

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.

Canada's 93-Cent Dollar Must Be Met

It's being proved that Pacific Northwest lumber manufacturers haven't cried "wolf" when they have complained about their precarious financial situation.

Whereas a few years ago it was the small, inefficient mill that was being squeezed out of the Northwest lumber industry, now bigger mills are being boarded up. And, it's obvious that as long as Canadian lumber cutters hold the multiple advantages of cheaper stumpage, tax concessions, devaluated dollars and less expensive shipping of their output, the trend is not going to be reversed.

This community—"lumber capital of the world"—has patent proof of the disastrous, and growing, effects of unfair Canadian competition. Announcement last week that Georgia-Pacific will close its Springfield sawmill in a few days came abruptly on the heels of the Giustina Bros. sawmill shutdown in Eugene. True, plant obsolescence was partly responsible for the loss of these two long-established payroll sources. But had there been reasonable prospects that such efforts would pay out, certainly both mills would have been retooled and kept operating.

The blunt fact is that the profit picture for Pacific Northwest lumber manufacturers is a fading rainbow. Increasingly, they are finding it impossible to compete with British Columbia mills that undersell them and still rack up profits which Canadian observers have recently termed "almost embarrassingly high."

Recent changes in the control of Canada's national government offer some hope that U.S.-Canadian relations may be improved en toto, but they do not indicate that Canada will turn away from the managed-dollar policy which greatly promotes the sale of that nation's products in the U.S. and abroad. Nor are there any indications that Canada, troubled by more unemployment than even the U.S., will graciously accept imposition of quota controls upon sale of its lumber in this country.

Efforts are being made to expand

overseas markets for U.S. lumber and to improve lumber products manufactured in this country so that they will be purchased in preference to Canadian lumber—and other building materials. In the long run, such efforts may, indeed, insure the future of the U.S. forest products industry. For the immediate moment, however, it should be apparent, especially in Washington, D.C., that this industry needs help in staying alive until it can get a safe grip on its bootstraps.

Right now, Congress must be compelled to see that U.S. lumber manufacturers need not only continuation of the capital gains tax treatment of their timber sales profits if they are to stay in business. Congress must be made to realize that the lumber industry can no longer afford to subsidize the American merchant marine, nor can it finance the internal changes it must make so long as it must compete on full-dollar terms against Canadian lumber prices based on a 93-cent dollar.

Repeat of the Jones Act, which requires U.S. mills to use high-cost American ships while Canadian mills use ships of any flag, would help coastal mills, especially here in the Pacific Northwest. But it would not help the bulk of this region's lumber producers. If the inland mills of this region are to have a chance of continuing as important economic mainstays of the communities in which they are located, they need federal government action to offset the trade dollar advantage which Canada's government has artificially given their competitors to the north.

If the lumber imports control approach is doomed to rejection in the name of overall U.S.-Canadian good relations, Congress must still recognize that American lumber operators are getting the short end in the trade dollar game—and unfairly. Congress must act, not to subsidize U.S. lumber producers with payments from the Treasury, but to give them tax advantages which are comparable to those held by Canadian operators and further calculated to offset the effects of the discounted Canadian dollar.

noise which accompanies the process of remodeling and improving our state government. As the great doors of Senate and House swing to and fro, sounds surge in and out in a manner sometimes disconcerting even to legislators not easily interrupted from their concentration upon affairs of state.

But sound can be stimulating as well as disruptive. Efficiency experts, certainly, would recommend that capitols be better sound-proofed. Practical politicians, on the other hand, might question whether church-like quiet would be conducive to spirited and effectual debate. Just as courts need silence to promote deliberation, perhaps legislatures need some measure of hubbub to keep them mindful that they must hear many voices before they determine what is best for the majority.

Not a Science

Ages and ages ago, back before there was any television or any Fidel Castro, the homemaker bragged about the chocolate cake she whipped up "from scratch." Now she looks at television, worries about Castro, and makes the cake from a box.

This is an important thing to remember as we read that vending machine makers have come up with a "cocktailmatic," a gadget which makes "scientifically" proportioned martinis, Manhattans and such.

The trouble with such weaponry is that the martini and the Manhattan are not the products of science. They are the products of art, pure art. A machine can do the job only when we find a machine that can paint a Mona Lisa or write a Beethoven's Ninth.

The machine, if it catches on at all, will be popular only among the set that keeps martinis in the icebox overnight.



Eric Sevareid

Our Allies Drift in Dark Waters

ROME—In the realm of ordinary life—traveling, doing business, sitting in the sun or inspecting one another's lovely vistas, museums and antiquities—Europe and the Europeans are thawing out. The winter of their physical discontent is ended.

In the realm of high politics, the freeze is still on. The winter of allied discontent, dated for the history books by De Gaulle's renunciation of the whole post-war Grand Design, has become the spring of restless perplexity. With what sometimes appears to be the single exception of De Gaulle himself, even responsible Europeans have no firm idea where their countries, singly or collectively, go from here.

Within the safety zone made possible by the American deterrent and commitment, Europe has surpassed its former prosperity, itself made possible by American capital infusions. Yet today more and more of political Europe looks on the American presence with a more and more jaundiced eye. But emotional reactions of resentment on our part would be childish. Gratitude rarely plays a leading or lasting role between nations; gratitude toward France didn't govern the foreign policy of the American Founders, once the Revolution was won.

The Alliance is now blanketed in dense fogs of dilemma and paradox. For every European—and they were numberless—who once criticized isolationist America for not being committed to them, there is now at least one who criticizes America for being committed too deeply and dominantly to them. For every one who fears American bravado will bring war upon them there is another who fears that if war should come upon them from other causes, America will not have enough bravado to defend them.

On the general wish to remain free, there is, of course, universal agreement within the Alliance. But on no specific issue, whether Berlin, or Cuba or Africa or east-west trade, does pan-alliance agreement exist; and it is out of such issues as these, not out of the general philosophical weather, that war would come, if it comes at all. On top of this, coincidentally, there remains that wonderfully illogical psychological phenomenon involving the inverse ratio of fear to proximity—when war seemed possible over Berlin, the nearby Europeans were calm and the far-off Americans scared; when war seemed possible over Cuba, the far-off Europeans were scared and the nearby Americans calm.

In diplomacy, European governments want to be treated with more equality by America, but the cohesive "Europe" that would make that not only possible but inevitable does not yet exist. In the interim, European governments disagree as to whether they should even try to provide themselves with the military power that must underlie diplomatic equality.

A fundamental, if obvious, flaw in the Alliance is that the majority power is held by one nation, able quickly to make vital policy decisions, while the minority power is diffused among several nations whose individual decisions are, for the most part, extremely limited in effect. Yet the conventional wisdom more and more thinks and speaks of the Alliance in terms of America and "Europe," an essentially false apposition.

It can be argued, indeed, that the very concept of "alliance," as history has shaped the common concept, is essentially false in the era of nuclear power, which has basically altered not

only the nature of war but the nature of sovereignty. Until our time, the final act of sovereignty was the declaration or the acceptance of war with the risk of defeat. Now, for the crowded countries of industrialized Europe, if not necessarily for our own spacious land, it is the acceptance of suicide, of non-existence. No European government can voluntarily make that choice for its people. None is likely to make it, if America should be hit and Europe left alone.

Present speculative talk about who would remain faithful to the Alliance commitment and who betray it, in case of war, seems pointless. Atomic weapons have meaning only in their deterrent capacity, as keepers of the peace, not as winners of a war. More specifically, it is the credibility of the deterrent that matters. We have established our nuclear credentials, in the issues of Berlin and Cuba, sufficiently to make the Russians give over. It is too hard to believe that fractional nuclear power, in any independent

European hands, would be credible to Moscow.

Short of universal disarmament or the over-arching detente with Russia that De Gaulle envisages—either one a long way off—there is no substitute for the American nuclear presence. This seems true, even though the question of "whose finger on the trigger and the safety catch" appears insoluble. Better, perhaps, that the European powers throw away their atomic weapons than that they continue the drive for independent arsenals—and that could happen in a post-Macmillan Britain and a post-De Gaulle France. Washington has no power to bring this about. It is, therefore, stalling and hedging against proliferation of atomic arsenals by its successive—and confusing—schemes for "inter-allied" and "multi-national" nuclear strike forces. Waters as opaque as those in which the Alliance now drifts can be muddied even more, but not much more.

Distributed, 1963, by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.

Peter Edson

Right Wingers Mounting Drive on Disarm Moves

WASHINGTON (NEA)—A drive against disarmament and a nuclear test ban treaty with Soviet Russia has sprung up in various parts of the country as the newest conservative cause. This move is regarded in part as a counteraction to "Ban the Bomb!" crusaders such as the "Women's Strike for Peace"—a group which has been pestering Congress and picketing the White House.

But the principal right wing objective seems to be repeal of the 1961 act of Congress creating the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the State Department.

Now under Director William C. Foster, this agency was given a \$6.5 million first-year appropriation to promote peace. It is asking \$15 million for the coming year. About \$10 million of this would be for research on nuclear explosion detection and verification of arms destruction, if disarmament ever comes.

This request for more money has given opponents of disarmament a new line of attack, as an economy issue. But a group of Republicans headed by Rep. Craig Hosmer, R-Calif., of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee is concentrating on opposition to the proposed test ban treaty as a United States national defense measure. And Rep. James B. Utt, R-Calif., has introduced a resolution to abolish the Disarmament Agency, which right wing groups are increasingly in favor of doing.

Misunderstanding and misrepresentation are major factors in the rising campaign against disarmament efforts.

The most vicious attack has come from a Citizens Congressional Committee of Los Angeles. It is a Gerald L. K. Smith Christian Nationalist Crusade offshoot run by Charles E. Winegarner, who married Mrs. Smith's niece.

Its principal mailing piece, which has been showered down on Congress, is a poster headed "Treason Treaty." It begins: "The President of the United States has approved a proposed treaty which would completely disarm the United States of America. Arms would be transferred to the United Nations and we would come under the authority of a United Nations dictatorship."

The broadside goes on to charge that disarmament would mean that the Declaration of Independence would become obsolete, the American flag would become a second-rate banner, Congress would be reduced to the authority of a state legislature in a world government, and the World Court would supersede the United States Supreme Court.

Other movements are scattered, but noisy and growing. A "Republican Committee of 100, Inc.," of New York, calls on President Kennedy and Congress to "dissolve this unconstitutional Arms Control and Disarmament Agency."

A Memphis "Committee for the Prevention of Disarmament" is circulating a statement from ex-Congressman John Roussette, R-Calif., charging that disarmament is all part of a Communist conspiracy which he traces back to 1955. He declares that the RS-70 slowdown and Skybolt abandonment by the Department of Defense are the latest acts in this conspiracy. "Free Enterprise," a Chicago monthly tabloid for which former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson writes a front-page column, devotes a full page in its latest issue to blasting State Department publications on disarmament.

Other right wing news letters are taking the same line of attack.

Kent and Phoebe Courtney of New Orleans, publishers of "Independent American," have put out two tax-fact leaflets titled, "Exposing the Appeasers' Plans to Destroy the Army, Navy and Air Force of the U.S.A.," and "Save Our Skybolt—Have Plans Been Made to Surrender the U.S. to the Soviet Union?"

Texas seems to me the real hotbed of opposition to disarmament, however. Rep. Walter Rogers, D-Tex., got so much mail against disarmament that he prepared an answering statement which he headed: "This County is Not Going to Be Disarmed."

To quiet alarms and fears, he points out that any United States disarmament must first be approved by congressional majorities or, if submitted in the form of a treaty, by two-thirds of the Senate.

Ralph McGill

Full Disarm Cost Sheet Had Effect

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One of the negotiating successes of the United States delegation to the Geneva conferences was the presentation of a document in reply to Khrushchev's "total and complete" disarmament program before the United Nations in September 1959.



For almost two years the Soviet proposal, though politically and practically impossible, was a barrier to any discussion of rational and possible armament reduction measures, both at Geneva and in the United Nations. There also were rather strong pressures from American individuals and groups which reached the desks of congressmen and the committee in Geneva. Most of the smaller nations, especially the eight represented at the conference, persisted in asking of the American delegation why it was not possible to proceed with implementation of Khrushchev's propaganda call for the world to lay down its arms.

The weight and persistence of this insistent demand came as a surprise, and yet it need not have. There exists in this country, as in the world, an earnest desire for peace or, at least, to escape war. This is equally true in Russia. The Soviets, by making world peace the keystone of their propaganda, have inevitably sold the idea to their own people.

Possible in Theory

Appealing though the proposal of total disarmament is, realism suggests that nations cannot proceed to divest themselves of all arms. Theoretically it could be done, if all nations were to agree on a plan for total and simultaneous abolishment of all weapons, but for any one or two countries to disarm leaves them prey to the armed and the ambitious.

When the urgings continued, particularly at Geneva, representatives of the United States produced, after a year of work, a published plan for total disarmament. It was a three-stage schedule to be put into operation across a period of years. In the final stage, of course, no nation would have an army or navy, but the world would rely on a U.N. international force. It cannot be said that the U.S. delegation presented this in bad faith. It was, however, first of all, a printed outline of how total disarmament could be attained, but, more important, it was also a clear picture of what such a step would entail. It was, therefore, a cost sheet. In effect, what the plan said was, "All right, you propose total disarmament. Here is what would have to be done. Here are all the necessary actions, including in the final stage the surrender of some sovereignty. This is the price. Are you willing to pay it?"

Profound Effect

This printed plan, or cost sheet, was distributed at Geneva. In that historical city of international conferences the effect was profound. Within a few days representatives of the smaller nations, who had been so insistent that the United States accept the Soviet offer of complete disarmament, were saying they did not believe either power could, or would, pay the bill so meticulously spelled out in the printed words. Instead, they began to work at what they thought could be had—an effective nuclear test ban.

In this country, of course, the lunatic fringe, which had not read the whole plan and had seen only newspaper paragraphs lifted out of context and, therefore, did not comprehend the carefully detailed presentation of it, made a compulsive outcry of treason and sell-out-to-the-U.N.

Knee-Jerk Lunacy

It needs to be said that if there is, as reactionary opinion has it, a type of knee-jerk liberalism in this country, knee-jerk lunacy is even more prevalent and clamorous. At any rate, there is no longer any propaganda momentum left in the Khrushchev proposal for immediate and total disarmament. Even Moscow withdrew in the face of the price to be paid.

Meanwhile, with Egypt almost surely testing small nuclear rockets, and with other nations moving toward that end, civilization seems to demand that the major powers earnestly try for an effective test ban. Such an agreement would not, per se, halt proliferation of weapons, but it would be an act of morality which might, in time, prevail. Certainly such a ban is better than the dangerous vacuum that exists.

Viewpoint

SPRINGFIELD (To the Editor)—In his letter to the editor April 16, Mr. Charles Horrell questioned the morals and honesty of a non-smoker who will sit idly by and hope to enjoy some small benefit from a cigarette tax.

Now let's talk about the non-property-owner who pays no taxes but year after year sends his children to fine schools paid for and maintained by other people's tax money. This same group of non-taxpayers enjoys the facilities of the many parks paid for by this same group of property owners. These same non-taxpayers enjoy the privilege of going to the polls each election day and voting in more taxes which they won't have to pay, to buy more of these benefits for them to enjoy.

Where I think this is all wrong, the system says that it is right, and you can't fight the system. Sir, Diogenes would only laugh at you.

That's right, I'm a non-smoker. After forty-three years of smoking I quit, not because of anything smoking had done to my morals or my pocketbook but because it had ruined my health.

JAMES W. RIDDLE 1906 G St.

Distributed, 1963, by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

MEMBER OF THE AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS

WILLIAM WASMANN News Editor DONN L. BONHAM City Editor ROSS G. JOHNSON Advertising Director JAIL FUGLE Circulation Manager ROBERT K. BERTSCH Promotion W. B. JOHNSTON JR. Auditor ANNE STROMMER Production