

NATO, With 15 Nations, Enters Perilous Era on 10th Anniversary

European War Prevented for Past Decade

Editor's note: This is the first of two comprehensive reports on the state of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization on its 10th anniversary. The writer, chief UPI military correspondent in Washington, has interviewed leaders of all 15 NATO countries and has inspected NATO installations from Norway to the Black Sea.

By CHARLES CORDDRY
UPI Correspondent
Washington—UPI—The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is entering a perilous new era as it marks its 10th anniversary.

NATO In Grave Crisis of Doubt Among U.S. Allies in Europe

London—UPI—The North Atlantic Treaty Organization reaches its 10th anniversary amid a grave crisis of doubt among America's European allies.

On March 11 President Eisenhower warned that Western ground forces in Europe could not hope to match Russia's 175 divisions in a ground war slugging match in Europe.

The West's only possible strategy, the President declared, would be to use its mighty nuclear deterrent at once.

This clear statement of fact—that many Americans may have been simply a restatement of the obvious—hit Western Europe like an atomic bombshell. The first questions many Europeans asked were:

What happens to NATO, with its continuing goal of a "shield" force of 30 ground divisions?

Is there any point to NATO any longer?

Ten years ago, when Eisenhower took over as first NATO Supreme Commander, the infant alliance could muster only 12 divisions—six of them American—to match Russia's gigantic forces. Military men then estimated it would take 65 to 90 divisions even to hold the line of the Rhine.

Two years ago, NATO's fourth Supreme Commander, Gen. Lauris M. Norstad, had sliced the minimum necessary holding force to 30 divisions. The development of tactical nuclear weapons accounted for the difference.

The NATO countries today still can scrape together only about 22 of the necessary 30.

But many countries are asking themselves whether even those are necessary—whether, in fact, a shield force is necessary at all.

A major showdown on this could take place at the NATO Council's 10th anniversary session in Washington.

Since the day the NATO alliance was first conceived and born, there have been difficulties and disagreements between the United States and its European allies over their NATO contributions.

Successive NATO commanders have accused European members of dragging their feet to keep costs at rock bottom.

Britain, faced with a desperate economic crisis in 1957, slashed her NATO forces in 1957.

Sweetland balks at questionnaire by Sen. Pearson

Salem—UPI—Placing of a questionnaire on the desk of each state senator by Senate President Walter Pearson (D-Portland) drew criticism Wednesday from Sen. Monroe Sweetland (D-Milwaukee).

The questionnaire asked senators if they favored any new taxes, whether they thought more money should be allocated to education and similar information concerning important issues before the Legislature.

Pearson explained that members did not have to sign the questionnaires and that the information would be used only for guidance.

Said Short-Cut Attempt
Sweetland declared that the action was in effect "an attempt to short-cut the committees now considering much of this legislation."

"I think that this is a wrong approach," Sweetland declared. "I am a member of the Education and the Tax Committees. I know that in both committees we are working on important legislation. To give out information at this time, in my opinion, is wrong."

Sen. Harry Boivin (D-Klamath Falls) calls to the defense of Pearson saying he thought the opinions would be valuable to the Tax Committee.

"I think it is a good plan," he concluded, "and I am only sorry that I didn't think of it first."

NATO was born in this capital on April 4, 1949, when the foreign ministers of 12 free nations placed their signatures on an historic pact pledging mutual defense against Communist aggression.

Now grown to 15 nations, the grand alliance observes its birthday with another foreign ministers' meeting in Washington. Over this meeting, like

Germany and still keeps them to a bare three divisions.

France, fighting a never-ending war in Algeria, has siphoned off the flower of her army to fight the Moslem rebels, cutting her NATO contribution to a mere token force.

West German rearmament has been far slower than originally planned. Even today she still has only seven partially trained divisions compared with the originally hoped for 12.

Norstad and other top NATO commanders no longer aim at a force that could halt and fling back Russia's 175 divisions on the ground.

That earlier concept has been scrapped in favor of the "trip wire" plan for a force just large enough to hold a limited aggression by Russia or her East European satellites until the U.S. nuclear retaliation bombing force could swing into action.

The alliance is plagued with other troubles, too, as it reaches

its 10th anniversary.

France announced recently she intends to keep her Mediterranean fleet under her own command in the event of war and not place it under NATO. France also refuses to have her air defenses integrated with those of other NATO countries and still is deeply reluctant to allow any NATO rocket bases on her territory.

Britain's bitter quarrel with Greece over Cyprus was another danger spot in the alliance. It apparently was removed by the agreement in February granting the island independence. But the so-called "cold war" between Britain and Iceland over fishery rights still drags on.

On the plus side, political and economic cooperation among NATO states, particularly those in Europe, is improving.

And standardization of arms and equipment is making rapid strides, with Germany, France and Italy among the leaders in this development.

He and other Allied leaders can point to three solid accomplishments by NATO during its first 10 years:

1. The alliance has developed a nuclear deterrent to war and a reasonably effective shield of ground, sea, and air forces on its 4,000-mile front from the north cape of Norway to the Caucasus on Turkey's east border. It believes Russia no longer can provoke a "cheap" war.

2. It has defended its territory without war or violence.

3. In combination with the Marshall Plan, it has restored the confidence of Europe's people, promoted prosperity and developed a will among free Europeans to defend themselves.

A look at NATO's problems today and tomorrow would make a Solomon shudder. But so would the storms that the alliance has weathered in its first decade.

Peace Threatened
In one way or another, peace has been threatened or broken outright, or NATO has been staggered, by these historic crises:

The Korean War and its threat of global war; the Qomoy and Kormosa threats which foisted America at odds with some NATO allies; the East German and Hungarian uprising and Poland's unrest; war in Algeria and Indo-China which depleted French strength; the Suez war of 1956 with a near-disastrous split between America and its Anglo-French allies; the Iraqi revolt and the Lebanon-Jordan convulsion last summer. And, fifteen months ago, following Russia's first Sputnik, the alliance was so ill that the heads of its governments met in Paris in an effort to put it together. That meeting produced a design for stocking nuclear warheads in Europe, sending American ballistic missiles to Europe, trying to improve coordination of Europe's air defenses, producing U.S. weapons in Europe and giving the alliance a new significance by concerting its strength against Russian economic warfare.

Progress toward all these goals has been much slower than hoped.

Problems Span Alliance
NATO's problems today are both political and military and span the whole alliance.

France has the cream of its army still tied down in Algeria and recently said its Navy will not be subject to Allied command in the Mediterranean in the event of war.

In Italy, the Communists have the best organized political party with 1,700,000 members and the ability to pull six million votes to the polls. Despite Red disruptions, however, Italy is accepting American ballistic missiles, the first continental country to do so.

The southwest flank of NATO is menaced by new explosive possibilities in the Middle East, where Russia is pressuring Iran and further penetrating Iraq.

Norway and Denmark, which together comprise almost one-third of the NATO front, refuse to permit foreign

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)



Political Turmoil Evidenced in Years Before Statehood



In the few years prior to the time Oregon became a state, there is evidence that it was a period of political turmoil, and the lack of a fast communications system with the east must have further complicated the business of getting Oregon into the Union.

One of the oddities to come out of this period of confusion is a collection of several Oregon state seals dated 1857 . . . two years ahead of themselves, for Oregon, of course, didn't become a state until Feb. 14, 1859.

The seal reproduced above is one of those that were submitted almost immediately after specifications for such were prescribed at a constitutional convention held in 1857. The reproduction was taken from a copper engraving, or cut, owned by Commercial Printing Company, Medford.

Article in Publication
According to an article in the Oregon Native Son, dated May, 1899, the specifications for the seal were originally set down as: "an escutcheon supported by 33 stars and divided by an 'ordinary' with the inscription, The Union. In chief, mountains, an elk with branching antlers, a wagon, the Pacific ocean on which a British man-of-war is departing and an American steamer is arriving. The second, quartering with a sheaf, a plow and a pick-axe. Crest, the American eagle. Legend, State of Oregon."

The seals made in 1857 deviated somewhat from these specifications. The one above has 35 stars instead of 33, it is enclosed in a shield and has an extra sheaf and rake thrown in. The first one, made a short time before, was similar except that it had 36 stars. Others that followed had these, as well as other faults, including the date 1857.

At least five facsimiles were made during a two year period and only after Ore-

gon became a state did some-one notice that the date was wrong. The date was changed on two subsequent facsimiles, but the design fault of other preceding seals were still present.

Early Seals
None of the early seals were officially adopted, however, and the territorial seal remained in use until June 2, 1859, at which time a seal was procured that has since been used as the seal of the state.

The article in the Oregon Native Son states: "By 1857, the husbandman among the pioneers had been crowded out in the management of affairs of state by an influx of politicians, and mistakes in seal-making were much greater than during territorial infancy. The prophetic vision of the real builders of Oregon was largely disregarded. The enabling act of 1856, the convention of 1857 and the election and inauguration of state officials in 1858 sadly mixed affairs . . ."

The illustrations at the sides of the seal above, showing running buffalo and a hunter and a bear, are presumed to have been put there for a special purpose by the artist, for they have no bearing on the original specifications.

Made By Hand
The facsimiles were made by hand in those days because the process of photoengraving had not come into general use. The way the design is formed is indication that the seals were made by the wood cut process, which is slow and difficult. However, another method in use then was that of etching metal in acid after a design had been made on it by hand with an acid-resisting substance.

However, they were made, the seals represent many hours of work, useless to anyone at the time, but valuable now as historic symbols of the struggle of Oregon's early years.

people in its 15 countries have been able to enjoy.

Its statesmen will fill the air with tributes to NATO's formidable virtues and strength during the anniversary celebration. But their attention will be riveted on West Berlin, the island in the Communist sea of East Germany from which Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev wants to expel Allied garrisons.

To be forced from West Berlin on Soviet terms would be catastrophic in the American view. The shock waves would envelope Western Europe. West Berliners would have been abandoned. Khrushchev's military and political influence would spread, tempting him to new "adventures."

NATO's painfully built confidence in its ability to resist would be undermined. Some smaller members might take a new look at neutralism.

The alliance, in brief, would be in peril of dissolution.

Now, President Eisenhower has agreed to go to the summit if there is promise of a German settlement there. The summit meeting has long been a desire of many European allies and differences over the need for one caused fissures in NATO last summer during the Middle East crisis.

Eisenhower, who was the first military commander of NATO forces, looks at the alliance through a long perspective, cautioning against hysteria over every Russian-made crisis.

He and other Allied leaders can point to three solid accomplishments by NATO during its first 10 years:

1. The alliance has developed a nuclear deterrent to war and a reasonably effective shield of ground, sea, and air forces on its 4,000-mile front from the north cape of Norway to the Caucasus on Turkey's east border. It believes Russia no longer can provoke a "cheap" war.

2. It has defended its territory without war or violence.

3. In combination with the Marshall Plan, it has restored the confidence of Europe's people, promoted prosperity and developed a will among free Europeans to defend themselves.

A look at NATO's problems today and tomorrow would make a Solomon shudder. But so would the storms that the alliance has weathered in its first decade.

Peace Threatened
In one way or another, peace has been threatened or broken outright, or NATO has been staggered, by these historic crises:

The Korean War and its threat of global war; the Qomoy and Kormosa threats which foisted America at odds with some NATO allies; the East German and Hungarian uprising and Poland's unrest; war in Algeria and Indo-China which depleted French strength; the Suez war of 1956 with a near-disastrous split between America and its Anglo-French allies; the Iraqi revolt and the Lebanon-Jordan convulsion last summer. And, fifteen months ago, following Russia's first Sputnik, the alliance was so ill that the heads of its governments met in Paris in an effort to put it together. That meeting produced a design for stocking nuclear warheads in Europe, sending American ballistic missiles to Europe, trying to improve coordination of Europe's air defenses, producing U.S. weapons in Europe and giving the alliance a new significance by concerting its strength against Russian economic warfare.

Progress toward all these goals has been much slower than hoped.

Problems Span Alliance
NATO's problems today are both political and military and span the whole alliance.

France has the cream of its army still tied down in Algeria and recently said its Navy will not be subject to Allied command in the Mediterranean in the event of war.

In Italy, the Communists have the best organized political party with 1,700,000 members and the ability to pull six million votes to the polls. Despite Red disruptions, however, Italy is accepting American ballistic missiles, the first continental country to do so.

The southwest flank of NATO is menaced by new explosive possibilities in the Middle East, where Russia is pressuring Iran and further penetrating Iraq.

Norway and Denmark, which together comprise almost one-third of the NATO front, refuse to permit foreign

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.

In 1954, the strategy was shifted to complete emphasis on nuclear weapons and the scale of conventional forces was drastically reduced.

A forward shield has been erected in the past five years and equipped with its own tactical nuclear weapons while the "sword" of air-atomic retaliatory power has comprised the main deterrent to all-out war.

Pursuing the same basic strategy, NATO military commanders are now seeking to rush into the missile age so that the war deterrent will prevail.

(Next: NATO'S Strength—and Russia's.)

troops to be based on their soil and want no part of atomic weapons.

Principle Shields
From 1949 to 1954, NATO's aim was simply to survive and build sufficient conventional

forces to keep the Russians out of Western Europe. The U. S. Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean were the principal shields under which NATO could build.