

MEDFORD TRIBUNE
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Ft. St. Ph. SP 2-6141
ROBERT W. RUEL, Editor
HERB EBY, Advertising Manager
GERALD LATHAM, Business Mgr.
ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr.
Managing Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Teleg. Editor
RICHARD FEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STAR, Her Women's Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.
AN Independent Newspaper Entered a second class matter at Medford, Oregon under Act of March 3, 1879.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By Mail - In Advance Copy 10c Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$9.00
Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. \$4.25
Sunday Only - One year \$4.25
By Carrier - In Advance - Medford Ashland Central Point Eagle Point Jacksonville Gold Bluff Phoenix Shady Cove Rogue River Talent and on motor routes Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$18.00
Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$10.00
Carrier and Dealers - copy 10c
All Terms Cash in Advance
Office: Paper in City of Medford Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press International Full Leased Wire
MEMBER OF ADVERTISING BUREAU OF CIRCULATION
Advertising Representative: WEST HOLIDAY CO. INC. Office in New York Chicago Detroit San Francisco Los Angeles Seattle Portland St. Louis Atlanta Vancouver BC
NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
Flight o' Time
Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.
10 YEARS AGO
Jan. 3, 1950 (Tuesday)
Medford fireman helps to put out fire in own house.
Cigarettes cost Medford taxpayers more money than city services, Vernon Thorpe, city superintendent, announces.
20 YEARS AGO
Jan. 3, 1940 (Wednesday)
U.S. formally protests British seizure of U.S. mail bound for Germany.
From Arthur Perry's "Ye Smudge Pot" column: "An Ohio man won the national liar's contest recently, and made a fair showing considering he was not a candidate for any office."
30 YEARS AGO
Jan. 3, 1930 (Friday)
Production of corn sugar for bootleg whiskey shows record increase during past year.
Hearings on taxpayer's charges that Butte Falls school district pays teachers excessive salaries are being held.
40 YEARS AGO
Jan. 3, 1920 (Sunday)
Oregon is fifth in nation in production of apples.
County court reportedly plans to purchase fairgrounds within next two weeks.
50 YEARS AGO
Jan. 3, 1910 (Monday)
Post office receipts increase 33 per cent in last year to \$19,000.
Deposits in Medford banks increase from \$800,000 to \$1,800,000 in last year.
What's Your I.Q.?
Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.
1. Who was the first woman to fly across the Atlantic?
2. Who wrote "The Pilgrim's Progress"?
3. Which of these is larger in area-Mexico or Colombia?
4. Are eels born in salt water, or in fresh water?
5. In which New England state was President Calvin Coolidge born?
6. What is known as the "Eternal City"?
7. Where does former President Harry S. Truman make his home?
8. Do mosquitoes have four, six or eight legs?
9. According to the Bible, what was placed at the entrance of the Garden of Eden to guard it, when man was driven out?
10. In what once-popular game is there talk of winds, flowers and seasons?
Answers: 1. Amelia Earhart. 2. John Bunyan. 3. Mexico. 4. Fresh water. 5. Vermont. 6. Rome, Italy. 7. Independence, Mo. 8. Six. 9. A flaming sword and cherubim. 10. Mah Jongg.

Federal Intervention

The ironic outcome of the Mack Charles Parker lynching in Mississippi could be a further diminution of states' rights. The U.S. Department of Justice is expected to recommend to Congress at the 1960 session broad legislation empowering the federal government to intervene in cases where states fail to prosecute.

Attorney Gen. William P. Rogers Nov. 17 declared that his recommendation would "not necessarily" be for a federal anti-lynching measure. And he added:

It seems clear to me that if the states are going to disregard responsibilities to the extent of not even calling witnesses in a case like the Poplarville case, then the federal government must consider something else.

THE REFERENCE was to the refusal of a Mississippi grand jury in Poplarville to hear the testimony of Federal Bureau of Investigation agents in connection with the Parker lynching. The grand jury, sitting in early November, indeed refused to touch the case, though a 378-page FBI report, the work of 60 agents, reportedly naming seven to ten members of the lynch mob, was available to it.

Parker, a negro accused of raping a pregnant white woman, had been dragged from his Poplarville cell by hooded night riders last April 25, shot, and thrown into the Pearl river. The FBI had entered the case with the approval if not at the request of, Mississippi's Gov. James P. Coleman. It found no proof that Parker was dragged alive over a state line, so prosecution under the federal Lindbergh kidnaping law was ruled out. But the FBI report was forwarded to the governor.

CONGRESS will undoubtedly be asked at the 1960 session to make lynching a federal crime. Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) introduced an amendment to that effect to the Senate Judiciary subcommittee's civil rights bill at the last session.

In the past—particularly in the 1930s when lynching was much more common and various anti-lynching measures were proposed—it was contended that the Constitution—in the Tenth Amendment—renders Congress powerless to make lynching, or murder, for that matter, a federal crime except when committed on federal property. Javits' amendment was phrased to get around that argument by stating a congressional interpretation of the Constitution.

Proposals for anti-lynching legislation have met with strong Southern opposition and the threat of filibuster whenever they have been raised in Congress. But more recently Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (D-Texas) has advocated an anti-lynching constitutional amendment.

FINALLY, the Parker case has triggered still another reaction repugnant to white supremacists. John A. Hannah, chairman of the federal Commission on Civil Rights, Dec. 6 disclosed that his fact-finding body had begun an investigation into "shocking" abuses in "the administration of justice."

The Commission, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, had previously limited its inquiries to discrimination in voting, education, and housing. Hannah made specific reference to the Parker case, maintaining that "when one man is lynched the security of each of us is diminished."—E.R.R.

Middling Good News from Iraq

Despite reports of renewed unrest in Iraq, the Iraqi embassy in Washington assures Editorial Research Reports that political parties will be allowed to resume activity on or before Army Day, Jan. 6. This would fulfill a pledge made by Premier Abdel Karim Kassem last July 14 on the first anniversary of the revolution which overthrew the monarchy.

Since the general's coup of 1958, the Iraqi Parliament has been suspended and formal political life frozen. Last May 1 Kassem declared that he was opposed to political party activity in the immediate future.

IF SUCH activity now is to be allowed, it would appear to mean that Kassem doesn't fear the well organized Communist party in Iraq. In an interview of last May 30, Kassem declared that he felt ready and able to check the party if it should become a threat to "the rights of the people."

Kassem's further pledge back in July was that elections would be held and a new Parliament established by the second anniversary of the revolution. Performance on that promise would make a real show of stability.—E.R.R.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Problem as this is written: What to write about on the last day of the year, with New Year's Eve only a few hours off. Here's a BIGGER problem: How to write something that would be worth reading. HERE'S A sample of what is being written and sent out over the wires in these last hours of the old year: It will cost more to ring in 1960 than it did to welcome 1959 according to a nationwide survey of New Year's Eve night club prices. Tabs at the better bistros will range from \$20 to \$50 a couple—and could go a lot higher. This would depend, a Chicago night club manager says, "on how wild you want to get." PRICES in the plushiest places, the story goes on, include a dinner, a floor show and ONE drink. Other drinks will be extra. Note: It's the extra ones that will determine the degree of wildness. THE SURVEY adds: There is a growing trend this year to seeing the New Year with parties at home. Sounds good, doesn't it? But wait a minute. These home-type celebrations are varied. There is the host in suburban New York, for example, who plans to spend \$32 a head for a household of reveling guests. WHAT OF him? He's a show-off. In this modern world, we could do with FEWER show-offs and more plain, honest, hard-working pluggers. WHAT OF the old year that will end at midnight tonight? The prevailing opinion is that it was pretty tough. WHAT OF the new year that will begin when the old year ends? The traditional expectation is that THE NEW YEAR IS GOING TO BE WONDERFUL. How about it? Let's put it this way: The new year will be wonderful for those who MAKE IT WONDERFUL. For those who merely sit and wait for something wonderful to happen to them it will be just about like all the other years.

Dennis the Menace



"HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO RUFF! HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO RUFF! COME ON! EVERYBODY SING! HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DEAR RU-UFF!"

President Can Be Expected to Use Veto Power More in 1960

By Congressional Quarterly Washington—President Eisenhower and the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress will prove again in 1960 that the doctrine of mutual deterrence works at home as well as abroad.

The President, now entering his last year in office, can be expected to wield his veto power even more forcefully than in 1959. Congress, for its part, is certain to exercise its own veto power by refusing to act on key Administration requests.

The full extent of the forthcoming executive-legislative clash will depend on the decisions of Democratic leaders regarding the appropriate strategy to follow in an election year. Already, however, it is apparent that on certain issues compromise will prove elusive.

Presidential Vetoes Likely Here are the principal questions on which a Presidential veto awaits the more likely Congressional proposal:

Housing—Democrats are itching to pass an omnibus housing bill with generous provisions for urban renewal, public housing, direct loans to veterans, etc. The President, who vetoed two such packages in 1959 before signing a third one, is expected to oppose any new omnibus bill in 1960.

School Aid—A substantial program of Federal grants for school construction will be pushed vigorously by Senate Democrats and may well reach the White House. The President, who dropped his own grant proposals after 1957 because of his concern for the budget, will insist on a much more modest bond-subsidy program.

Social Security—Strong support has developed for adding health insurance for the aged to the social security system, a step long opposed by the Administration. If such a bill is sent to the President, he will be under as heavy pressure to sign it as to veto it.

'Inflationary' Proposal Minimum Wage—The Administration regards as "inflationary" the proposal, backed by organized labor and many Democrats, to raise the minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour. The President almost certainly would veto such a bill.

Area Redevelopment—Congress will hand the President a bill, passed by the Senate in 1959 and slated for early House action, carrying up to \$300 million in grants and loans for the Nation's economic

development. The President, who vetoed two such packages in 1959 before signing a third one, is expected to oppose any new omnibus bill in 1960.

Sen. Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, and we now have one-but only one—open, a vowed, declared, announced, committed and admitted candidate for President in 1960. The notoriously open campaign waged for months by "Ole Hubert" is now strictly official. This Democratic liberal of the liberals has said formally what no other aspirant in either party has yet announced: He is running—and just as hard as he possibly can.

The Bible says the first shall come in last. Humphrey hopes this will be altered so that the first shall remain first. Alone of the five Democratic "available"—the others

being Adlai E. Stevenson and Senators Lyndon Johnson of Texas, John Kennedy of Massachusetts and Stuart Symington of Missouri—Humphrey has dropped the amiable cover of ill-camouflaged intentions.

HE IS already pledged to enter 1960's primaries in at least three states—Wisconsin, Oregon and South Dakota—plus the District of Columbia. And when more campaign money is raised, he will enter others.

This will be a strange pre-convention campaign. Humphrey's one hope lies in the highly debatable assumption that a prosperous country will want to return in effect to the Roosevelt New Deal of the '30s. When he says he knows it will be "an uphill fight," he understates the case.

All the same, he cannot be counted out in advance. For he is one (indeed, perhaps the only) advanced liberal in the Democratic party who is also a practical and gifted politician.

MOREOVER, he is one of the very few—if not, again, the only one—in this group able to avoid the self-righteous rigidity so common to it. A darkish, rather dapper man of many thousands of eager words for any occasion, he is able to disagree with others, and suffer them to disagree with him without:

A. Giving up any real principle on his own side. B. Insinuating that his opponents are hopeless fools at best or, more likely, actually crooks and knaves.

This columnist, as an ex-Senate correspondent, knows "Ole Hubert," he believes, from the ground up. What follows should not be considered a political testimonial—for this one Washington observer has no trouble whatever in disagreeing fundamentally with Humphrey. It is only a true account of the extraordinary progress of Hubert Horatio Humphrey in the United States Senate.

HUMPHREY came to that proud and clubby body in 1949 under the worst possible omens. He had just all but wrecked the 1948 Democratic National Convention—in the view of so liberal a man as President Harry S. Truman as well as of moderates and conservatives—by leading a rebellion for an extremely "liberal" civil-rights plank.

He was brash. He talked immeasurably too much in a place that has always believed any newcomer is lucky to be there at all and surely ought, in common decency, to hold his tongue until he is spoken to.

But somehow, without apologizing or going back on what he believed, within a year he was making crusty old Senate types like him. They never approved his ideas and never will—not will many, many others who are not nearly so crusty. But he conceded him this much: He was a fair man, if a wrong-headed man given to extreme views. And he was able, perhaps the best speaker (if maybe a little overpoweringly so) in the Senate.

SO THERE are many Democratic politicians who actually know "Ole Hubert" who could never go along with his ideas. But they nevertheless would wish him well now, if only in conscience they could. For even if he could restrain as President his own far-from-moderate notions, he could hardly reach office without becoming captive to the evenless-moderate notions of most of those who would surround him.

So, the mood among these politicians is rather this: "Hail, Hubert-hail, but also farewell!" (Copyright, 1960, by United Feature Syndicate, Inc.)

Washington Report

By WILLIAM S. WHITE



William S. White

Washington—The other shoe has at last been dropped by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, and we now have one-but only one—open, a vowed, declared, announced, committed and admitted candidate for President in 1960. The notoriously open campaign waged for months by "Ole Hubert" is now strictly official. This Democratic liberal of the liberals has said formally what no other aspirant in either party has yet announced: He is running—and just as hard as he possibly can.

The Bible says the first shall come in last. Humphrey hopes this will be altered so that the first shall remain first. Alone of the five Democratic "available"—the others

being Adlai E. Stevenson and Senators Lyndon Johnson of Texas, John Kennedy of Massachusetts and Stuart Symington of Missouri—Humphrey has dropped the amiable cover of ill-camouflaged intentions.

HE IS already pledged to enter 1960's primaries in at least three states—Wisconsin, Oregon and South Dakota—plus the District of Columbia. And when more campaign money is raised, he will enter others.

This will be a strange pre-convention campaign. Humphrey's one hope lies in the highly debatable assumption that a prosperous country will want to return in effect to the Roosevelt New Deal of the '30s. When he says he knows it will be "an uphill fight," he understates the case.

All the same, he cannot be counted out in advance. For he is one (indeed, perhaps the only) advanced liberal in the Democratic party who is also a practical and gifted politician.

MOREOVER, he is one of the very few—if not, again, the only one—in this group able to avoid the self-righteous rigidity so common to it. A darkish, rather dapper man of many thousands of eager words for any occasion, he is able to disagree with others, and suffer them to disagree with him without:

A. Giving up any real principle on his own side. B. Insinuating that his opponents are hopeless fools at best or, more likely, actually crooks and knaves.

This columnist, as an ex-Senate correspondent, knows "Ole Hubert," he believes, from the ground up. What follows should not be considered a political testimonial—for this one Washington observer has no trouble whatever in disagreeing fundamentally with Humphrey. It is only a true account of the extraordinary progress of Hubert Horatio Humphrey in the United States Senate.

HUMPHREY came to that proud and clubby body in 1949 under the worst possible omens. He had just all but wrecked the 1948 Democratic National Convention—in the view of so liberal a man as President Harry S. Truman as well as of moderates and conservatives—by leading a rebellion for an extremely "liberal" civil-rights plank.

He was brash. He talked immeasurably too much in a place that has always believed any newcomer is lucky to be there at all and surely ought, in common decency, to hold his tongue until he is spoken to.

But somehow, without apologizing or going back on what he believed, within a year he was making crusty old Senate types like him. They never approved his ideas and never will—not will many, many others who are not nearly so crusty. But he conceded him this much: He was a fair man, if a wrong-headed man given to extreme views. And he was able, perhaps the best speaker (if maybe a little overpoweringly so) in the Senate.

SO THERE are many Democratic politicians who actually know "Ole Hubert" who could never go along with his ideas. But they nevertheless would wish him well now, if only in conscience they could. For even if he could restrain as President his own far-from-moderate notions, he could hardly reach office without becoming captive to the evenless-moderate notions of most of those who would surround him.

So, the mood among these politicians is rather this: "Hail, Hubert-hail, but also farewell!" (Copyright, 1960, by United Feature Syndicate, Inc.)

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

THE YEAR OF DECISION Washington—New Year's day of 1960 is to be comically and appropriately bracketed by two announcements of candidacies.

Sen. Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, and we now have one-but only one—open, a vowed, declared, announced, committed and admitted candidate for President in 1960. The notoriously open campaign waged for months by "Ole Hubert" is now strictly official. This Democratic liberal of the liberals has said formally what no other aspirant in either party has yet announced: He is running—and just as hard as he possibly can.

The Bible says the first shall come in last. Humphrey hopes this will be altered so that the first shall remain first. Alone of the five Democratic "available"—the others

being Adlai E. Stevenson and Senators Lyndon Johnson of Texas, John Kennedy of Massachusetts and Stuart Symington of Missouri—Humphrey has dropped the amiable cover of ill-camouflaged intentions.

HE IS already pledged to enter 1960's primaries in at least three states—Wisconsin, Oregon and South Dakota—plus the District of Columbia. And when more campaign money is raised, he will enter others.

This will be a strange pre-convention campaign. Humphrey's one hope lies in the highly debatable assumption that a prosperous country will want to return in effect to the Roosevelt New Deal of the '30s. When he says he knows it will be "an uphill fight," he understates the case.

All the same, he cannot be counted out in advance. For he is one (indeed, perhaps the only) advanced liberal in the Democratic party who is also a practical and gifted politician.

MOREOVER, he is one of the very few—if not, again, the only one—in this group able to avoid the self-righteous rigidity so common to it. A darkish, rather dapper man of many thousands of eager words for any occasion, he is able to disagree with others, and suffer them to disagree with him without:

A. Giving up any real principle on his own side. B. Insinuating that his opponents are hopeless fools at best or, more likely, actually crooks and knaves.

This columnist, as an ex-Senate correspondent, knows "Ole Hubert," he believes, from the ground up. What follows should not be considered a political testimonial—for this one Washington observer has no trouble whatever in disagreeing fundamentally with Humphrey. It is only a true account of the extraordinary progress of Hubert Horatio Humphrey in the United States Senate.

HUMPHREY came to that proud and clubby body in 1949 under the worst possible omens. He had just all but wrecked the 1948 Democratic National Convention—in the view of so liberal a man as President Harry S. Truman as well as of moderates and conservatives—by leading a rebellion for an extremely "liberal" civil-rights plank.

He was brash. He talked immeasurably too much in a place that has always believed any newcomer is lucky to be there at all and surely ought, in common decency, to hold his tongue until he is spoken to.

But somehow, without apologizing or going back on what he believed, within a year he was making crusty old Senate types like him. They never approved his ideas and never will—not will many, many others who are not nearly so crusty. But he conceded him this much: He was a fair man, if a wrong-headed man given to extreme views. And he was able, perhaps the best speaker (if maybe a little overpoweringly so) in the Senate.

SO THERE are many Democratic politicians who actually know "Ole Hubert" who could never go along with his ideas. But they nevertheless would wish him well now, if only in conscience they could. For even if he could restrain as President his own far-from-moderate notions, he could hardly reach office without becoming captive to the evenless-moderate notions of most of those who would surround him.

So, the mood among these politicians is rather this: "Hail, Hubert-hail, but also farewell!" (Copyright, 1960, by United Feature Syndicate, Inc.)

NEWSPAPERMAN DIES Spokane, Wash.—UPI—Jack B. Evans, 49, a Spokane newspaperman, died Thursday night in a hospital here where he was being treated for cancer. Evans had joined the Spokesman-Review in 1952 after having worked with United Press International, Associated Press and the Seattle Star.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

Once in a while, this column comments on the foibles and fripperies of the newspaper business.

So, today, we are going to "borrow" a column from the trade magazine, "Editor & Publisher," which republished it from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, where it was written by City Editor L. T. Anderson. He called it "Language of the Client," a list for newspaper newcomers of phrases most frequently heard around a city room, and their ACTUAL meanings.

Here goes:

Where did you get that story? (Who squealed?)

Here's the material I talked to you about yesterday. (My job depends on the number of clippings I send to the main office.)

I KNOW you'll throw this in your wastebasket. (This negative publicity will insure its publication.)

I'm an old newspaperman myself. (I sold classified ads one summer for an obscure weekly.)

Hiya pall (I am a press agent for a circus.)

I have a rather unusual request to make of you. (I was out with another man's wife and we had a car wreck and I want you to keep it out of the paper.)

I've been wanting to meet you for a long time. (I want a story in the paper.)

I want you to meet a friend of mine. (He wants a story in the paper.)

They told me you were the man who'd take care of this. (Exaggerated respect might impress you.)

You know what those damn Republicans have done? (They fired me.)

He's a member of a very prominent family. (He's a relative of mine.)

This is a story that'll blow the lid right off this town. (I was jailed for drunkenness and disorderly conduct and I want to get even with the cops.)

Everybody up here reads your paper. (If you don't print this story, everybody in my community will stop buying the paper immediately.)

Everybody is anxious to read about this. (I want to get my name in the paper.)

I'M KNOWN as a political independent. (I've been cut out of the graft.)

I know your editor very well. (You'd better print this if you know what's good for you.)

HOW COME you guys have it in for me? (Why did you expose me as a fraud?)

I've been taking your paper for 35 years. (I want you to take my uncle's picture.)

We want you to settle an argument for us. (We've been drinking.)

I know you people are always looking for pictures of children. (I want you to take my little girl's picture.)

This is the REAL story. (This is my side of it.)

Don't change a word of this. (I write beautifully and you'd just ruin it.)

THE PEOPLE who made this charitable project possible ought to get a little recognition. (I don't believe in doing any charity work unless I am paid for it in the form of publicity.)

This story has a lot of human interest. (It's about my grandmother.)

Your crossword puzzle is a gyp. (I lost again.)

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

SOME POLITICAL NOTIONS

Although Mr. Nixon is now the President's one and only heir, there is a most important part of the estate which he cannot inherit. It has been Gen. Eisenhower's unique achievement above the party battles, and to invest for the time being the office with the attributes of a constitutional monarchy.

This has enveloped him with an aura of invulnerability such as no other President in modern times, if ever before, has enjoyed. Whatever has gone wrong has been blamed on his ministers and he has moved above it serene and untouched.

This exalted position is uniquely Eisenhower's, and it cannot be passed on to his successor. It is entirely beyond Mr. Nixon's reach. As a candidate, as a President if he is elected, Mr. Nixon will be down in the dust and the heat of the battle, not above it in the clear blue yonder. In this critical respect there could be no sharper contrast than between Eisenhower and Nixon—between the non-political world famous soldier who was drawn into politics at the top and the ambitious young man who clawed his way up from obscurity.

THE CONTRAST is a warning that a Nixon administration will not be and cannot be a continuation of the Eisenhower administration. We shall find, I believe, that the Eisenhower administration has been an interlude which cannot continue and will not soon be repeated.

The party struggle which has been throttled down under Eisenhower is certain to break out again under Nixon. Our present situation—that of living under a divided government with the Republicans in control of the Executive branch and the Democrats of the Legislature—has been made worse by President Eisenhower's preference with which he has overawed the Democratic Congressional leaders. With Nixon on the party struggle would be bound to revive, and a divided government would then seem far less benign than it does under the Eisenhower-Johnson regime.

That, in essence, is the character of the turning point we have reached. Freedom's future depends on the workability of our system in the years just ahead. Our system only works in the right kind of man in the White House. Good luck to us, then, in choosing him, and good luck to him when he is chosen.

(c) 1960 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

at the summit meeting in May there is a prospect of some continuing accommodation. It is not easy to build up an opposition to Eisenhower. As a party the Democrats have not yet been able to make an effective case against him, and Gov. Rockefeller found that he could not make one either.

Yet there is a case to be made, and some fine day—perhaps not yet in the 1960 elections—someone will make the case.

The case against Eisenhower's prosperity is that we are not producing enough wealth of the right kind. Our economic growth is slower than is required by our position in the world, which is challenged as it has never been challenged before. And of the wealth we do produce too large a proportion goes into consumer goods which are not necessities, and too small a proportion into public necessities, both military and civilian.

The case against the Eisenhower administration on the "peace" issue is not that he is seeking accommodation with the Soviet Union. With the race in nuclear armaments as menacing as it is, it would be a neglect of the President's duty if he did not seek the accommodation.

The great charge to be made against the Eisenhower administration is that it has been fumbling the ball in the contest of armaments with the Soviet Union. Thus it has compelled us to negotiate for the accommodation from a second rate position.

Although, no doubt, military expenditures ought to be increased, the primary source of the fumbling in the Pentagon is a feeble leadership from the White House.

THUS, WE ARE not meeting the challenge of the Soviet Union. It is a dual challenge—to negotiate and to compete—to reduce the international tension and to increase the national effort. This is the case which, if I have read the record rightly, Rockefeller would have made had the Republican contest been an open one. This is the cause which the Democrats need to make if ever they can unite behind a candidate who understands the case and has the eloquence to take it to the country.

(c) 1959 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

New York Transit Strike Threat Ends

New York—UPI—A crippling strike of all the city's subways and bus lines was averted today only one hour before the deadline.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner said the present 15-cent bus and subway fare would not be raised. But he said the city would have to help the private bus lines.

(c) 1960 New York Herald Tribune Inc.