

Herald and News

Editorial Page

Can't Win 'Em All

We do not pretend that we are as well informed on matters of international diplomacy as some of the self-styled "experts." For that reason, most of our editorials on that subject are prone to be a little fuzzy.

But, the matter of foreign relations and diplomatic endeavor cannot be counted as anything but of the utmost importance. Both candidates for the presidency have substantiated this concept.

A seasoned international analyst, Leon Dennen, of Newspaper Enterprise Association recently filed what we consider a calculated interpretation of the situation that pretty well conforms with our own ideas on the subject.

Excerpts from Mr. Dennen's reasoned approach include:

One of the fallacies in the election campaign is the widespread illusion that diplomacy is a game in which it is possible for one side — in this case the U.S. — to win virtually all of the time. This, of course, is an absurdity.

Were it possible for the president to come out on top wherever the U.S. is challenged by Russia or Red China there would obviously be no need for Summit conferences or patient diplomatic negotiations.

The fact is that between the Democratic charge that American foreign policy is a failure and the Republican claim that it is a glowing success, there is a realistic appraisal often lost in the din of campaign oratory.

For instance, take the personal views of seasoned United Nations diplomats from West and East. In public debates they are frequently critical of President Eisenhower's conduct of foreign affairs. Yet in private conversation they readily agree that the U.S. has scored some notable diplomatic victories in the last 15 years.

Of course, the U.S. suffered a loss in prestige when President Eisenhower was prevented by leftist riots from visiting Japan in 1960. But what about the warm acclaim the President received when he visited India, Western Europe and Latin America? And what about Vice President Nixon's triumphant tour of Communist Poland in 1959?

Some U.N. observers consider the Marshall Plan sponsored by ex-President Truman in 1947 as the first real check to Communist expansion in Western Europe. Others credit President Eisenhower's leadership and the policies of the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles with the political and moral decline of communism in Europe.

The fact is that there is not a Communist party in Western Europe today strong enough to aspire to power — let alone seize it. This is quite a change from 1945-48.

More important, the nations of Western

Europe, prodded by the U.S. State Department, are making rapid strides toward unity.

Even President de Gaulle, who continues to dream of France's lost grandeur and would like to promote France to the leadership of a European "third force," cannot impede the urge toward European unity of which the Common Market and the Free Trade Association are symbols.

A historical phenomenon is thus occurring in Europe. "Europe," once a dream, is being born — a union of people who had been warring for centuries.

Growing European unity is also in a large measure a tribute to U.S. policy since the end of the last war. In this, the Democratic and Republican Administrations share equal credit.

Few of the U.N. diplomats who commented on American diplomacy think that U.S. policy in Asia, Africa and Latin America is as effective as it could or should be.

However, the majority agree that Soviet policy is even less effective — that Premier Khrushchev suffered a series of setbacks in the U.N. from which the Kremlin will not recover.

The success or failure of a foreign policy can be best gauged in relation to the diplomatic gains of one's adversary.

Let us then for a moment reverse the picture. Imagine that America suddenly found herself in the same difficult spot in relation to Britain or West Germany as the Russians are in relation to their "friend and ally," Red China.

Suppose President Eisenhower had lost the respect of the uncommitted African and Asian nations to the extent that Premier Khrushchev lost it at the U.N.

Were this the American situation in the U.N., the defeatists would have written off the free world as a lost cause long ago.

I am not suggesting, of course, that U.S. diplomacy has been an unqualified success. Far from it.

America still has a long way to go before winning the confidence and support of the people in Asia, Africa, Latin America and behind the Iron Curtain. When one negotiates with a dictatorship and conspiratorial power like the Soviet Union, diplomacy is a painful process.

However, one thing is certain: Communist aggression and subversion—not merely Western good will or economic aid to the underdeveloped countries—are the keys to world peace.

Therefore, the ability of the next president to stand up to Khrushchev or his successor may be crucial to world freedom.



Letters To The Editor

Island Rebuttal

In rebuttal to your October 14 editorial in which you state that you feel Vice President Nixon came out the better in the third television debate between Senator Kennedy and him, because of "wooley thinking" on the part of Senator Kennedy regarding the question of the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, I submit the following views:

Mr. Kennedy has stated his policy quite clearly with regard to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadore Islands by saying that we should defend these islands, if attacked, with all our force. This is stated plainly in the existing treaty and serves notice on the Chinese Communists that we mean to fight for our commitments which are made before the world. There is no such guarantee included in this treaty for the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, two islands comparable in distance from the coast of Red China as Staten Island is from Manhattan. In addition, a majority of this nation's military leaders have variously described these islands as "of little or no military value," "indefensible" and "not worth the bones of a single American soldier."

To sustain ground troops within easy artillery range of the mainland of China is like providing a target and asking to be fired upon. Mr. Nixon, on the other hand, would defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu at the risk of total war, even though this would, in effect, be going one step further than our commitment. His argument for doing so is that to give the Communists an inch is to give them a mile. It is also further practice of the art of "brinkmanship" in a world in which the slightest provocation can precipitate all-out nuclear war.

It appears to me that the islands' only purpose is to provide another base for Chiang Kai-shek to occupy to prove to the world that he cannot face up to the reality that he will never invade the mainland of China.

Mr. Kennedy's stand to defend that which has some value to us and to make clear to the world that we will defend it, does not show weakness, but good sense, and is not, I think, a good example of "wooley thinking."

A better example of "wooley thinking" may be Mr. Nixon's boast of not having intervened in Cuba and then claiming to have had a hand in reducing the number of dictators in South America from 11 to three and calling that "real progress."

John S. Spencer Jr.
Mount Hebron, California

Down With DST!

Once again it is necessary to write you another letter about daylight saving time. It is not daylight saving time. It is nothing in the world but fast time.

No one benefits by it, or saves any time. Why, oh, why can't people let well enough alone. We voted this silly time down in the general election of 1954 and that should be the end of it. But no—a few smart aleck women of Portland had to start yapping about it. Most of these women never save a real cow or chicken

News Report

I have been intending to write you for several weeks expressing my appreciation for your fair and unbiased report of the political news.

In reading your paper I noticed you have been criticized several times for not reporting the news fairly. I was a registered Democrat and I think that you have reported all the news that is worth our reading both fairly and reliably.

I am concerned about the coming election and the people who will lead our nation in the coming years. It is my opinion that we need leaders who will stand for what is right both in principle and in action. According to my historical thinking, such thinking as Senator Kennedy proposed last night brought on the Korean War that cost us 30,000 young men's lives. Matsu and Quemoy must be defended if we expect to prevent another Korean War that was brought on by poor foreign policy during a Democratic administration.

Those of us who believe there is a limit to the amount of government control we need are certainly going to express our votes for Mr. Nixon and Mr. Lodge, who have proved by their capable leadership that they are for private ownership in relation to government control and ownership.

We certainly do not need socialism in our country any more than we already have, and according to recent trends the present administration has stood firmly against more federal control and for private enterprise.

True, both parties promised a lot of things that their parties were demanding, but I believe Mr. Nixon will try to keep a balanced budget and the Democrats seem to try to outstep one another.

Gene Bowlin,
Klamath Falls.

Almanac

By United Press International
Today is Monday, Oct. 24, the 298th day of the year with 68 more in 1960.

The moon is approaching its first quarter.

The morning star is Mars.

The evening stars are Venus, Jupiter and Saturn.

On this day in history:
In 1861, the first telegrams were sent across the United States from California Chief Justice Stephen Field to President Abraham Lincoln in Washington, D.C.

In 1901, Mrs. Anna Edison Taylor became the first person to survive a trip over Niagara Falls in a barrel.

In 1929, prices on the New York Stock and Curb Exchanges collapsed as more than 19 million shares changed hands.

In 1931, the George Washington Bridge, spanning the Hudson River between New York City and New Jersey, was opened to traffic.

In 1960, women's hosiery made of nylon was placed on sale for the first time in Wilmington, Delaware.

Thought for today: American humorist Will Rogers said: "I never met a man I didn't like."



EDSON IN WASHINGTON

Editors Skeptical Of Candidates' Ability

By PETER EDSON
Washington Correspondent
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — Large measures of skepticism are found in comments of U.S. daily newspaper editors on this year's presidential election, all across the country. Criticisms are applied to both Democratic and Republican parties, platforms, candidates almost impartially; even by supporters.

This grass-roots opinion should be a potent political warning for 1964, even though it may be too late to apply in 1960.

"Neither candidate has emerged as a person," comments Editor-Publisher Wayne W. Bleakley Jr. of the Franklin, Pa., News-Herald. "Thinking so far is pretty negative."

In the same vein, Editor Donald L. Breed of the Freeport, Ill., Journal-Standard writes:

"What we would like to see is a positive approach to the presidential candidacy of either Nixon or Kennedy, rather than a negative one."

"That is, we should like to read just why either Kennedy or Nixon offers what we need in the White House, without tearing down his opponent . . . the more the average citizen absorbs the negative approach, the more he is apt to feel like voting against both of them, and therefore feel inclined not to vote at all."

Warren Thornton of the Marysville-Yuba City, Calif., Appeal-Democrat puts it this way: "I believe that Nixon and Kennedy are . . . flagrant opportunists. The political philosophy of each of them is determined by whatever he thinks is popular with the majority of the voters . . . their differences are so minute as to give the voter no real choice."

In a slightly more charitable way, Editor Dan J. Rooker of the Pulaski, Va., Southwest Times puts it like this:

"I personally do not believe either of these candidates is as socialistic as their party platforms would indicate. But I am convinced this is what is needed to buy votes for the presidency."

For downright cynicism over the American political situation today two editors who ask that their confidential views be not attributed to them or their papers take the prize:

"Although this newspaper is supporting Vice President Nixon," writes an eastern editor, "in my

personal opinion it is a lost cause. I am convinced that Senator Kennedy will win in November . . . the Republican party does not have a military hero to lead it into battle this year. It is not as well organized as the Democrats. Therefore, a weak party will be fighting a strong one, plus the labor unions, the solid South and the world's most powerful organization — the Roman Catholic Church."

"As always," comments the second anonymous cynic, from the south, "the fools will outvote the reasonable people. But the Democrats are always better at gulling the fools, so, more or less accidentally, the Kennedy-Johnson team will win."

Editors on both sides of the political fence say they have to stick with their respective parties, even though they don't like them. "We do not agree with everything in the Republican platform, but we have no place else to go," says Publisher Roy C. Swank of the La Grange, Ga., Daily News.

"The Democratic party has made it clear that the south is no longer welcome," confesses Natchez, Miss., Times Editor R. E. Wilcox somewhat sadly. He goes on to say that "Sulking on the outside may express disgust, but we must go along and do what we can to counteract the influence of misguided zealots."

In an editorial headed, "This year's presidential race leaves conservatives out in the cold," J. W. Gore of the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News laments that "The election boils down not to a choice between a liberal and a conservative, but between an ultraliberal and a plain liberal who has just a few overtones of conservatism."

From the other side of Dixie comes the Alice, Texas, Echo with the further comment that:

"We can't stand the idea of more socialism and we believe that the next few years will see a trend away from central government."

And from up in Oregon, Edd E. Rountree of the Ashland Daily Tidings writes:

"We also feel that there is a definite conservative trend getting underway in the nation. Many people here in the northwest would have preferred to be able to vote for Senator Barry Goldwater."

"We believe that by the time of the next presidential race, he will be a very powerful leader within his party."

Other Editor's Opinions

Applying Earns Success

(THE OREGONIAN)

Secretary of State Howell Applying is a shining example of a young, energetic, thoughtful businessman who has made a conspicuous success in high state office. He has mastered the problems of government and withstood the brickbats of political critics without obvious dents in his equanimity and good judgment. At the same time, he has become a better-than-middling protagonist in the vital field of tax-saving behind whom political forces tend to rally.

Perhaps his appreciable success since he followed Mark Hatfield as secretary of state in January, 1959, is attributable to the fact that this office is administrative in character and his business experience was in management. After his discharge from the Navy at the end of World War II, Mr. Applying built his \$700 in muster-out pay into a large and profitable wholesale equipment business. His interest in sound government, coupled with his achievement in business, brought him into Gov. Hatfield's campaigns and ultimately to appointment as secretary of state.

Mr. Applying feels very strongly that public officials have a moral obligation to hold down the costs of government as well as to provide help for those unable to help themselves—as in the state's institutions. He opposes the excesses of the reactionary right as well as those of the radical left. His goal is better state government at the lowest reasonable cost. In the operations of the secretary of state's office, he has already saved a quarter of a million dollars, and is getting along with 28 fewer employees.

While eliminating "frills" and improving efficiency at lower costs—as by installing electronic data processing equipment, and adopting maintenance practices of commercial buildings to state buildings—Secretary Applying has also done these things:

He has organized vocational training schools at the new Correctional Institution to teach the inmates useful trades. He has

pushed reorganization of the institutional farm program for the production of almost one million dollars worth of foodstuffs. He has made appointments on the basis of professional ability rather than politics. He has supported an intensified treatment program in state institutions for more effective rehabilitation, including an out-patient department at Eastern Oregon State Hospital, "trainable" program at Fairview Home, teacher-training at the Blind and Deaf schools, intensified program at MacLaren School, a mental health research program, and plans for full-time chaplains at all institutions.

Howell Applying was once a conservative (Jeffersonian) Democrat. He became a Republican. His opponent in the election, State Sen. Monroe Sweetland, publisher of a weekly newspaper in Milwaukie, was once a Socialist and became a Democrat. But it might be said that neither changed his political views much in the process of changing his registration.

Sen. Sweetland is what has become popularly known as a "knee-jerk liberal." He is slavish toward organized labor, and automatically supports unions in their positions, including all strikes, without concern for management's side. He is on the side of public ownership, usually whether or not private enterprise is able and willing to do the job with the same or greater efficiency. He is for larger federal programs, particularly in aid to local education, and for larger state programs to help communities.

Sen. Sweetland's militant "liberalism" has found him a niche in one wing of the Democratic Party, in this state and nationally, although he has not been notably successful in impressing his views on the Oregon Legislature. Perhaps his left-of-center philosophy adds something to legislative deliberations. But we do not think he is well qualified to sit on the State Board of Control in the administrative position of secretary of state.

The public attitudes and performances of Mr. Applying and Sen. Sweetland provide a sharp contrast for the voters. Our choice is Secretary of State Applying, who has proved his competence, judgment and fair balance in the 22 months of his incumbency.

BARBS

About the only thing Mom can't get on time these days is the kids when lunch is ready.

Wild life is decreasing in some of the states because of lack of food. Or, maybe it's the cover charge.

The prospective bridegroom likes to pick out the solitaire himself, but the bride has a finger in it later on.

The dad of a six-foot Michigan boy stands only 5 feet, one. The lad's a block off the old chip.

Improving property these days consists of cutting down beautiful trees and putting up gas stations.

Why do people have to write "warmest regards" on vacation post cards during the hot weather?

A 90-year-old Kentucky man has used the telephone only once. My gosh, when is he going to hang up?

States' Rights

- ACROSS
- New
 - Western state
 - Harbor
 - Ireland
 - Nevada city
 - Hall
 - Police dogs
 - Place
 - Ballot
 - Hunting dogs
 - Comfort
 - States
 - "Uncle"
 - Cover
 - Agro
 - Sports group
 - Large cat
 - New Jersey city
 - Distant
 - Pullman attendant
 - Let fall
 - Hurried
 - Watch
 - Beverage
 - War god
 - Dried grapes
 - Bizarre
 - Since
 - Contented
 - Decimal unit
 - Christmas carol
 - State's standard
 - Worm
 - Essential being
 - Withered

Answer to Previous Puzzle

- DOWN
- Get up
 - Swiss canton
 - Posters
 - Girl's name
 - Entertainers
 - Cellars
 - Asses
 - Soaks
 - Flax
 - Beverage
 - Mongol
 - Cloys
 - Nobleman
 - Refrigerator
 - Reductions in rank
 - Heavy drinker
 - Awry
 - Simple
 - Horses' gait
 - Western events
 - Adhesive substances
 - French river
 - Suffices (ab.)
 - Grade
 - Erased
 - Inner temple
 - Ceramic piece
 - Raise
 - Rim
 - French island

