, ratifications were obtained from North Carolina, Louisiana and South Carolina, all of which had

once rejected the amendment. The Ohio and New Jersey moves to rescind were not recognized, and thus the ratifications were counted.

Now, how about those moves to rescind? And how about the legality of the three southern legislatures which changed their minds? Those are questions the court has avoided.

Oregon figures in this story somewhat, too. Oregon voted to ratify on Sept. 19, 1866. But the complexion of the Legislature changed, partly as the result of southern Democrats who flocked in here after the war. In October of 1868, three months after ratification of the amendment was proclaimed, Oregon, also, voted to rescind. And Oregon didn't get around to ratifying the 15th amendment, which gave former slaves the right to vote, until Feb. 24, 1959, some 90 years after the first state, Nevada, had ratified that amendment. California rejected that amendment and never even bothered to act on the 14th.

Illegal? Well, maybe. Certainly it was high-handed. But, then, high-handedness was called for between Fort Sumter and the removal of troops from the South in 1877. The only way the Union could be glued together again was by high-handedness. This is what brings a smile to those who read, 100 years later, southern protests about "Abe Lincoln's illegal invasion of the South."

Ah, what a flap there would be if the 14th amendment should be ruled illegal, which is unlikely. So large a body of decision has been based upon it the past 94 years. Certainly a new one would have to take its place, and pronto. For we must remember that the 14th, as important an amendment as the bill of rights in safeguarding our liberties, bears also upon many activities that are not remotely related to tragic events in the South.



What Is Home Rule?

Would you rather have control of your family's affairs right within the family circle? Or would you prefer to take such matters to an area council of family representatives for final and binding decisions?

If you favor settlements made at home, by those directly to be affected by them, you are in favor of "home rule," the principle underlying a new Lane County charter to be voted on Nov. 6.

By adopting this charter, Lane County residents can control how day-to-day affairs of county government are handled. If the charter is defeated, control of our county affairs will continue to be patterned by the State Legislature.

Nothing in the new charter, or that might be done under its provisions, would overrule state-wide laws. But home rule would be employed in such matters as reorganizing courthouse departments and adopting local ordinances to deal with local problems. The responsibility for the efficiency of most county departments would be given to three elected county commissioners instead of being scattered, as it now is, among a group of independently elected department heads.

If the new charter is adopted, county voters will then have rights that city voters have long possessed, including the powers of initiative and referendum through which they may exercise item-by-item control over the direction of local public affairs.

To state it simply: Grassroots government is the idea that will be served if Lane County's home rule charter is adopted. With home rule, Lane voters will be able to dictate any future changes in county procedures which they think should be made. Without it, Lane residents will continue to be governed too much according to the will of the legislators of the entire state assembled in Salem.

Take the Eighth?

Mississippi's Gov. Ross Barnett could be fined \$10,000 a day for every day of noncompliance with a federal court order. Lt. Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Jr., could be fined \$5,000 a day.

These cumulative penalties are like those in the Internal Security Act, which provide fines of \$10,000 a day and five years of imprisonment for each day of noncompliance. One wonders if they are not in the nature of a "cruel and unusual punishment," and thus in violation of the Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Bad Luck Sign

President Kennedy is going all out in his effort to "help" Democratic candidates for Congress. The President boasts he is a student of history. If some of the candidates for Congress are history students, too, they may ask him to please stay in Washington until after Nov. 6. Presidential "help" has usually been the kind candidates can do without.

Woodrow Wilson in 1918 made a great effort to get the American people to elect Democrats to Congress. Republicans that year gained 30 seats in the House and five in the Senate.

And remember the famous Roosevelt "purge" of 1938. FDR that year singled out nine senators and three representatives he said he wanted beaten. All but one was re-elected. The Republicans gained 80 House and six Senate seats.

In 1954 Vice President Nixon did the job for President Eisenhower. Democrats won 19 House seats and one (Oregon's) Senate seat. In 1958, Mr. Eisenhower tried it himself, with Nixon only helping. Democrats gained 49 House seats and 17 in the Senate, their greatest gains in two decades.

Maybe President Kennedy has something his predecessors didn't have. But Democratic candidates are entitled to worry a little if the Caroline lands at the home-town airport.



Letters In The Editor's Mailbag

Backs Lewis

SPRINGFIELD (To the Editor) — After reading the rambling letter to the editor in a recent issue of the Eugene Register-Guard, signed by a candidate for justice of the peace, Springfield District, I am more convinced than ever that we should retain our present judge, Carl M. Lewis.

There is absolutely no doubt about Judge Lewis's experience, proven ability, tolerance and understanding. Judge Lewis has built our justice court up from nothing to a recognized court of dignity and high standing in the community. An untried, inexperienced person seeks the office.

Why should we vote for an inexperienced man that has been in the state only a few years compared to Judge Lewis who has been a resident of Lane County for 55 years? Therefore, I shall cast my vote for the man that knows the county, the people in the county, and their problems, a man with proven ability and experience; a man that believes justice should be tempered with common-sense. That man is Springfield's own Judge Lewis.

JOE PROCIW S. 32nd St.

Back 'Again

EUGENE (To the Editor) — Because of the many requests I have received and also because I believe in the old adage that "the pen is mightier than the sword," I will again begin writing letters to the Guard.

- 1. What law has Governor Barnett broken? There is no law on record passed by the Congress of the United States which gives the federal government the right to intercede in state educational institutions. 2. If the federal can dictate to a local government in the field of education, there is no field it cannot take over from our locality. If government by minority pressure groups is so advanced that the force of all the taxpayers' money can be used to satisfy the whims of a few, then let us cease all pretense of representative government and honestly admit that we have a ruthless dictatorship. 3. Governor Barnett has rightly and legally interposed the

Ralph McGill

Youthful Leaders Proving Their Abilities

On the day that President Eisenhower, out beating the drums for GOP candidates, criticized what he called the callow youth of the Kennedy administration, there was not much reason to stand up and give a rousing cheer for old age.

In France the venerable Charles de Gaulle was in trouble. In Bonn, Germany, the octogenarian Adenauer was refusing U.S. suggestions designed to relax Berlin tensions and continuing his private talks with France about setting up a nuclear arms program. In Spain the regime of non-callow youth Franco was in trouble. In Britain there was a surge of younger politicians which concerned the graybeards of both Labor and the Conservatives. In the United States the U.S. labor movement was slowed down and unable to conceal friction within its own ranks, where the contented old-timers were holding back the restive younger leadership.

At the time Eisenhower was plumping for the wisdom of the more aged men, the young President was talking with Sekou Toure, of Guinea. By Mr. Eisenhower's definition he too is callow, having been born January 9, 1922. The fact that he was in Washington was, how-

ever, not without significance. At 40 he is one of the most important men in the forces emerging in Africa.

When an angry, elderly De Gaulle cut Guinea off from France, his administration withdrew everything possible, even to tearing the telephones from the walls of offices and removing all typewriters and office equipment. The angry reaction was swift. Russia came in. For a period of about two years Soviet hopes were high. It appeared that Guinea might soon become a Soviet base.

The Russians sent aid — but they bungled much of it. (A part of the aid shipment was snow plows.) Much of the equipment did not work. Some of the building was ineptly done. Last December a Soviet plot to subvert the government was discovered. Russia's ambassador was sent packing. Communist propaganda was sharply reduced.

Asks for Peace Corps Sekou Toure has now asked this country's callow Peace Corps to come into Guinea. Russian propaganda sought to make Africans believe the Peace Corps was merely a cover for espionage. The record of the young (and callow) missionary teachers, technicians, agricultural and vocational instructors has disproved the Russians. African countries which have benefited from the Peace Corps are enthusiastic. Guinea asked for some teachers.

In addition, Guinea may resume ties with France. On the day that Eisenhower was deploring the presence of young men in government, Uganda ended 66 years as a British protectorate and became a sovereign nation. Her premier is Apollo Milton Obote—aged 37. His father was an illiterate herdsman. A product of mission schools and college, Premier Obote crammed and studied late to extract all he could from the books. He is tough, resourceful, ambitious and determined. His political and economic handicaps too are many. His nation needs everything.

Soft Spot for British He is not anti-British. He condemns colonialism as fervently as other African nationalists. But he has, he says, a soft spot in his heart for the British protectorate officials. He is pledged to strict independent neutralism.

There are in Uganda 6,800,000 Africans, 11,800 white persons and 77,400 Indians and Pakistanis. The premier has urged they all stay. Speaking of foreign teachers and administrators, he said, "We need them desperately." It is highly dubious if the world of 1962 is much interested in the reminiscences of graybeards... of the wisdom of the past. In a way this is a pity. There is much value in both.

But it is doubtful if even the loudest critic of President Kennedy finds fault with his age.

(Distributed 1962 by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.)

sufficient defense that its use is a "school tradition" dating back "several years." I am appalled at the ignorance or bad taste or both which permitted the adoption of such a symbol in the first place.

The Confederate flag from its earliest appearance until now has symbolized defiance of federal law and allegiance to a society based on racism; this last was made abundantly clear by Confederate Vice-President Alexander H. Stephens when he declared that the Confederacy rested upon "the great truth" that "slavery — subordination to the superior race — is his (the Negro's) natural and normal condition." In recent years the Confederate flag has always been displayed when defiance — frequently by mob violence — of the Supreme Court desegregation decision was being urged and carried out. Persistent glorification of the Confederacy, its symbols and leaders, by ignorant, sentimental, or money-hunting novelists and movie or TV producers, and by vote-chasing politicians, can be credited with a share in encouraging the resistance to federal authority which most recently and catastrophically erupted in Mississippi.

Granted that the adoption of the Confederate flag at South Eugene was the work of innocent ignorance and that its use has become traditional. No one now has any excuse for ignorance of its meaning and no time is better than the present for discarding a symbol which now, at least, is inescapably associated with lawlessness and viciousness.

KENNETH W. PORTER 1790 Skyline Blvd.

Paperboys, Too

EUGENE (To the Editor) — In reading Mr. Weeden's letter in Wednesday's paper, I approve of all the applause he is giving the KORE station and the phone operators, and would add my appreciation to those mentioned. But I would add one more establishment, our own newspaper and its staff, reporters, and especially the carriers, most of them in the teen-age group. Of course most of them are dedicated boys—but one, especially, I think, needs special recognition. I don't know the name of the boy who delivers our paper (and I don't doubt there are many more like him), but when a boy will get off his bike, or out of his car in a

sume ties with France.

On the day that Eisenhower was deploring the presence of young men in government, Uganda ended 66 years as a British protectorate and became a sovereign nation. Her premier is Apollo Milton Obote—aged 37. His father was an illiterate herdsman. A product of mission schools and college, Premier Obote crammed and studied late to extract all he could from the books. He is tough, resourceful, ambitious and determined. His political and economic handicaps too are many. His nation needs everything.

Bicycles

ALVADORE (To the Editor) — Congratulations on bicycle editorial. Hope your paper will push idea more—and relegate such important observations to the front page occasionally, rather than the editorial page, which a lot of people avoid.

GLENN CHAMBERS 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 WASSMAN, News Editor DONN L. BONHAM, City Editor BOSS G. JOHNSON, Advertising Director JARL FUGLE, Circulation Manager ROBERT K. BERTSCH, Promotion W. B. JOHNSTON JR., Auditor ARNE STROMMER, Production

Eric Sevareid

Historic? Crucial? Nonsense!

This is an unsolicited form letter to the President, Ev and Charlie, the national party chairmen, all state and congressional candidates, their ghost writers, and my comrades in the columning and commenting trades:



Let's give it up, fellows. The 1962 off-year elections are neither "historic" nor "crucial." They aren't even exciting, and no amount of saying will make them so. Dramatically, they are a bust, and were it not for the ordinance forcing the box office to stay open until the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, the show would have closed last Saturday night.

In terms of national policy, nothing whatsoever is going to be measurably changed by the Nov. 6 result. The next Congress will be like the last Congress. It is almost inconceivable that the President can get an even heavier majority of, not only Democrats, but the kind of Democrats he wants to "set the country moving again." He is not Roosevelt and 1962 doesn't look, feel or smell like 1934 to anybody, anywhere. In terms of general party strength, 1960 did not mark the start of a Democratic resurgence; it was the highwater mark of a resurgence that began in 1954. Just as 1952 was not the start of the Republican come-back, but its apex. These things run in cycles, and, barring some apocalyptic event, the Democratic party curve is now bending downward.

A 'Grey' Situation The President's cross-country exhortations exude an air of unreality, as do the hyperbolic assaults upon him, and for the same reason—that the whole situation is a "grey" one, with no blacks and whites about it. His record of leadership was good but not that good; the Congress was obstructive, but not that obstructive. Like vice presidents and lieutenant colonels, both dwell in the realm of the not-quite but not-quite-not.

There simply is no over-arching national issue for either orators or voters to bite on. Congress removed the immensely important question of America's future in the world economy as an issue by rising to its duty and passing a whole-cloth trade bill. It gave him half a farm act, half a tax act, and three-quarters of a foreign aid act, leaving him in these areas with a series of fraction-issues, and no amount of fraction-issues add up to one big issue.

Not Even Stock Slide It denied him the Urban Affairs Department, but the case for it was never proved. It denied him the school aid he wanted, medicare, and the actions on housing, and unemployment; but each of these is a real issue only in scattered fractions of our geography and our social structure, and it seems impossible to fuse them into a national election theme or image for his party. No consensus has yet formed, among the people or in the Congress (or even within his administration) as to precisely how we "get the economy moving." Nor, with all its emotional overtones, has Cuba—the chief foreign policy problem — yet produced a really sharp division of opinion in the country.

Even the stock market fall wasn't dizzy enough and far enough to produce political trauma. The President draws crowds because he is John F. Kennedy, a popular and glamorous personality, not because he seems to the people either a politically victorious hero or a political martyr. He is, in this campaign, an acrobat on a political tight-rope, forced to argue, in effect, that even an overwhelming party majority in both houses is not enough and he must have a near monopoly.

A 'Personality' Election The truth is that, unlike nearly all "off year" elections, this is a "personality" election. It is true on the federal level, where, if anything is changed by the President it will be because of his person, not his arguments. It is true on the state level. In several races for governorships will lie the only real excitement for election night, and even there personalities are more important than issues.

In both New York and California the issues are fuzzy, the voters so far are rather apathetic and the real drama lies in the truly vital question of whether it will be man named Rockefeller or a man named Nixon (I make only a faint bow in the direction of Michigan and Romney) who will fight the 1964 battle for the White House against Kennedy.

There lies the one and only element of national drama for Nov. 6, an admission nobody could regret more than this devotee of the exclamation point.