

Herald and News

# Editorial Page

## The Race For Power

America's economic superiority over other nations can be ascribed to many things, not least its abundant energy sources and its ability to convert these remarkably into work accomplished.

This is why we have to be concerned when the Soviet Union puts itself into a headlong "power race" against us. If we were to be outpaced, for example, in the production and use of electric energy, our economic laurels might be seriously threatened. And they represent the strength which is our security.

Interior Secretary Udall, reporting on a late-summer tour of Soviet power developments, says the United States delegation he headed was much impressed by what it heard and saw in this field.

He thinks the Soviet Union may well realize its 1965 goal—an electric generating capacity slightly more than half what the United States has today.

Yet he suggests that the Russians may find it much harder to reach their 1970 and 1980 objectives, since these demand very steep increases in the pace of power development.

If his skepticism proves justified, it could turn out to be an important stroke of luck for this country. Growth of our electric energy capacity has slowed somewhat in recent years. We, of course, rely heavily on coal, oil and gas as direct energy sources. But we could hardly be happy if the Russians were to tap soon their immensely superior hydroelectric power potential.

Many economists say that the mechanical or electrical "horses" an individual worker can bring to bear on an industrial task are crucial in determining economic superiority.

For instance, in 1961 the United States consumed more than three times as many kilowatt hours of electric energy per person as did the Soviet Union. This obviously is no small factor in explaining our heavy industrial advantage, though the state of our technology, the inventiveness of our economic organizers and the priceless freedom of our system play big roles.

Our highly developed energy sources show up as key elements, too, in comparisons between the United States and such advanced industrial nations as Japan and those in Western Europe.

If United States per-man output in steel were no better than Japan's, we would need 900,000 steel workers instead of the 400,000 we have. We likewise surpass the whole of Europe in this regard.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev understands what power sources have to do with such superior performance. He told Udall in a private talk last summer: "Whoever has the most mechanical robots will be the richest." The Red leader forecast that ultimately Russia would perform its work more cheaply than America.

Few things are more important to us than to make this particular Khrushchev prediction fail.

## Property Tax Relief

(Oregon - Statesman, Salem)

A Benton County tax study group recommends a three per cent sales tax, with the money to be allocated to counties to relieve property taxes. Exemptions on the sales tax would extend to agricultural and industrial materials, medical prescriptions and food other than restaurant meals. The committee called the ad valorem property tax unfair and as "old-fashioned as the horse and buggy."

This is the season of the biennium when sales tax ideas start to circulate; and this year there is a little more soil for them to strike root in, with property taxes high and the state income tax not yielding enough to enable the state to live in the style to which it has become accustomed.

But Rep. Eymann, who probably will head the House committee on taxation, came up Thursday with another idea; local income taxes to offset local property taxes. This poses a choice; but it is doubtful if the Legislature will find either palatable.

It may be that when a sales tax comes it will arrive as an offset to the property tax. That was the way we got an income tax

in 1929. After the war, after the state had taken on the basic school support burden, the offset feature, which by that time had become a bookkeeping procedure, was dropped. And it may be that not until the property tax rally becomes oppressive that the people will approve of a sales tax. As far as the ad valorem property tax is concerned, as applied to real property it is not unfair, especially if property appraisals are kept current. The complaint now is more about its amount than over inequities.

As for local income taxes, communities will be loathe to apply them. They are used in some large cities but they excite a lot of controversy with those who reside outside the city but work inside.

Property tax relief may come by increasing state grants to counties, cities, school districts, rather than by adding new locally imposed taxes. As for a state sales tax, it has been defeated so many times that it is usually rated a dead duck whenever it is suggested. But legislators recall that the last tax to be referred and defeated was one raising the income tax. Memory of that raises a "caution" sign on adding to the income tax.



## Letters To The Editor

### Respect

In a recent editorial published in a Portland newspaper, discussing the Oregon State Patrol and the Washington State Patrol, the following statement is made, we quote in part: "That an officer wearing an impressive uniform commands more respect than one dressed like a Greyhound Bus Driver." We would like to have the following letter published in the Herald and News for the benefit of the people of this area. The original copy of this letter with 46 names signed to it is being sent to the Portland newspaper that wrote the editorial.

We, the undersigned Greyhound drivers take exception to this remark: "We do so for the following reasons:

It is our belief that an "impressive uniform" is not the ingredient which demands respect. It should be the officer, the one wearing the uniform, who warrants the respect of those with whom he comes in con-

tact. By this, we mean this officer must "earn" that respect.

In the article you mention the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. If you will analyze the reasons why the Mounties are respected as they are, you will find that, over the years, these men have earned the respect of not only their fellow citizens, but of the citizens of other countries as well. It doesn't make any difference whether a Mountie is dressed in a parka following a dog sled in the far north, or dressed in the plain brown uniform they wear as their regular work uniform; that Mountie is respected because he is a Mountie.

We know that, if one of these men were asked this question: "Does your uniform, by itself, command respect?" his answer would be: "No, it is to be respected only as far as I, myself, conduct myself as an officer and a gentleman; only as far as I earn this respect in the performance of my duties according to

the highest traditions of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police."

We further believe this is one of the things wrong with America today. Politicians, executives, and many others, think that just because they have a "title" they are able to "command respect." They are to be considered the "oracle of wisdom." Their every word, their every order, is to be accepted without question. They seem to forget that in our American way of life, one does not "command" respect, one "earns" it. According to their position, they may command "obedience," but they cannot command "respect."

It should make no difference whether one is decked out in gold braid from one end to the other, or whether one is dressed as a Greyhound bus driver. If that individual, or group of individuals, has earned the respect of those around him, then and then only, should that respect be given.

We, sir, as Greyhound drivers, are proud of the fact we are Greyhound drivers. We believe that, particularly here in the Pacific Northwest, we have the finest drivers you can find. Further, if you will check the records, you will find that of the 3,100 drivers in the 11 western states over 1,800 of them have over 10 years seniority. Also, by far the greater majority of these men are family men. They try to do their job to the best of their ability, and they work hard to warrant the respect they should have.

Again, if you will check the records, you will find that our safety record is second to none. We further believe that the Greyhound drivers are (as is expected of us), the safest, the most reliable, the most courteous drivers you will find on the highways.

By this letter we do not mean that we are "throwing rocks" at these officers. No matter what the organization is to which they belong, we are merely trying to say that we believe we, too, warrant respect. We believe the comparison made would have been better left unsaid.

We repeat once again, it is not a campaign hat or a cowboy hat that commands respect—it is the man under the hat who must earn that respect.

Harvey B. Lee, 421 North Seventh Street.

### POTOMAC FEVER

Ode to the Chief: Our leader's brains, we'll never impouch. When winter reigns, he's in Palm Beach.

Social security taxes go up. That may be all right for security, but it ain't very social.

Khrushchev calls for concessions by both sides in '63. For his part, all he wants is the concessions on four continents.

A survey shows it costs \$125 to outfit a college football player—or about twice what it would cost the pollsters to think up a survey that means something.

Postage stamps go up to a nickel. One thing about the Democrats, they're not a bunch of cheap politicians.

Supreme Court Justice Douglas says newspapers waste space on unimportant items. Proving his point, a lot of newspapers used space to quote him verbatim.

FLETCHER KNEBEL



## EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . . Rockefeller Heads The List Of Possibilities

By BRUCE BISSAT  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.  
WASHINGTON (NEA)—A big sampling of Republican leaders across the country generally sees New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller topping the 1964 GOP presidential list. But ideas on a possible serious rival just haven't jelled.

With Republican professionals about to gather in Washington to start making hard plans for 1964, this correspondent conducted a coast-to-coast survey by telephone to gauge the early sentiment. Their responses cannot be attributed to them by name.

In assigning Rockefeller a commanding front position, those leaders who were queried tended, in one sense, simply to confirm a widely held notion in and out of politics. But they fleshed out the impression with interesting detail.

For one thing, it is abundantly clear that Rockefeller not only leads in the more liberal Northeast but already has made a sizeable dent in the conservative Central, Plains and Mountain states. The South and Southwest are, of course, the chief regions where the governor's name stirs expressions of distaste and hostility.

For another, not a single politician tapped in this survey suggested Rockefeller had been hurt by the fact that his 518,000-vote margin in 1962 fell below both the forecast and his 1958 showing. The matter was never even mentioned.

Not surprisingly, other names offered as 1964 possibilities were Governors-elect George Romney of Michigan and William Scranton of Pennsylvania, and Arizona's Sen. Barry Goldwater. One leader tossed in Sen. Thurston Morton, recently re-elected in Kentucky.

The over-all view on Romney and Scranton was, however, that in national terms they are still pretty much unknown and totally unproven.

Goldwater, the deep South's overwhelming favorite, is fondly mentioned in nearly all parts of the country, but often by men who say in the next breath that he could not be elected and may not be a serious candidate.

No respondent talked as if he had yet made more than a mental

commitment to Rockefeller, if that. Some said they were "open-minded" on the 1964 race, wanted to see more of him and others, but nevertheless felt he is today far and away the leader.

In this connection, it is not widely known that George Hinman, Rockefeller's chief forager in national pastures for the last two years, recently wrote GOP leaders in several major states disclaiming any present Rockefeller intent to seek 1964 commitments.

In substantially identical letters, Hinman said the governor not only is not now seeking support but for the time remains personally uncommitted to running—and thinks the party should keep itself free on the subject.

This can hardly brake for long the expected early moves toward the 1964 nomination. These comments illustrate Rockefeller's still improving position out front.

From a Midwesterner: "He has served with ability, got his bills passed, showed fiscal responsibility. I can't see anyone else right now."

A Plains State politician: "This stuff about Rockefeller not being popular out here. . . I wonder where they're getting it. Not from the people I talked to. Most think he's the logical and the probable one."

A Mountain State leader: "Goldwater is well-liked here, but I find an increasing acceptance of the idea Rockefeller is ahead and may well be the nominee. On one visit he did a terrific job converting a conservative legislator who had threatened to boycott his talk."

Southern leaders' disapproval of Rockefeller is perhaps best summed up by one spokesman who said: "He is poison in the South."

But, after Goldwater, the southerners say little about alternative choices. One mentioned Romney, another Morton. Usually they stop with Goldwater.

Party leaders in other regions are, however, just about as vague on second choices.

Romney gets somewhat more attention than Scranton, but most seem to agree with the New Englander who said: "He's going to have to go through the fire first."



## WASHINGTON REPORT . . . House Liberals Seek Controls On HUAC

By FULTON LEWIS JR.  
Foes of the House Un-American Activities Committee may alter tactics this week in another effort to destroy the Congressional group.

In recent years, only a tiny handful of extreme liberal Democrats have possessed sufficient courage to vote against HUAC appropriations. On the last such roll call, in 1961, six Congressmen (out of 411) voted against funds to run the committee.

Those six members (the so-called hard core) feel that several new Congressmen, including three from California, will vote against HUAC. That would make only nine of 435 members, however, who would publicly oppose the House group.

Five of the six "hard-core" members therefore feel that different strategy must be used this year. They propose to make HUAC—now a standing, independent committee—into a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

This would give Brooklyn's Emanuel Celler, a liberal Democrat who is Judiciary chairman, absolute control over committee operations. It would, in effect, completely emasculate the Congressional group that helped send Alger Hiss to jail.

A sizable number of liberal Democrats—and one Republican—are thought likely to buy the "compromise" idea. Rep. Celler, of course, is one.

So is California's James Corman, New York's Abe Muller, and Ben Rosenthal. Others thought likely to support a transfer of HUAC to the Judiciary Committee are several freshman Congressmen from California.

Three of those have vowed to support the platform of something called Californians for Liberal Representation, which opposes "Congressional investigative power for non-legislative purposes or in violation of the Bill of Rights." That literary doubletalk is a not-so-thinly-disguised attack upon HUAC.

These three Congressmen are Lionel Van Deerlin, Edward Roybal and George Brown. Another California Democrat thought hostile to HUAC is Augustus Hawkins, possessor of a Communist front record.

Only one Republican is reported to think that HUAC should be transferred to Judiciary. He is Manhattan's John Lindsay, who was endorsed for re-election by the ultra-liberal New York Post. The decision to switch strategy

from abolition to transfer has not yet been made. Five of the six hard-core members favor such a move. Only New York's William Fitts Ryan insists upon abolition. He held a Los Angeles rally Dec. 12.

"This is the year we can do something about abolishing the House Committee—not just transferring it to another branch of government, but completely abolishing it."

Outside Congress, anti-HUAC leaders are whipping up enthusiasm for the kill. Frank Wilkinson, the identified Communist who serves as Field Secretary of the National Committee to Abolish HUAC, has traveled extensively, setting up local chapters.

In one recent month, he reached almost 20 Midwest colleges. They included: Antioch, Wayne State, Oberlin, Kenyon, Iowa State, Grinnell, Knox College, the universities of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

A group known as the Midwest Student Civil Liberties Coordinating Committee has been formed in Chicago. It will help bring students to Washington next week to buttonhole home-town Congressmen, and picket the committee.

Local "abolition groups" are functioning in various cities across the country. In New York, identified Reds run the show, and will descend upon Washington next week.

Fifty-six leftists in Chicago banded together to attack HUAC. In Milwaukee, a similar committee was set up. The usual professors at major schools have been persuaded to lend their names to Operation Abolition, 1962.

## Almanac

By United Press International  
Today is Monday, Jan. 7, the 7th day of 1963 with 359 to follow.

The moon is approaching its full phase.  
The morning stars are Mars and Venus.

The evening stars are Jupiter and Saturn.

Those born on this day include the 12th president of the United States, Millard Fillmore, in 1800.

A thought for the day—American educator and writer James Frank Debie, said: "The average Ph.D. thesis is nothing but a transfer of bones from one graveyard to another."

## THESE DAYS . . .

### Farmers Resent Controls

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

It's big news when a pressure group says that it would like a little less paternalistic help from Washington, D.C. Yet that is just what the huge and prestigious American Farm Bureau Federation has gone and done. Meeting in Atlanta, Ga., the Farm Bureau bigwigs served notice on Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman that they intend to oppose the Kennedy program in 1963 for stricter "supply management" in wheat and other agricultural products.

The Farm Bureau Federation has not taken its man-bites-dog stand because of any noble decision to stand by an abstract economic principle even though it causes a painful inflammation of the average farmer's pocketbook nerve. Manifestly, the Bureau still favors a floor under prices. Just for once, however, a big pressure group has balanced long-term advantages against the lure of immediate gains, and has made a decision in favor of freedom in the far future. What President Charles B. Shuman of the Farm Bureau has firmly grasped is that control of any one part of a market drives inexorably toward control of all phases of that market. The first step in the suspension of free market principles has its totalitarian potential, and the point comes where if you don't turn back, you go the whole way.

As one who follows the news in

farm publications, I have often wondered how anyone can believe that you can hope to tie a farmer to a restrictive program without eventually taking all of his decisions out of his hands. A little item in the January, 1963, issue of the "Farm Journal" should help to illuminate the point. In Washington, D.C., they worry about the general problem of over-production, with its attendant storage difficulties. But out in Indiana they go blithely ahead with contests to see who can raise the most corn on a given acre. The "Farm Journal" tells the story of Paul E. Morse, a Vigo County, Ind., farmer who is a part-time railroad worker. Entering a corn growing contest, Mr. Morse produced 243 bushels of No. 2 shelled corn per acre on five acres—possibly the biggest yield ever recorded in that part of the world.

How did Morse do it? He took a chance and spent \$150 extra for fertilizer. For \$30 worth of phosphate and potash and other soil ingredients, Morse got 100 bushels more corn per acre. Right behind him in the contest came a 17-year-old boy, Philip Wilcox of Tippecanoe County, Ind., who grew 241 bushels an acre. Elsewhere in Indiana 172 other Hoosiers went over the 200-bushel mark in the contest, which was sponsored by the Purdue University Extension Service and the Indiana Crop Improvement Association.

The strange thing about in-

creased corn yields this past year is that they have been extracted from the soil without benefit of particularly good weather. The fecundity has been achieved by planting better hybrid seed and by a more artful application of chemicals to the soil.

Thus the local university agricultural extension services, the hybrid seed experimenters, and the big chemical companies, work to increase yields while Washington, D.C., strives to keep overproduction in check. It does not take anyone skilled in Aristotelian logic to see that crop control, under such circumstances, is an impossibility. To make controls effective, Washington would have to stipulate the amounts and the kinds of fertilizer a farmer is permitted to use. It would have to confine new hybrid seed development to greenhouse laboratories. And, finally, it would have to establish a cut-off point for rainfall. Having achieved all this, and having taken out an insurance policy with the Almighty against any interruptions of the plan by corn borers, grasshoppers, or a plain, ordinary dry spell, the Washington planners might hope to keep supply and demand in balance at a parity price.

Where would the farmer be in all this? He would be reduced to playing the role of a routine clerk. That is what the American Farm Bureau Federation has seen at the end of the road.



By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

As I write these lines, the House Un-American Activities Committee is questioning members of the "Women for Peace" movement, trying to sniff out any possible Communist influence or direction within the group.

No doubt, a few Commies will turn up in the ranks—and so would a few vegetarians, Esperantists, nudists, Zen Buddhism devotees, and a handful of Gold Star Mothers.

But it has been my personal observation of the group in Chicago that 95 per cent of the "Women for Peace" are composed of ordinary American citizens, passionately concerned about preserving peace, and better informed about what is happening in the world today than many Congressmen.

Right or wrong—and I happen to think they are more right than wrong—these women are taking their responsibilities of citizenship seriously; unlike the bulk of us, who awaken out of our torpor once every few years to vote, and then subside into self-centeredness.

What we desperately need are many more groups who are as earnestly concerned with the world's plight, and who are making an effort to read, study, discuss and ventilate the basic problems facing human survival. Apathy, not "un-Americanism," is our greatest national enemy.

The House Un-American Activities Committee may have grasped a tiger by the tail this time. These women will not be intimidated; they have more moral courage than most men, and they are not afraid for their jobs, as so many men are.

Peace is everybody's business. No one is sure exactly how we can achieve it; and, by the same token, every viewpoint must be explored and encouraged. It cannot be left to that abstraction called "the government," because a representative government such as ours is supposed to be responsive to the will of the people.

But what is the "will of the people"? Most Americans are puzzled and confused and frightened.