

Capital Journal

An Independent Newspaper—Established 1888
BERNARD MAINWARING (1897-1957)
Editor and Publisher, 1953-1957
E. A. BROWN, Publisher
GLENN CUSHMAN, Managing Editor
GEORGE PUTNAM, Editor Emeritus

Published every afternoon except Sunday at 280 North Church St., Phone EM-46811
Full Leased Wire Service of The Associated Press and The United Press. The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches credited to it or otherwise credited in this paper and also news published therein.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

By Carrier: Monthly, \$1.25; Six Months, \$7.50; One Year, \$15.00. By mail: Oregon: Monthly, \$1.00; Six Months, \$6.00; One Year, \$12.00. Outside Oregon: Monthly, \$1.25; Six Months, \$7.50; One Year, \$15.00.

Foot in the Mouth

Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, the lone member of the Eisenhower team who seems to suffer from chronic foot-in-mouth disease, has done it again.

This time he has drawn the ire of the politically powerful National Guard association for his statement that some young men joined the National Guard to dodge the Draft. Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, president of the guard association, called Wilson's statement "a damn lie."

There were other statements banded back and forth, but for these two, both men are partly right and partly wrong. In spite of Walsh's further statement that "Not one of those young men who joined the guard was a draft dodger," Wilson's statement is true to a degree. Hundreds of young men, seeing a chance to escape the draft and possibly stay with their loved ones, did join the guard. They also knew full well that they might be called to active duty anyway, but there was a fair chance of staying home.

This wasn't the fault of the young men. They didn't make the rules of the game. As a matter of fact, the Defense department, along with the National Guard made the rules at a time when national guard and army reserve forces needed to be built up. The fact that a youth between the ages of 17 and 18½ could join the guard, get away from the clutches of a draft board and possibly stay at home was a terrific selling point for enlistments that hadn't been coming in. And it served its purpose. The guard built up a large reservoir of manpower, ready for immediate call, at a nominal cost to Uncle Sam.

If some draft dodging developed it was a byproduct of something set up in Washington. We don't condemn Wilson for his statement on draft dodging. He just picked a poor choice of words, and most people will probably take a holier-than-thou attitude on the matter as General Walsh has done. He did criticize training of guardsmen however and intimated that a civilian army made up of nearly 80 per cent personnel with no prior military experience couldn't be depended upon. There he was way off base.

The national guard in the past four years has become a pretty fair training ground for future soldiers. Training programs which used to be laughed at are getting so stringent a lot of the old regulars have dropped out. We know this is true in Oregon and probably in all the states. We don't say the Oregon-Washington 41st division is combat-ready right now, but it wouldn't take much of a shake-down program on full-time active duty to make it so.

No one will question the brave part guardsmen have played in fighting two world wars and the Korean war. Guardsmen generally receive good training at only a fraction of cost to the taxpayers a regular army of comparable size would cost and they'll continue to be a necessary part of our national defense. High level misuses on both sides of the fence and the political slam bang that goes with it place both sides in a bad light.

Arab King's Guest

Mayor Richard F. Wagner Jr., mayor of New York City staged a rude, churlish and boorish performance when as the highest official of the nation's greatest city he refused to greet and publicly denounced King Saud of Arabia, on his arrival as an ally and invited guest to visit President Eisenhower at Washington to discuss the crisis in the Asian Middle East.

Wagner reflected the racial and religious prejudices capitalized on by the Tammany ward healers and bosses for political power, and even if the mayor's remarks were based on facts, the Arabian King's power is so great that without his friendly support, defeat awaits the Western World if it loses it. Along with it would go the greatest oil reserves in the world, which would flow to the Soviet Union instead of westward, and might mean the collapse of democracy. He is the key to peace in the middle east.

King Saud is an absolute monarch, certainly the most powerful non-surviving. But he is no more absolute than the Kremlin hierarchy, and more humane. As the Oregonian says:

"Ethically there is a difference, too, between the type of absolutism practiced by King Saud and that of the Kremlin. He is a product of centuries of isolated, religious fanaticism which has known no other way of life. There is hope for a future Arabia closer to our ideals. Communism, on the other hand, is a cold, cynical product of intellectuals which is every bit as fanatical and much more dangerous."

President Eisenhower's gracious welcome to the Arabian monarch atones for the shabby brush-off given by Mayor Wagner. He greeted the king at the Washington airport personally, along with Secretary of State Dulles, Adm. Arthur A. Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, other high officials and ranking members of the diplomatic corps, plus an honor guard of troops from all the armed services. Fourteen bands lined the route, and a 21 gun salute.

The President and the king headed the motorcade to the Blair House, Presidential guest house, across the street from the White House, where he resides while in Washington.

The desert king, in his gold-threaded robe, with his jeweled gifts, is the most colorful figure to visit Washington in recent years.—G. P.

Nehru and Kashmir

V. K. Krishna Menon, spokesman for Prime Minister Jawaharal Nehru of India, in a long speech before the United Nations, declared that the long disputed Kashmir issue, that India considered the case closed, and that Kashmir is now part of India and will remain so, because India's constitution has been amended to include Kashmir, although the people of Kashmir, who are Moslem, have not been considered, and the mountain kingdom is claimed by adjoining Pakistan.

It was Mr. Nehru who originally proposed that the political disposition of Kashmir ought to be determined by a free vote of the Kashmiris themselves, which was reasonable. The United Nations agreed to it on August 26, 1953, and authorized a plebiscite and an administrator was named. The U. N. reiterated this position subsequently and has not repudiated it, but India has, and stands pat on the grab—albeit contrary to the principles of rule by consent of the governed that freed India itself.

The fate of Kashmir should lie not with New Delhi nor with Kerachi but decided by Kashmir people who should be given their rights to express their will.

Pakistan has suggested that an international police force, under the United Nations supervise such a plebiscite, and solve the problem of foreign troops in Kashmir, enabling both Indian and Pakistan forces to be withdrawn, making a free vote possible.

The sincerity and integrity of Mr. Nehru are questioned in the light of his efforts to grab a nation without consent of the governed. It is strange that a disciple of Gandhi should thus repudiate his master's avowed principles.

As far as Mr. Menon is concerned, he is running true to form, for he has always favored the Soviet Union, whenever possible in speech and action.

Kashmir is a small mountain state north of the Punjab, contains 82 sq. mi., between Afghanistan, Sinking Province, China and Tibet, population 4 million, 77 per cent Moslem. It has long been famous for its shawls and textiles.—G. P.

NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG

Fulbright Repaid England in His Searing Attack on Dulles

By RAY TUCKER

WASHINGTON — When Cecil Rhodes left a vast fortune to finance the education of American youngsters in British universities, he never dreamed that it would pay off in a savage and personal attack on an American Secretary of State named John Foster Dulles. Such a return exceeded even the imperialistic statesman and mining engineer's fondest expectations.

But Senator J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, in his abortive demand for a Congressional investigation of the Administration's Middle East policies and hostility toward Downing Street under Anthony Eden's guidance, appears to have repaid the investment on his four years at Oxford University, England.

In the opinion of this Rhodes scholar and educator, the Eisenhower-Dulles major failing was a refusal to sanction and support the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt, which precipitated today's grave crisis in the Middle East, a nadir seemingly threatened by war between Russia and the European nations.

Denunciation of Dulles. Five times in his denunciation, which reddened with anger the faces of Dulles, Admiral Arthur W. Radford and John B. Hollister, JCA Director, Fulbright cited the deterioration of relations with our European Allies as the Administration's greatest offense.

By implication, he defended the Anglo-French-Israeli conspiracy to use force, as well as the refusal to answer Ike's requests for information, and their defiance of his warning that the controversy was a matter for solution within the United Nations.

Rhodes Scholar's Question. "I have seen no responsible explanation," said Fulbright, "of why Great Britain and France, the two greatest beneficiaries of our foreign aid program, should want to deceive us. Surely, the members of this committee should know what motivated this unprecedented action by responsible and

friendly nations before we are asked to express confidence in the conduct of foreign affairs."

Dulles had to bite his tongue to keep from answering this amazing question. Seeking to repair the diplomatic damage done by the Anglo-French-Israeli assault to Ike, he did not want to reply that the three nations deceived Washington, deliberately and premeditatedly, because they anticipated Administration opposition.

Despite their criticism of Dulles and doubt concerning the economic features of the Eisenhower Middle East Doctrine, even Senator Green of Rhode Island, Foreign Relations Committee Chairman, and Senator Russell of Georgia, Armed Services Committee Chairman, refused to support Fulbright's demand for a full-scale inquiry, or for issuance of a White Paper on the Administration's Middle East program in the past.

British Imperialist. Cecil Rhodes, who helped to bring on the Boer War to protect his diamond mines and other vast investments in South Africa, was a more swashbuckling imperialist than Rudyard Kipling or Winston Churchill, and was severely criticized in England for his expansionist ideas. Here are a few of them, as described by the Encyclopaedia Britannica:

"He saw one of the healthiest countries of the world barely occupied (South Africa). He knew the agricultural possibilities of Natal and its mineral wealth. The effect of the combined influence on his mind was profound. . . . He had found an object to which he proposed to devote his life. It was nothing less than the government of the world by the British race."

Ironic though it may seem now, he sought to achieve expansion of the British empire in his will. He left most of his fortune to found a scholarship at Oxford for students from every important British colony, and "from every state and territory in the United States of America." Obviously, the good will he created now stands battered Britain in good stead.

Liberal New York Still Far Behind With Desegregation

By DAVID LAWRENCE

WASHINGTON — News that seems on its face to be confined to a locality and hence gets little attention nationally can upon occasion be upon a far-reaching importance in the life of a nation. A good example is the failure as yet of New York City's Board of Education to obey the Supreme Court's order in the U. S. v. Brown case. What a good example is the failure as yet of New York City's Board of Education to obey the Supreme Court's order in the U. S. v. Brown case.

It will be surprising to many people to learn that "integration" in the school system has not been solved in the metropolis of America where so-called "liberalism" is very vocal. There loud voices of accusation recently have been heard denouncing the South as "backward" or as "undermining respect for the Constitution" or as contemptuous of the Constitution.

One can hardly believe that it is in the northern city of "Civil Rights" where public attention is being vividly drawn to the tendency of human beings to segregate according to color. With a commendable sense of realism in assessing the weaknesses of human nature, the "New York Times," in an editorial entitled "The Bean in Your Own Eye," a few days ago spoke out as follows:

"Ever since the Supreme Court in 1954 concluded that in the field of education the doctrine of 'Separate but Equal' had no place, and that racial segregation deprived children of a minority group of equal educational opportunities, New York City has been re-examining its conscience. A commission on integration, with various sub-commissions, has been at work for the Board of Education."

The board did not, for the most part, have to deal with the problem found in parts of the South, where there is settled public opinion against integration. It had to cope with the more subtle forms of segregation that create, as if by accident, a school almost wholly white, Puerto Rican or Negro in its student body. The good intention to integrate is not enough. Real physical difficulties exist, as in the case of a school drawing its student body from a residential area almost wholly of one race. Inertia, some prejudice that must be admitted, and other obstacles too numerous to recount stand in the way of instant solution, even granted the best of goodwill.

"Now the Board of Education stands at the critical point where mere paying of lip service to fine moral principles will not suffice to move us forward, and where the sacrifices by which high principles are translated into action must be assumed."

News to Some People. This will come as news to many people outside New York, especially in the South. For evidently there are no "Citizens Councils" in New York which have brought about this situation. It will be a comfort to the Southerners to learn, however, that the problem cannot soon be solved "even granted the best of goodwill" because "obstacles too numerous to recount stand in the way of instant solution." Maybe one of the Great Courts of Appeals and one of the District Courts, which in

recent rulings didn't allow time for "gradual" change will be conscience-stricken to discover that court decisions based on "psychology" do not wipe out either prejudices or the characteristics commonly called "human nature." For even in New York City apparently it takes time to find ways to accomplish "integration."

Struggling Slowly. But perhaps the real significance of the New York City episode is that the persons who are making the Supreme Court decision literally do not really understand how much distance they have to go. For if the logic of the high court's decision is really followed, it will become necessary for every school to admit at least a sprinkling of persons of another color in order to remove the "inferiority" complex which the pupils of one race are supposed to develop when there is any race discrimination in the schools. Theoretically, even the private schools will some day have to make their contribution to the "psychological" millennium described by the Supreme Court of the United States when in 1954 it suddenly decided that "psychological" considerations were more controlling than a legal precedent which had stood more than 100 years as "the law of the land."

The sympathy of the South doubtless will go out to the people of New York who are struggling so slowly "to obey the Constitution."

Citizen of Civil Rights. One can hardly believe that it is in the northern city of "Civil Rights" where public attention is being vividly drawn to the tendency of human beings to segregate according to color. With a commendable sense of realism in assessing the weaknesses of human nature, the "New York Times," in an editorial entitled "The Bean in Your Own Eye," a few days ago spoke out as follows:

"Ever since the Supreme Court in 1954 concluded that in the field of education the doctrine of 'Separate but Equal' had no place, and that racial segregation deprived children of a minority group of equal educational opportunities, New York City has been re-examining its conscience. A commission on integration, with various sub-commissions, has been at work for the Board of Education."

A Knock Is a Boost



OPEN FORUM

Deafness Doesn't Hamper Drivers

To the Editor: Recently there appeared an editorial in the Capital Journal (Wed., Jan. 16) entitled "For Safety on the Highways" and I wish to take exception to the part which has to do with automobile drivers with physical deficiencies.

I refer particularly to the deaf drivers who long record of safe and careful driving is one of which we are justly proud. There are thousands of deaf drivers, like myself, in this country today (roughly 200 in Oregon) who have passed their driving tests and have proven over the years their competency in handling motor vehicles.

Although the editorial did not express in explicit language, it creates an impression that it favors going away with granting drivers licenses to certain types of the physically handicapped. The Oregon Association of the Deaf has repeatedly had to watch for discriminatory legislation prompted by well-intentioned but misinformed individuals who would deny the licensed deaf driver the right to drive.

Also I challenge the statement, insofar as the deaf driver is concerned, that "Records show that these drivers are not involved in many accidents, but indirectly they cause many." Due to the nature of his affliction the deaf driver is, of necessity, more alert, uses his eyes more, thus is able to concentrate on the road, the car in front, the car behind. It is not the ears per se, but rather what is between them that counts. The argument that loss of hearing contributes to accidents, indirectly or otherwise, is fallacious in the extreme.

The idea, as suggested by the editorial, of requiring all drivers to submit to a test every two years for renewal of license would be welcome by the deaf driver who would be happy to demonstrate his driving skills to competent examiners. Generally, examiners are familiar with ability of deaf drivers.

It does seem odd, indeed, that with honking horns, clanging bells, tooting whistles, sirens and other sound warning devices, drivers will run smack into each other; onto the path and sides of trains; and that deaf drivers, with their ability to hear does not play such an important part so far as safety on the highways is concerned.

JOHN G. O'BRIEN
Legislative Comm. Chmn.,
Ore. Assn. of the Deaf,
220 N. 18th St., Salem.

Lets Slap Taxes On Our Farmers

Editor, The Capital Journal
Salem, Oregon
Attention: The Oregon State Senate and House.
Dear Sir:

Your paper of Jan. 28th carried a letter from Lew Wallace regarding a homestead exemption law. Of course, we realize that the people who can afford a twenty thousand dollar house would not have to pay more taxes on it than he who lives in a ten thousand dollar house.

The same issue of your paper carries an item regarding tax exemption for sororities and fraternities. Obviously those who can afford a fraternity are more able to pay taxes than those who are working their way through our universities and colleges.

The people who are working out a sales tax are trying to put this burden on the group that makes barely enough to get by for they must spend every cent they make and with a sales tax would pay on every cent they spend.

Since the farmer produces all that we eat and about 80% of what we wear and since he is poorly organized I feel that we should put all of the tax burden on him. It will be a long time before he

Ike Places Himself Solidly Behind Actions of Secretary

By JAMES MARLOW
Associated Press Analyst

WASHINGTON — Any future criticism of Secretary of State Dulles for his handling of foreign affairs must include President Eisenhower. Eisenhower has taken equal responsibility for whatever Dulles has done.

That's covering a lot of ground. Nevertheless, in the midst of the worst attack on Dulles in his four years in office, Eisenhower has not only put his arm around him but has opened his personal umbrella over him.

Eisenhower was practically forced into it. In the past few weeks, some Senate Democrats have opened up on Dulles almost violently, even to the point of suggesting he quit.

Ike Praised Dulles. Eisenhower apparently was bothered by things being said about Dulles — and through Dulles, about the administration's handling of foreign affairs — for he went out of his way at a luncheon with senators Tuesday to praise his secretary.

He was given his chance to elaborate at his news conference yesterday when a reporter reminded the President he had once called Dulles the best secretary in our time and asked him if he still felt the same way.

Eisenhower said he stood on that, but he then went further, saying Dulles has a "wisdom and experience and knowledge (in foreign affairs) that I think is possessed by no man — no other man in the world."

And he took one more step by praising the world indirectly for any criticism of Dulles should include Eisenhower, for he said:

Criticism Includes Ike. "Secretary Dulles, to the best of my knowledge and belief — and I keep, I assure you, very close touch — has never taken any action which I have not in advance approved."

The word "action" in this sense would, it seems, have to include what has often appeared like a lack of action and a change in tactics.

For example, Dulles had years to prepare a plan, along with this country's British and French allies, to prevent the Communists from taking over Indochina.

But when the collapse of Indochina was imminent, Dulles had no plan and at that last moment went racing off to Europe to see if he could get joint action from the allies.

Says Dulles Dawdled. When Dulles dawdled on giving Egypt arms until President Nasser bought them from Russia, that, too, was an action. It was also an action when Dulles not only refused Nasser money for the Aswan Dam but also unnecessarily belittled the ability of Egypt to pay its bills. Nasser within a week after that seized the Suez Canal and the Middle East was in turmoil.

It was also an action when, trying to find a way out of the canal seizure, Dulles talked in terms of a strong plan — called the users association — before setting out for Britain. Once there, he toned down his plan until it was meaningless. And his performance there infuriated Britain and France.

The Democrats who have retrained from criticism of Eisenhower may now feel free, as they pursue their criticism of Dulles, to start attacking the President.

POOR MAN'S PHILOSOPHER

Janitor Awed by Ability of Young Ladies to Not Agree

By SAUL PETT
For Hal Boyle

NEW YORK — As the janitor in a small but exclusive sorority house, I am continually awed by the ability of young ladies to disagree.

If it were not that it came as a reflex action, one might say that the two young tax exemptions in our place have raised the business of consistent disagreement to a fine art.

Why they differ so frequently is a puzzle. Neither is favored or compared or made to feel competition by their charming, understanding, intelligent parents. Still, it has been going on a long time, even back when Kathy was 3 and Amy 6.

"On My Side" I remember a week day at a deserted stretch of ocean beach. Nothing but clean, white sand in either direction for miles, no people except the four of us. And yet, after a tranquil three minutes, suddenly the piercing cry: "Hey, she's on my sand!"

This dispute over territorial rights and spheres of influence flourished, of course, while they shared a bedroom but continued even when they got separate rooms. It also prevailed on the road, especially after we had been driving for a long time, like 12 minutes.

"She's on My Side" Suddenly, from the back of the car, came the musical scream: "She's on my side!" Examination revealed that Kathy's toe was dangling a full quarter-inch over the invisible frontier. Or perhaps Amy was merely breathing over the border. In such tense moments, a hand merely brushing a sister's ankle could be the opening round of all-out war.

Kathy is now 11 and Amy 14, and while the form of their disagreement has changed, the degree hasn't. Thus, it was inevitable that if Kathy chose to worship Elvis Presley, Amy fell at the feet of Perry Como. E. H. maintains her own shrine to her singer and neither is allowed to cross the corridor on pain of death.

It was also inevitable that when Amy found Stevenson banners in hang on her door during the last campaign, Kathy came up with Eisenhower signs on her door.

It really is a remarkable performance. About the only thing the ladies agree on is that their parents don't understand them. Which, of course, is entirely true.

Inaugural Prayer. N. Y. Times. It was no political address that President Eisenhower made to us people and to the world after he took the oath of office yesterday. It was an inaugural prayer. He said these were the "deepest prayers" of our people. They are worth remembering.

May we pursue the right—without self-righteousness. May we know unity—without conformity. May we grow in strength—without pride of self.

May we, in our dealings with all peoples of the earth, ever speak truth and serve justice. In humility and reverence we can say God grant that his prayer be answered. These are the things of which we have need. These are the goals to which we aspire. This is the base upon which a firm peace can and must be built.

We must pursue the right, in Lincoln's phrase, "as God gives us to see the right," else we are traitors to ourselves. But this pursuit, also, as the President said, must be in full humility, "without self-righteousness." We must know unity, not compelled and not blind, and not meaningless conformity. We must have strength, but we must be devoid of the false pride that might come from it. And we must serve that justice that is based upon truth in our dealings with all.

Peace, said the President, is our goal. But peace, he pointed out, must live in the climate of freedom. We must serve that peace through that freedom, and it will not be easy. In his inaugural address we are only by indirection within the world of policy and politics. We have been taken, rather, into the field of philosophy and morals. Here are no questions in expediency. Here are the basic issues of the things by which we live.

The President has spoken for his country and has spoken prayerfully. We join in his prayer, in his aspiration, and in his dedication to pursue that which is right, without self-righteousness.

save! rebuilt Kirby vacuum cleaners \$39.95

Kirby model C3 cleaners, thoroughly reconditioned and guaranteed for one year! Equipped with the famous Sani-Motor dust bag and other famous Kirby features. Many other makes available at reduced prices. Mail and phone orders. Plus shipping costs to areas outside our regular truck delivery routes. VACUUM CLEANERS SECOND FLOOR



ELECTRICITY IS FASTER!

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY

MURDER COMING

COOKS BAY TIMES
Unless the weather turns warmer soon, we'll just about guarantee that there'll be a murder right downtown in broad daylight. The victim will be one of two types—the cheery one who asks us if it's cold enough for us, or the even more cheery bird who spent a misshapen childhood in the Middle West and wags his arms against his sides happily and tells us this isn't cold at all compared with what he's seen. Just once more and blood will spill.

can get anybody to try to get him exempted from paying his fair share. All good things come from the soil so let it produce the taxes too.

Years for bigger city incomes and more tax exemptions.
SAM JONES,
Rt. 1, Box 28,
Gervais, Ore.