

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
32 North Fir St. Ph. SE 2-4141

1960 NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
MEMBER OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNITED PRESS 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
Dec. 28, 1950 (Friday)
The two parties of civilian Army engineers who surveyed the Camp White wartime training site here...

20 YEARS AGO
Dec. 29, 1940 (Sunday)
Three persons were injured, none of them seriously, when a motorcycle collided with a car near the Phoenix city limits yesterday.

30 YEARS AGO
Dec. 29, 1930 (Monday)
The state highway commission has announced plans to widen the Pacific highway south of Phoenix.

40 YEARS AGO
Dec. 29, 1920 (Wednesday)
The Gold Hill Boxing Association will hold a wrestling and boxing show on New Year's afternoon.

50 YEARS AGO
Dec. 29, 1910 (Thursday)
The Union Meat company, which has more than doubled its business here during the past year, has announced plans to erect an extensive division to its existing plant.

What's Your I.Q.?
Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

- 1. Name the man appointed by Senator Kennedy to be the Secretary of Labor in the new administration?
2. What is the last word in the New Testament?
3. Correct the following sentence: "I wish one of my brothers were coming."
4. What is the national game of England?
5. Which two nationally observed holidays in the U.S. always fall on the same day of the week?
6. In contrast bridge, the winning of two games by one side constitutes a...?
7. What does the "A" stand for in Thomas A. Edison?
8. The city of Adelaide is in Australia, or New Zealand?
9. The nickname "The Voice" has been applied to which crooner?
10. Is copper, or silver, the better conductor of electricity?
Answers: 1. Arthur J. Goldberg. 2. Amen. 3. It is correct (subjunctive mood). 4. Cricket. 5. Labor Day and Thanksgiving. 6. Rubber. 7. Ails. 8. Australia. 9. Frank Sinatra. 10. Silver.

Nonconformity

The desk dictionary defines nonconformity as the "neglect, failure, or refusal to conform, as to a rule or practice..."
"Conform" is defined: "To make or be like; to bring into, or be or act in, harmony or agreement."

Nonconformity first came into being as a word when applied to those who left the Church of England. Since then, its meaning has broadened to apply to other situations.

IN A free nation, governed by elected representatives ruling by the consent of the people, nonconformity is essential. How are we to find the right answers unless issues are debated, pro and con? This is the necessary Great Dialogue on which democratic processes are predicated.

Can you imagine everyone wearing only the same clothes, attending only the same church, eating only the same foods, reading only the same books, watching only the same TV programs, voicing only the same opinions?

THUS we conclude that nonconformity is not, of itself, a bad thing. But, like everything else, it can be carried to extremes.

A murderer is a nonconformist. He refuses to conform to the rule of law against killing. A conscientious objector is a nonconformist, refusing for reasons of conscience to abide by the rules of selective service.

All criminals are nonconformists in one sense, by refusing to abide by society's rules; but they are conformists, too, conforming to the rules and practices of criminal society.

THUS nonconformity is neither good nor bad, as such. It depends on which rules and practices and customs and attitudes one rejects.

It is often used as a word of both opprobrium and of praise—and incorrectly in both instances. It is simply descriptive, and by itself should not indicate either goodness or badness.

And, of course, an individual can be a conformist in one field of activity, and a nonconformist in another.—E. A.

Should We Care?

Why should we be concerned about nonconformity?

Well, a lot of people are these days. They say there is too much pressure for conformity, for standardization, and toward a lack of initiative and gumption and imagination in the schools and in society itself.

A group of Roman Catholic prelates the other day took out after what they call the "cult of adjustment," remembering that history is not ordinarily made by "well adjusted" citizens, but by the strong and thoughtful and vigorous and determined and ambitious—in other words, by nonconformists.

THE Register-Guard agrees. Conceding if everyone were "out of adjustment" that it would be pretty disorderly, the Guard goes on to declare:

"But we need a continuing supply of the imaginative, the cantankerous and the bold. Think of your epiphany. Do you want chiseled in stone the words 'He was well adjusted'? Or would you rather have some more authoritative statement?"

A degree of adjustment sufficient to get along in society is a mighty useful thing to have. But a degree of adjustment which leaves one totally satisfied with the status quo is not going to provide leaders, scientists, thinkers and doers—the very people who are the greatest need in today's complex and problem-ridden world.—E. A.

The Pursuit of Happiness

Despite the admitted pressures toward conformity which are at work in our society today, we are not too greatly concerned.

Perhaps that is because this is a relatively small community, with a good school system, which encourages individual development along lines of ability, and with a whole lot of nonconformists in residence in and around the city.

In our area are many people who are "well adjusted" enough to be looked upon as exemplary citizens, and yet who are nonconformists enough to make up their own minds about the problems of the day, and to speak out on them.

THIS shows up in the Mail Tribune's communications column, among other places, which contains a wide range of lively comment on a variety of subjects.

It shows up at election times, when heated opinions are voiced without inhibitions.

It shows up in the variety of clubs and organizations, big and small, representing just about any interest you can name—charitable, cultural, social, fraternal, occupational and religious, and for hobbies, sports and outdoor recreation.

THESE, and the wide variety of ethnic and racial and spiritual heritages in this country are what we have in mind when we talk about the "splendid diversity" of America today.

Various circumstances, including increasing population and social and technological complexity, may make the "pursuit of happiness" more difficult today than in times past.

But happiness is still being pursued, in many ways, by people who conform only to their own ideals.—E. A.

Communications



"I WAS OVER AT MR. WILSON'S WHEN YA STARTED YELLIN' AT ME. MOM, WHAT'S A 'FISHWIFE'?"

Communications

Letters to the Editor must bear the name and address of the writer, although under certain circumstances the use of a pen name or initial for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with a view to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words. The letters printed in this column do not necessarily represent the views of the paper; in fact the contrary is often the case.

Church News Policy

To the Editor: We congratulate the Medford Mail Tribune in regard to the church news policy. The service has surpassed that of any we have heretofore experienced. Thank you for your kind consideration of our desires and suggestions. The printing of our church programs has been beyond our expectation.

James R. Hendricks, Pastor of the Jacksonville Bible Church, Jacksonville, Ore.

Fairyland

To the Editor: We are thrilled and grateful for being considered and awarded a prize for our Christmas entrance display by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. We drove up and down the streets (between fogs) to admire the lights and displays but they were few and far between and we wondered if folks realized what a glorious picture of fairyland could be accomplished if each and every house had one or two strings of lights on it. Maybe fairyland is not typical for Christmas but what a showplace and delight the whole town would be, and certainly put a song in the hearts of the members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce who are giving of their time to promote Medford in every shape and form.

Mr. and Mrs. A. Sterton, 59 Summit ave., Medford

Holidays at the Home

To the Editor: London has nothing on Medford, that is when it comes to fog. In fact it seems as though we have had a little more than our share of this unforgettable weather, particularly so as it has hindered many church organizations and individuals from visiting us here at the Jackson County Farm Home as they have done in past seasons. Those remaining away, we all feel it was best, for to endanger themselves upon the highways would be inviting disaster to one's life, the most cherished asset we have. It is to these people that we wish to say, even in their absence, "Thank you anyway."

Prior to the prevailing weather, the monthly visitation of the Salvation Army and other church groups, including the Young Peoples Glee Club of the Apostolic Church, under the leadership of Mr. Duane Jones, in connection with their rituals presented many traditional melodies both celestial and carols, to the enjoyment of us all. Then, as fog again makes its appearance, Sister Marion Joseph of St. Mary's school, somewhat dubious as to venturing out in such dismal weather with her entourage, managed to "creep through" into sunlight and bring us many young ladies and gentlemen presenting a series of melodies likewise appreciated by us all.

In the intermediate periods, seemingly to be without music or song, Mr. Lusk of the Lusk piano company, took pity upon us and loaned to Mrs. Hoffman an electronic organ with its complement of celestial tones simulating those of the magnificent pipe organs in Cathedrals throughout the world. Under the very capable musicianship of Mrs. Delphia Schmelzer, organist, a staff member of nurses in our domestic, many pleasing contemporary melodies were wonderfully expressed.

Most pleasing was our "guest artist", Mr. Millard Hoffman, superintendent, who, by his extensive study of the pianoforte, (five lessons, to be exact, and under exhorting instruction by Mr. Howard) was drawn to the organ console by some magnetic force, where, he became somewhat perplexed as to which of his five fingers he should employ in his rendition of a Christmas carol... becoming further confused he applied a rather unique and impromptu interlude involving passages from traditional New Year's Eve joyful tunes so well known to all who participate on this occasion, ending as a "finale" with a few strains of Silent Night.

To those of the past and present, Mrs. Hoffman wishes to express her heart-felt gratitude by wishing you all a Very Happy New Year.

E. Cozad Howard, 5465 South Pacific Hwy., Medford

Try and Stop Me
By BENNETT CERF
THE CONTRIBUTOR who submitted the following has wisely chosen to remain anonymous. HE: LOOK, MADEMOISELLE! This is the SEVENTEENTH TIME I've called you THIS WEEK. Why haven't you answered McCALLS? SHE: Because I've been writing a PLAY, BOY, and singing in the Syracuse choir. They call it the S-CHOIR. The conductor is a GENT named Al, and I'd JOIN-AL right now if it wasn't for his wife, who sure keeps HER-EYES-ON ME! HE: Okay, Babe! I'll waste no more of my FORTUNE on you. I've got my own LIFE to live. I'll keep my own HOUSE BEAUTIFUL! This essay depressed me so, I turned on the old sun lamp—determined to get a COSMOPOLI-TAN. Two Eskimo families—long before Alaska achieved statehood—were wont to throw harpoons at each other from morning to night. In fact, they're the folks who actually started the frozen food industry.

Revaluation of Soviet Ruble Declared Misleading; Objectives Are Discussed

By RICHARD SPONG
WASHINGTON—The new "heavy" ruble is supposed to be worth 10 of the old ruble. It also is supposed to be worth more than the U.S. dollar. Both remain suppositions, for realistically the ruble is not convertible in gold either nationally. Indeed the ruble might be called an entirely internal currency. The Soviet Union conducts most of its foreign trade by barter, the remainder in dollars, sterling, or other international currencies. Moreover, Russia has had a multiple currency system, with a different rate for the benefit of foreign residents and tourists, and yet another rate for ruble notes abroad. Soviet Finance Minister Vasily F. Garbuzov on Nov. 14 announced the abolition on Jan. 1 of the dual system under which an official rate of four rubles to a dollar was maintained simultaneously with a tourist premium rate of ten rubles to the dollar. Will Exchange Rubles? On the same date the Soviet people will get one new ruble for 10 old ones. Also, the prices of goods will be changed on the same ratio. This is similar to the trick of "dropping the zeros" the French played successfully last year to restore the stability of the franc, only the French revaluation was ten times more sweeping. But as the British economist, Paul Einzig, has pointed out, "This kind of operation does not improve with repetition." This is the second ground for the Russians. A one-for-ten exchange was ordered in December, 1947. The main purpose then was to destroy the value of "hot money"—inflationary note hoards. At present there appears to be no such intention—though the value of the small amounts of rubles which have been smuggled from the Communist bloc will probably be wiped out. The strikes had historical precedent and also a root in smoldering resentments between the unions and the Eyskens government. Unions vs. Premier In February 1959 the Socialist trade union federation backed a strike by 137,000 coal miners against a government plan to close down un-economic mines. The government agreed to resettle unemployed workers and came up with an economic plan to encourage investment and which also promised a more liberal financial policy, increased public works and special development zones. Last January, Socialist trade unions called a 24-hour strike to force the government to carry out its program promised nearly a year before. Today's strikes once more deal with government decision, but with a difference. The label on these reads: "Made in the Congo."

'Made in the Congo' Label Pinned on Belgian Problems

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign News Analyst
Belgium, creator of an independent Congo, has become a victim of its own offspring. The seeds of the violence which today threatens to topple the Belgian government were sown last Jan. 27 when Belgium proposed that its former colony become independent on June 30 and hopefully believed it had prevented another Algeria. Somehow, Belgium hopes that an ill-prepared, savage people could take over their own destinies and, in continuing close association with Belgium, develop peacefully the rich resources of a land nearly one-third the size of the United States. Never could hopes or plans have gone more wrong. Belgian hopes disappeared in the fury of African nationalism fanned to white heat by the rivalries of the cold war and in the flight of Belgian men, women and children fearing the "night of the long knife."

Cost Was Heavy With the hopes disappeared also a Belgian stake of more than \$7 billion. From this came a government-decreed austerity program and an answering strike by socialist unions fearful of the effect on social benefits. Joining the strikers were Belgium's numerically small but militant Communists. Premier Gaston Eyskens, drawing on Belgium's NATO troops in Germany to meet the threat to his government, accused the strikers of acting in "total ignorance" and of attempting to settle political problems by "pressure from the street, agitation and violence."

The strikes had historical precedent and also a root in smoldering resentments between the unions and the Eyskens government. Unions vs. Premier In February 1959 the Socialist trade union federation backed a strike by 137,000 coal miners against a government plan to close down un-economic mines. The government agreed to resettle unemployed workers and came up with an economic plan to encourage investment and which also promised a more liberal financial policy, increased public works and special development zones. Last January, Socialist trade unions called a 24-hour strike to force the government to carry out its program promised nearly a year before. Today's strikes once more deal with government decision, but with a difference. The label on these reads: "Made in the Congo."

The principle of the ruble revaluation was announced by Soviet Premier Khrushchev on the eve of last May's abortive Paris Summit conference. It was generally considered at least partly a propaganda move to increase the international prestige of the Russian currency. It may also be a part of a Russian plan eventually to make the ruble an international currency. And it may be a step toward Russian membership in the International Monetary Fund. Khrushchev in Paris declared: "Gold we have, but we save it. Why? I don't really know. Lenin said that the day would come when gold would serve to coat the walls and floors of public toilets. When the Communist society is built, we must certainly accomplish Lenin's wish." A better explanation for Soviet gold-hoarding would probably be that the Reds are amassing reserves toward the long-term goal of making the ruble convertible.

Also the dollar will be rated as worth 90 kopecks (there are 100 kopecks in the ruble). Thus the ruble will be worth \$1.11 as against the old pegged rate of 25 cents. This may impress the unsophisticated. But since ten old rubles have to be turned in for one new one, the ruble actually is being devalued. What was worth \$2.50 will now be worth only \$1.11.

The government agreed to resettle unemployed workers and came up with an economic plan to encourage investment and which also promised a more liberal financial policy, increased public works and special development zones. Last January, Socialist trade unions called a 24-hour strike to force the government to carry out its program promised nearly a year before. Today's strikes once more deal with government decision, but with a difference. The label on these reads: "Made in the Congo."

When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

WHAT is his system? Well, he is on record as favoring a standby program for lowering the tax rate when the country is suffering economic pangs and raising them when it becomes necessary to combat rising inflation. His idea is to set up precise scales of reductions and increases in the tax rate, to be written into law in advance and "triggered" when needed by putting a simple resolution through congress.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

HOW would it work? It would go something like this: When business is bad—as he puts it, "when the country is LOWER taxes. The result of that would be to LEAVE MORE MONEY IN THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With more money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump. When business begins to get good again (that is to say, TOO good) and prices begin to rise stiffly and inflation begins to bite, he would RAISE tax rates, thus taking money OUT OF THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS. With less money in their pockets, the people would spend more and thus business would be stimulated and we would come out of the slump.

1960, by Bennett Cerf. Distributed by King Features Syndicate

1960, by Bennett Cerf. Distributed by King Features Syndicate