

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.

Dancing on Nixon's Political Grave

After his defeat in California last week, Richard M. Nixon, the former political figure, was most critical of the press, blaming it largely for the beating he took. He expressed thanks for radio and television, which, he said, kept the printed word boys on their toes. One wonders how he feels now, after Howard K. Smith's brutal burying of Dick Nixon on a national television program Sunday night.

Mr. Smith's program, which featured many of Nixon's old friends and foes, will be talked about for a long time. Certainly it will stand out as one of the most controversial television programs of the year. Criticism was heavy Sunday night because Alger Hiss, the man whose career Nixon is responsible for wrecking, was permitted to dance a bit on Nixon's political grave.

The use of Hiss on this program was, to say the least, poor taste. We have forgotten, perhaps, that Hiss, a convicted perjurer, sought to cover up activities which may have amounted to espionage against the United States. We do not know to what extent Hiss was involved in espionage, nor do we know exactly what it was he did. But we do know that he lied in an effort to keep the government from finding out. We could not expect that he would be sympathetic toward the man who exposed him.

Jerry Voorhies, the former congressman whom Nixon beat in his first bid for Congress, also was given a chance to twist the knife in the corpse. He delighted in reminding the audience of Nixon's rather brutal ways, back in the days before he was presidential material. And, true enough, Nixon was one who encouraged Joe McCarthy and who was not above a bit of character assassination, if he thought it would help him. But Voorhies, in speaking of Nixon's campaign against Helen Gahagan Douglas for the Senate in 1950, was not at all

fair to Nixon. He neglected to point out that the worst attacks on Mrs. Douglas and her record came not from Nixon, but from Manchester Boddy, her Democratic opponent in the primary. Much of the mud which rubbed off on Nixon was Boddy's, not Nixon's.

Voorhies, we must remember, has every reason to remember Nixon with bitterness. His commentary served to make Nixon's defeat for governor all the more bitter. But it did nothing to make Voorhies look any better. Nor did it do anything to clear up the record.

It is not the primary function, either of the historian or of the journalist, to be kind. But it is the obligation of both the historian and the journalist to be fair, to seek perspective, and to avoid gratuitous violations of good taste. In this regard, the Smith program was a gross failure.

One of Nixon's problems as a politician, and it would have been a great problem if he had been elected president, is that his public image does not make him out to be a particularly lovable guy. He lacks the warm political appeal of most successful politicians. (And, California defeat or no California defeat, Nixon must be regarded, in the long run, as a successful politician.) The public, generally, would not have been overjoyed in a Nixon victory, much as segments of the public might have approved of it. And the public, generally, shed no tears at his defeat, much as segments of the public might have regretted it.

Does public reaction to the Nixon defeat have a parallel in history? Has there been another politician who twice missed so narrowly and who also had to take this kind of humiliation? Defeat to a politician is humiliating enough. It is a bad grace and in poor taste for those who dislike Nixon to have shown such glee at his defeat.



The Movies

A quarter of a century ago, quite a splash was made by a book called "Our Movie Made Children." Its thesis was the charge that that generation's young people were being shaped by what they saw in the movies.

Probably, there was something to it. In the November Cosmopolitan, Connie Clausen writes on the "Double Feature Syndrome." That's what many of today's middle-aged Americans have. Their attitudes, their hopes, their beliefs were shaped by what they saw on the screen on bank night or on Saturday afternoons. Miss Clausen tells of one woman who moved to New York and hates it. But she won't leave, not until she rides through Central Park in a hansom cab with a man wearing white tie and tails. Other women, she says, catch themselves wishing their husbands looked more like Cary Grant and "less like the boy next door grown older and heavier."

The movies did have a tremendous influence on a young generation that was less traveled than today's, that had no television and very little money. We did learn there to aspire to luxury. Many of our attitudes, many of our ideas of proper conduct were picked up from the movies.

Not that all this was bad. The movies, as teevee does today, played a large part in removing from the American scene the hick and the hayseed of other years. A plowboy going to New York for the first time no longer needed to gawk at the tall buildings. He had already seen them, on the screen. He could order in a fine restaurant, just by doing it the way he'd seen Clark Gable do it. The movies, along with other media of communication, sped us on our way to becoming, culturally, one nation and less a collection of narrow regions.

Tip Wanted

If we ever get back to being friendly with the Russians, we might ask them how it is that they can assemble and dismantle missile bases with such speed.

Ward Macy

One mark of a man is the esteem in which his colleagues hold him. Ward Macy's colleagues at the University of Oregon thought highly, indeed, of him. They chose him to serve on their key committees, including the committee that sought a new president for the university. There was talk among many that he might be just the man for the job, himself. Many more hoped that he would accept one of the higher deanships when one became available. Only his age, 63 at the time of his death Sunday, ruled this out.

In university history, Ward Macy was one of the "old new faculty." He wasn't here before the war. But he came shortly thereafter to assume his job in building up the economics department after the ravages of war had scattered the faculty and after the pressure of returning veterans had strained the resources of all university departments. He worked closely with three presidents in "the pursuit of excellence" for his department and the university. In his 12 years as department head, he attracted an outstanding staff, many of whom came to Oregon largely because they wanted to be in Ward Macy's department.

Good professor, he was. Good administrator, he was. Also, however, he was a first-rate economist. He was frequently called upon for advice and information. In his special field, taxation, he was a recognized authority.

A pleasant fellow in the living room, a stimulating teacher in the classroom, Ward Macy, in only 12 years, left an important part of himself on the University of Oregon campus.

Oops!

A typographical error crept into an editorial about the historic meeting of American and Russian troops on the Elbe River in 1945. The American unit was incorrectly identified as a regiment of the 6th Division. It should have been, as veterans of the ETO know, the 69th Division.

A. Robert Smith

Norblad Now Dissenters' Only Voice

WASHINGTON (Special) — The elections results in Oregon have posed a new responsibility for the state's lone surviving Republican in Congress, Rep. Walter Norblad, if Oregon conservatives are to voice any dissent from the proposals of the New Frontier.

The victory of Democrat Robert B. Duncan over Republican Carl Fisher in the 4th district, and the re-election of Sen. Wayne Morse and Reps. Al Ullman and Edith Green, means that Oregon once more has a congressional delegation which is decidedly liberal in its view and voting persuasion.

This situation is not in itself new, but the circumstances in which it occurs are new. For the four years from 1956 to 1960 the delegation consisted of five liberal Democrats and one Republican, Norblad; but those were the years of President Eisenhower's second term, and it was the liberals who were the dissenters, voicing the viewpoint of the opposition or the "outs."

From Personal Conviction
Circumstances are now reversed. The Oregon Democrats will be working hand-in-glove to a great extent with the Kennedy administration, as they have in the past two years. During this period, 1960-62, the voice of dissent in the Oregon delegation came chiefly from Rep. Edwin R. Durno, the retiring Medford Republican, who criticized the administration's Medicare plan especially, plus other liberal proposals.

As an authentic and articulate conservative, Doctor Durno played that vital and necessary role of dissenter or spokesman for the "outs," and he did it from personal conviction rather than from the posture of a partisan sniper. His voice and vote will be missed by Oregon conservatives unless Norblad assumes this role.

Carl Fisher would doubtless have assumed this role had he won Durno's seat; so would Bob Chandler, the articulate Bend publisher, had he defeated Ullman. Duncan's victory over Fisher has already revived Kennedy administration plans for creating an Oregon Dunes national seashore park.

His Customary Approach
This park issue may not lend itself to ready ideological alignment as between liberals and conservatives, although the controversial question of whether the government should take private property for inclusion in the park tends to inflame some conservatives. But Senator Morse has disliked this feature of the park proposal, and Representative Green has never endorsed the park at all.

Congressman Norblad has taken no position on the park, explaining it is an issue involving lands outside his congressional district. This is Norblad's customary approach — to avoid entanglement in any controversy, particularly if it can be said to be outside his district.

The proposed electric power intertie between the Northwest and California may be a more certain issue to divide liberals and conservatives. The private power companies want to build their own intertie, but the administration has held up issuing a special use permit over national forest land because of the prospective drive by the government for a federal intertie.

He May Have to Change
Interior Secretary Stewart Udall says this is on his 1963 program. It may be the biggest congressional fight involving Oregon in the new Congress, for there are some conservatives in the Washington state delegation who oppose a federal intertie. The likelihood of any resistance or vocal opposition from the Oregon delegation appears to be fairly remote — unless Congressman Norblad begins to speak up for the conservative opposition.

Norblad virtually never enters debates on the House floor, although he is candid in relating his stand on any national issue. He is careful, however, to avoid taking a stand on regional or state issues outside his district which might irritate some of his supporters. If Oregon conservatives are to be heard in Congress, Walter Norblad may have to change his accustomed ways.

Viewpoint

Henry Hazlitt in "Economics in One Lesson": The whole of economics can be reduced to a single lesson, and that lesson can be reduced to a single sentence. The art of economics consists in looking not merely at the immediate but at the longer effects of any act or policy; it consists in tracing the consequences of that policy not merely for one group, but for all groups.

Below Olympus



How about negotiating the removal of this 'offensive weapon' aimed at the people of the world?

In '62 House Elections

Whatever 'Frontier' Gains, Key Issues Still in Doubt

From Congressional Quarterly

WASHINGTON (CQ) — President Kennedy gained in "hard-core" supporters in the 1962 House elections, a Congressional Quarterly study of Nov. 6 election results shows.

But whether he can translate that advantage into House victories on such contentious "Frontier" issues as Medicare, urban affairs and school aid remains a matter for conjecture.

In the Senate, the advantages accruing to the President from a net pickup of four Democratic seats are clear. A Congressional Quarterly projection of votes on the Medicare issue, for example, shows that if the issue is brought to a vote in 1963, if incumbent senators vote exactly as they did in 1962, and if the newcomers vote according to the stands they took while campaigning, Medicare will pass, 52-48.

This would be an exact reversal of the 48-52 vote in July of this year which killed Medicare for the session.

House Analysis

To assess the new House lineup in terms of support for President Kennedy, Congressional Quarterly went beneath the partisan election results (a four-seat loss for the Democrats and a two-seat gain for the Republicans) and measured the known record or public stand of each member leaving Congress and each new member who will take a seat in January. The findings:

• Of 69 members leaving the House because of election defeat, primary defeat, retirement or resignation (40 Democrats and 29 Republicans), 14 can be classified as "hard-core" Kennedy supporters on key controversial issues.

• Of 67 members who will enter the House in January (36 Democrats and 31 Republicans), 24 can be classified as "hard-core" Kennedy supporters on the basis of their campaign stands.

Thus the President makes a net pickup of 10 in the vital area of hard-core support.

• Of the 69 outgoing members, 25 can be classified as generally dependable in their support for the President's program, including the hard-core backers. Among the newcomers, 27 are similarly rated — making a net gain of two in terms of general support.

A major reason for the Kennedy gains, despite the small slippage in Democratic seats, is that the Democratic standard-bearers departing from Congress include a number of Southerners who opposed the President's program or were lukewarm at the most. On the other hand, Democrats picked up a number of seats outside the South, most notably nine in California made available by the 1960 census reapportionment, and in many cases the winners are expected to be "down-the-line" Kennedy men.

Specific Issues

When the apparent Kennedy gains are translated into specific issues, the outlook is mixed. On a number of roll calls in 1962, the President was able to attract some votes from those departing members who generally opposed him.

Thus, on the Jan. 31, 1961, vote on temporarily enlarging the House Rules Committee, so as to ease the way for Kennedy bills, 33 of the departing members supported the President. The enlargement carried 217-212, and a switch of three votes would have defeated it. Since the President gains only 27 known supporters in the new Congress, he faces a potential net loss of six votes if the issue is brought up again in 1963, assuming all other members vote exactly as they did before. Obviously this would be touch-and-go, despite the election turnover. The outlook on other issues:

• School Aid — The President has lost 22 members who backed him on his 1961 general aid to education bill. His pickup of 27 supporters means a

hypothetical gain of five on this issue. But it would take 37 switches to reverse the outcome of the roll call which killed school aid in 1961.

• Taxes — Thirty-four of the outgoing House members supported passage of the President's tax bill in 1962. His pickup of 27 new supporters means a net hypothetical loss of seven on this issue. But it would have taken a switch of 12 votes to defeat the bill in 1962, lending some encouragement to inclusion of comparable reforms in the tax package expected to be sent to Congress early in the next session.

• Urban Affairs — The President loses 20 supporters on this one. His new supporters would give him a net gain of seven — hardly a beginning in the 58 switches needed to give the President an Urban Affairs Department, on the basis of the roll-call which defeated the plan Feb. 21, 1962.

• Farm Program — The first 1962 farm bill, including supply management controls for feed grains, died June 21 when the House voted to reject it on a cliff-hanging 215-205 roll call. The President loses 35 members who backed him on this one. The new projection of 27 supporters would merely mean that the same bill would lose by a wider margin.

• Foreign Aid — The President loses 32 members who supported him when the House rejected, 190-203, a move to cut economic assistance by \$100 million. If he has gained 27 new supporters, the net loss, five, would not reverse the outcome, since opponents would have needed seven switches to prevail.

Other Factors

Obviously, many other factors will influence the outcome on these issues if they are brought to a vote in 1963. The President has won a psychological advantage by repulsing Republican inroads in a midterm election. However, he may lose votes of Democratic Southerners mindful of the near defeat of Sen. Lister Hill in Alabama. This could serve to strengthen the "conservative coalition" of Southern Democrats and Republicans.

On the other hand, some moderate Republicans, mindful of the GOP overturn in six 1962 Senate races, could prove more helpful on Kennedy domestic programs than they were in 1962.

On issues like Medicare and permanent unemployment compensation changes, which have yet to come to a vote in the House, much may depend on what is done in committee, where the conservative forces will continue to be strong. In view of the Senate changes, however, it is doubtful that Medicare can be kept off the floor of either chamber in 1963.

Copyright, 1962, Congressional Quarterly, Inc.

Thoughts

So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good — Romans 7:12.

Our human laws are but the copies, more or less imperfect, of the eternal laws so far as we can read them. — James Froude.

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 WASSMANN, News Editor
DONN L. BONHAM, City Editor
ROSS G. JOHNSON, Advertising Director
JAIL FUGLE, Circulation Manager
ROBERT K. BERTSCH, Promotion
W. R. JOHNSON JR., Auditor
ARNE STROMMER, Production

Washington Notebook

Greener Fields (Where?) Beckoning Bob Kennedy

By WASHINGTON STAFF
Of the NEA

WASHINGTON — Brother Robert F. Kennedy says: "I'm certainly not going to stay on as attorney general for eight years." The hot dope is that he would like to seek election to public office. But he gives no indication of what office. As for running for president, he says, "It's not an ambition of mine."

According to Robert E. Thompson and Hortense Myers, authors of a new Macmillan book, "Robert F. Kennedy: The Brother Within," the attorney general's wife Ethel says, "The Massachusetts governorship needs him. It's a mess." Another suggestion is that Bobby change his voting residence, perhaps to his wife's home state, Connecticut, and run for office there.

Comments Arizona Republican Sen. Barry Goldwater on the above: "As of now, I don't think he can be elected president. But I said that of Jack, too."

Pennsylvania's Rep. William Scranton, seeking his state's governorship, had a little trouble with his trousers on a busy swing through a suburban Philadelphia county.

Checking into a hotel for a late afternoon rest, he sent his



pants and his wife's dinner dress out for a quick pressing. Meanwhile, some thoughtful local politician ordered the Scranton's telephone cut off so they would not be disturbed.

The Republican nominee began to worry, however, when a long time later his and his wife's clothes were not returned.

Unable to raise anybody on the dead telephone, he sneaked down the hotel corridor in his shorts, tapped on a politician's door, and asked for aid. Back in his own room, Scranton again waited. The pants and dress did not come.

Finally his wife wrapped a sheet around her, pinned it together with a huge Scranton button, and stroled down the hall for another try. This time the mission paid off, and the Scrantons were able to emerge from their room properly togged out for the evening's campaigning.

Newspaper cartoonists compiled a new 48-page pictorial history on the career of Richard M. Nixon to date. The title? "How to Try in Politics Without Really Succeeding."

Richard L. Roudsbush of Indiana got this brief letter from a constituent:

"I don't want any liberals to

liberate me from what our forefathers fought and died for; I want the conservatives to conserve it for me."

Comedian Shelley Berman announced to a somewhat startled audience in the capital last week that he's "not going to make any jokes about Washington." Reason: "I see nothing funny about Washington."

Post Office Department has designed a special "non-commemorative" 4-cent Christmas stamp. Mandatory requirement by the department to artists who designed it was that it should not contain anything whatsoever about religion or of religious significance. Says Republican Sen. Karl Mundt of South Dakota:

"That's about the same as taking the red and blue out of the American flag and calling it the national emblem."

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, new chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked how the sale of his book "The Uncertain Trumpet," which he wrote several years ago, was going.

Said the General: "The sales have been very good since the price dropped to 99 cents."

A Hollywood movie studio making a Navy picture picked actor Larry Keating to play the part of chief of naval operations. Keating had a moustache and he didn't want to shave it off unless he had to. A worried movie official, not wishing to offend the Navy, thought it wise to write to the Pentagon's Information Office asking if it would be all right for Keating to keep his moustache while playing the CNO role and whether it would be "offensive?" The Navy dashed back: "Have you any razor blades?"

Sen. Stephen Young of Ohio reports that "even though months ago the American people ceased to take it seriously, civil defense spenders continue to think up new ways to spend the taxpayers' money."

"Among their more recent half-baked brain storms has been the acquisition of 70 million survival biscuits. The Kro-



ger Baking Co. alone has received over \$8 million in contracts to bake survival biscuits. So now we have 70 million biscuits for nonexistent fallout shelters which are supposed to be built in prime target areas where they will be absolutely useless in a nuclear holocaust."

In the Editor's Mailbag

Jeannace

EUGENE (To the Editor) — Regarding your editorial, "Why This Wait and Not the Others?"

Jeannace Freeman's background is interesting but serves no purpose in the issue in point — should she be executed for her crime? When a person plans the death of another and then personally carries it out, there should be no question whether he or she deserves the same fate. And to make the crime even worse, when the victim was a child, unable to defend himself, and was eliminated only because it interfered, through no fault of its own, should make the whole thing quite simple.

But then there's always someone who will scream it's not our right to take a life in punishment. Well, we were given intelligence to organize and govern ourselves, and this is all-inclusive, as it has to be. Our society cannot tolerate cold-blooded murder, and the punishment should not be less. Whether or not capital punishment is a deterrent is not at issue. It is a punishment only. If it deters further crimes of this nature this is good, but the effect of deterring is secondary.

Your business is news, reporting and editing it, not making it. Why stir up the coals with this editorial? Every time we have a big fuss. Is it because we have nothing better to do? There are people that'll join every bandwagon that comes by — for something to do. Maybe that's why we have wars — who knows?

WAYNE L. JOHNSON
4501 Franklin Blvd.

Time

EUGENE (To the Editor) — Now that you have helped ram idiot time down our throats, what have you got? Just one hour. Why not two, six, or 12 and have daylight all night? If you can fool yourselves into thinking you have set the sun back by moving the clock ahead, then go Washington and California one better. Eh?

Carmichael

WELL, WELL, FIVE OF A KIND — ALL WORTHLESS —

MADE BY THE REGISTER-GUARD

