

MEDFORD TRIBUNE
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St.
MEDFORD, OREGON 97504

Subscription Rates
By Mail - In Advance Copy 10c
Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$12.00

Flight 'o' Time
Medford and Jackson County
History from the files of The
Mail Tribune, 1920, 30, 40
and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO
Feb. 12, 1951 (Monday)
Harry Watson, manager of
the Medford hotel, today
denied a story printed in a
Portland newspaper that the
hotel has been sold to eastern
interests.

20 YEARS AGO
Feb. 12, 1941 (Wednesday)
Three white female rabbits,
inoculated with hormones for
experimental purposes, were
stolen from their individual
pens at the Community hospital
last night.

30 YEARS AGO
Feb. 12, 1931 (Thursday)
The lower house of the state
legislature has passed a free
school books bill.

40 YEARS AGO
Feb. 12, 1921 (Saturday)
Fire destroyed the former
West Side Stables building on
South Grape st., last night,
and also destroyed 32 autos
parked inside.

50 YEARS AGO
Feb. 12, 1911 (Sunday)
An Interstate Commerce
commission hearing here on a
petition by the city of Medford
for lower rail freight
rates to California points was
concluded yesterday.

1961's Your IQ?
Nine or ten correct is superior;
seven or eight is excellent; five or
six is good.

1. Complete the quotation.
"Millions for defense, but not
a cent for..."

2. Did St. Paul ever go to Rome?
3. Is Copenhagen the capital of Norway, Denmark, or Sweden?

4. Harry S. Truman was the first U. S. President to veto a tax-reduction bill; true or false?
5. Graphology is the study of what?

6. Is coral a plant or animal, or stone?
7. Can salt water be made fresh?
8. What does "Pan" stand for in Pan-American?

9. In baseball, which base is called the keystone sack?
10. In what year did the late President Roosevelt declare the bank holiday?
Answers: 1. "... tribune."
2. Yes. 3. Denmark. 4. True.
5. Handwriting. 6. Animal. 7. Yes. 8. All. 9. Second. 10. 1933.

The Medical Care Plan

President John Kennedy's proposal for medical care for the aged, tied in with the Social Security system, is being billed as a major advance in the nation's welfare services.

If viewed in one light, however, it is a very small step indeed. If enacted (and it will face some rough going from the lobbies of American Medical Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and others), it will still leave the United States far behind most other western nations in the provision of health services for their people.

Canada, Great Britain, West Germany, the Scandinavian countries—all of them have far broader medical services than the U.S. proposal.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY says the proposal is not "socialized medicine."

This, of course, will be disputed. But he's right. What it is a government-operated medical care insurance program for older folk.

It fits in nicely with Abraham Lincoln's definition of the role of government, which, he said, should do for the people what they cannot do, or do as well, for themselves.

Only the facilities of the federal government, operating nationwide and equally everywhere, are adequate to support an equitable program.

ONE of the objections which will be heard is that those now 65 and over will be "riding on the backs of the other taxpayers."

In a sense this is true. The program would be financed by a modest increase in the amount of the Social Security payroll deduction.

But it has to start somewhere. And the 14 plus million people who would be covered immediately are, by and large, unable to afford to pay for their own health care protection now.

And, looked at another way, the increase in Social Security taxes is merely advance payment for coverage under the plan for those who will be covered in later years.

NOBODY is saying so out loud right now, but it must be obvious that, if and when the medical care insurance program is enacted, it will be subject to later broadening and improvement.

This, actually, is one of the things the AMA fears and objects to, believing that it ultimately will grow into something resembling the British National Health Service, which they castigate in horror as "socialized medicine."

Well, we too foresee that the program will grow and broaden. But how it grows and how it broadens does not depend on any arbitrary example in Britain or anywhere else. It can be on an entirely different basis, designed purely to meet American needs and desires.

WE'LL never convince our doctor friends, but we think that they ought to recognize the handwriting on the wall, and then adopt the old adage, "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em."

If the medical profession, in a spirit of progress, service and cooperation, would work with the government in making federal health services fit the best possible pattern, both for doctors and patients, they would be doing the nation, and themselves, a big favor.

But the present violent, blind, foot-dragging opposition and obstructionism will work to their own detriment in the long run.—E.A.

Whither Duncan?

There could be a variety of reasons for it, but it seems to us that Bob Duncan is getting into the news a lot more during this session of the legislature than during the last one.

As speaker of the house of representatives, and particularly as one who shattered precedent by being elected for a second consecutive term, he is naturally a good source of news.

But, in addition to the routine kind of news, he's also doing quite a bit of public speaking throughout the state, and in entering the dispute between the Governor and Welfare Commission in the role of compromiser, mediator, and hearing chairman, he took a bold step which could, if he is successful, push his reputation even higher.

DUNCAN has stated, categorically, that he is not planning to run for governor, or for congress.

In this, he undoubtedly is telling the truth—at the moment. He's busy trying to do a job in the house, to keep expenses down, and to get necessary legislation through the legislature speedily and in good shape.

But the fact that he is "not a candidate" at the moment certainly doesn't bar him from becoming one later on, when he sees which way the wind is blowing. And being much in the news will not hinder the "name familiarity" so important to office seekers.

SUCCESSFUL politicians (and we use the phrase in its true meaning, not in a derogatory sense) are, by the nature of things, opportunists. Duncan has been badly bitten by the political bug—the desire to serve his state and nation in public office—and makes no bones about it.

But for him to commit himself, now, to run for anything two years from now would be both silly and useless.

Whatever his decision may be, he will be a formidable candidate. He has a rocklike integrity, a canny Scots attitude of thriftiness in public expenditures, a gift of gab (which he sometimes finds difficult to turn off), keen intelligence, and absolute, tough-minded independence.

His career will be watched with great interest by partisans on both sides of the fence.—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"I COULDN'T SLEEP, SO I THOUGHT I'D PRACTICE MY DRIBBLING!"

Matter of Fact

TIDDLYWINKS WITH THE ESTIMATES

Washington - The first bad bobble of the Kennedy administration has now occurred. In a background talk, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara gave a group of reporters a preview of the estimates that the famous missile gap was a mere myth.

Stories to this effect were published. Whereat the White House condemned the stories as "absolutely wrong."

Behind this mystifying episode, there are two simple sets of facts. First, the Army and Navy have been pressing on Secretary McNamara all their customary arguments that a second-rate nuclear deterrent will be quite good enough—especially if the money saved on the deterrent is then invested in the Army and Navy. And the new Defense Secretary has not yet quite decided that the Army-Navy arguments are incorrect.

Second, and far more important, one of the last efforts of the outgoing Eisenhower administration was yet another game of tiddlywinks with the National Intelligence Estimate. This favorite pastime produced the usual results. The United States was made to look stronger in comparison with the Soviet Union, by the easy and wonderfully inexpensive expedient of downgrading the national estimates of Soviet strength.

IN PARTICULAR, the estimates of Soviet long range missile output, which formerly showed a 3-to-1 Soviet lead in 1961, were fairly sharply downgraded. This was done on the ground that there was no evidence of "a crash program."

Ever since President Eisenhower suspended the U-2 overflights, the entire evidence available to the estimators has been what is public knowledge; plus what can easily be faked to deceive expected listeners, like interceptible communications; plus such data as agents and intelligence officers may run across while ranging through the vast and secret spaces of the Soviet Union.

Among the evidence produced by these means, the estimators found nothing to suggest intensified Soviet missile output. Furthermore, there was no available proof of active construction of more than two Soviet missile-based complexes in Eastern Siberia. Hence the forecasts of Soviet missile output were reduced for the second year in succession, on the same argument—from-lack-of-data that was used last time.

EVEN SO, the revised estimates are not overly comforting. As usual, they offer the defense planners a choice between minimum, medium and maximum figures. If the maximum figure happens to be right, the Soviets will have 600 long range ballistic missiles with thermo-nuclear warheads in operational readiness in 1963.

Unless existing programs are increased, the U. S. will have about 200 ICBMs in firing positions by the end of 1963. Hence the maximum figure in the revised estimate still gives the same Soviet 3-to-1 lead in missile power which was so cheerfully predicted by former Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy, in his testimony admitting the existence of a missile gap. Evidently a missile gap. Evidently a missile gap.

All this needs to be understood, it must be added, for the bleak reason that the whole system of preparing and using the estimates is close to insane. It is this system which has mouse-trapped Secretary McNamara.

THE character of the estimate is also wrong, at least when weapons of total destruction are in question. For in such cases, the policy-makers should request estimates of the most that it seems practicable for the Soviets to do, rather than asking for guesses, however expert, as to what the Soviets are actually doing. And this is doubly true when these guesses quite heavily depend on the argument—from-lack-of-data; and the place where data has not been obtained is the grimly secretive Soviet Union.

Finally, the use made of the estimate is the wrongest thing of all. For the degree of strength this country needs should not be wholly determined by guesses of the enemy's strength. It should be determined by this country's ability to strengthen itself. An unbearable burden will always be placed on the estimators, as long as guesses about the Soviet defense effort are used as the Eisenhower administration used them, as rigid and absolute yardsticks for the American defense effort.

Fortunately, there is significant evidence that President Kennedy and his staff have been aroused to these dangerous defects in the system that mouse-trapped Secretary McNamara. The resulting bobble has in fact produced the first order to study this system with a view to improvement.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

In the Day's News

Newspaper people are a curious lot. They like to know what is going on. They NEED to know what is going on, for their job is to tell their readers what is happening in the world—and WHY. So they tend to bring to their conventions people who can tell them what they need to know.

Among these interesting people is Jorge Zayas, whose Havana newspaper was taken away from him by Castro's henchmen because he refused to print ONLY what he was told to print, and NOTHING more. He told us about it.

QUESTION: Castro's presently complete physical conquest of Cuba be PERMANENT? Not, Editor Zayas believes, if we make it flat and plain that the Monroe Doctrine means exactly what it says. He thinks that if actual, physical occupation of Cuba by communist military forces is prevented the Cuban people will take the situation into their own hands and throw Castro out. Military intervention on our part, he thinks, would be a mistake. Instead, we should give Castro rope enough to hang himself. He told his hearers:

"Every chance should be given Castro to try to prove his claims that he will turn Cuba into a communist paradise. This will give all Cubans and all the peoples of Latin America an opportunity to see for themselves the falsity of his promises."

EDITOR Zayas hazarded an interesting prediction, that when Castro finds he is no longer able to control the growing resistance to him in Cuba he may attempt to seize the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo to create an international incident that might enable him to blame Yankee "imperialism" for his failure to bring to the Cuban people the communist heaven on earth he had promised them.

But Zayas thinks by that time Cuban disillusion with his promises will have proceeded too far and U.S. defense of Guantanamo will not be misunderstood.

WHAT do we need most to do? Well, he thinks we need to REGAIN the confidence of Latin America. We once had it, he says. But it has been shaken. It has been shaken, he thinks, by our preoccupation during the past several decades with the REST of the world and our relative neglect of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. It is as if, he says, you suddenly lost interest in your neighbors in your own block, or your own town, and began to devote all your interest to PEOPLE ELSEWHERE.

IT IS an interesting thought. In recent decades, we HAVE been paying a lot of attention to the rest of the world and comparatively little attention to our close neighbors.

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

SOME DIPLOMATIC APPOINTMENTS

With notable exceptions the Kennedy diplomatic appointments have seemed to experienced observers more conventional and less distinguished than the domestic appointments. There must be a number of interesting reasons for this, not least among them that the field of choice has been much narrower. Our foreign service has not yet recovered fully from the devastation of the McCarthy era and from the sacrifices imposed upon it and the fears engendered among it by the appeasement in the Dulles period of the radical extremists of the right.

Furthermore, it has been quite normal and possible for the leading domestic appointments to have fruitful public careers outside the government service. But there is not much, except to do some teaching and writing and to work for a foundation, which a man interested in foreign affairs can do when his party is out of power. The President has been able to go into the law schools and the departments of government and economics to find men with experience in public affairs who have enriched their knowledge while being out of office.

Nevertheless, it must be said, that there are no fat cats selected for the big posts. There are, however, one or more cases of personal favoritism, there are several cases of men chosen for one job to get them out of a more critical job. But we do not yet know the full story of the Kennedy diplomatic appointments. For what is going to be done to staff the embassies at the second and third levels will make a very big difference in the end.

THIS IS especially important in France. There is no disguising the fact that in view of General de Gaulle's known distaste for the company of Generals, the choice of General Gavin is a strange one. But having just read the relevant portions of General Gavin's book, I can see why this appointment, unpromising at first glance, could possibly turn out to have been a good one. This is because the most critical issue in Franco-American affairs is to reach an understanding about how to modernize and reform the largely obsolescent strategic doctrine of NATO.

General Gavin does not, I am told, speak much French, certainly not the kind of French which would enable him to negotiate in French with General de Gaulle. What is more, General de Gaulle, who can be amiable in English, is the kind of French-

man, the kind of literary Frenchman, who feels that the truth is best stated, perhaps can be stated only, with the precision and the elegance of the French language.

Nevertheless, these two Generals have a common language in that both possess what is so rare in the armed services, truly inquiring and original minds. Both are insiders in the military profession with brilliant military experience. But they are not conventional and conformist, and they are not over impressed by the big brass. It is not impossible that between them they may work out for NATO that new military doctrine which it so sorely needs.

But if General Gavin is to do what he is especially qualified to do in Paris, the Embassy will have to be greatly strengthened to handle other business.

PRE-EMINENT among the notably good appointments are those of Mr. David Bruce to London and Mr. George Kennon to Belgrade. Mr. Bruce has been Ambassador to France, to Germany, and to the Coal and Steel Community, and there is no other American with a comparable knowledge of the crucial problem of Europe. That problem is the schism of Western Europe between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven. The closing of that schism is a primary American interest in Europe, fully as important as, perhaps even more important than, the rejuvenation of NATO.

The return of George Kennon brings back into government service a most perceptive, learned, and distinguished mind. It was a brilliant idea in the State Department to send Mr. Kennon to Yugoslavia. For there is no better place, not even in Moscow itself, to observe what is so very important and so little known—the foreign policy of the Soviet Union within the Communist orbit, with China of course, but also with the smaller Communist states.

The choice of Kenneth Galbraith for India is excellent, provided he can be spared in Washington. And so too, it seems to me, is the choice of Ellsworth Bunker for Brazil. In Italy and in India, where he has served, he has been extremely successful in his quiet, old-fashioned, American way. Then, very high marks are deserved for the choice of Prof. Reischauer for Japan. For with his knowledge not only of the Japanese language but of Japanese history and culture, he should be able to make a kind of contact with the Japanese which has not been achieved by any of his predecessors.

THE decision to keep Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow and Walter Dowling in Bonn is, in view of all that is pending, a wise one. We have no more competent diplomat than

Thompson, none more expert in the art of quiet diplomacy which the President and Secretary Rusk believe in. The time will come, of course, when Thompson will be entitled to a change. Moscow is a hard post for an American, as Washington, no doubt, is a hard post for a Russian.

The trouble with such an inventory as this one is that, in limiting it to the critical posts, it seems to cast a shadow on all the others. That is not my intention. Moreover, there are a lot of appointments still to be made, and many of them will prove to be very important. One of these, for example, could be that of William Attwood to Guinea. In making this choice the Department of State acted with the kind of freshness of mind that is expected of the Kennedy administration.

For Mr. Attwood and his wife, who are entirely fluent in French, are young enough, adventurous enough, and yet from his wide journalistic experience is quite seasoned enough to take a very interesting gamble. The gamble is to see whether Sekou Toure, who is much involved with the Communists, is not at heart, if he is befriended and understood, in the end and after all, an African nationalist.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

shaken. It has been shaken, he thinks, by our preoccupation during the past several decades with the REST of the world and our relative neglect of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. It is as if, he says, you suddenly lost interest in your neighbors in your own block, or your own town, and began to devote all your interest to PEOPLE ELSEWHERE.

IT IS an interesting thought. In recent decades, we HAVE been paying a lot of attention to the rest of the world and comparatively little attention to our close neighbors.

THE decision to keep Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow and Walter Dowling in Bonn is, in view of all that is pending, a wise one. We have no more competent diplomat than

Thompson, none more expert in the art of quiet diplomacy which the President and Secretary Rusk believe in. The time will come, of course, when Thompson will be entitled to a change. Moscow is a hard post for an American, as Washington, no doubt, is a hard post for a Russian.

The trouble with such an inventory as this one is that, in limiting it to the critical posts, it seems to cast a shadow on all the others. That is not my intention. Moreover, there are a lot of appointments still to be made, and many of them will prove to be very important. One of these, for example, could be that of William Attwood to Guinea. In making this choice the Department of State acted with the kind of freshness of mind that is expected of the Kennedy administration.

For Mr. Attwood and his wife, who are entirely fluent in French, are young enough, adventurous enough, and yet from his wide journalistic experience is quite seasoned enough to take a very interesting gamble. The gamble is to see whether Sekou Toure, who is much involved with the Communists, is not at heart, if he is befriended and understood, in the end and after all, an African nationalist.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

shaken. It has been shaken, he thinks, by our preoccupation during the past several decades with the REST of the world and our relative neglect of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. It is as if, he says, you suddenly lost interest in your neighbors in your own block, or your own town, and began to devote all your interest to PEOPLE ELSEWHERE.

IT IS an interesting thought. In recent decades, we HAVE been paying a lot of attention to the rest of the world and comparatively little attention to our close neighbors.

THE decision to keep Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow and Walter Dowling in Bonn is, in view of all that is pending, a wise one. We have no more competent diplomat than

Thompson, none more expert in the art of quiet diplomacy which the President and Secretary Rusk believe in. The time will come, of course, when Thompson will be entitled to a change. Moscow is a hard post for an American, as Washington, no doubt, is a hard post for a Russian.

The trouble with such an inventory as this one is that, in limiting it to the critical posts, it seems to cast a shadow on all the others. That is not my intention. Moreover, there are a lot of appointments still to be made, and many of them will prove to be very important. One of these, for example, could be that of William Attwood to Guinea. In making this choice the Department of State acted with the kind of freshness of mind that is expected of the Kennedy administration.

For Mr. Attwood and his wife, who are entirely fluent in French, are young enough, adventurous enough, and yet from his wide journalistic experience is quite seasoned enough to take a very interesting gamble. The gamble is to see whether Sekou Toure, who is much involved with the Communists, is not at heart, if he is befriended and understood, in the end and after all, an African nationalist.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

The other day there was an editorial on this page entitled "Who Represents Who?" This construction, frowned on by grammatical purists, drew a reproof from an old friend, L.G.W., as follows:

Who Represents Who? I would not know. Would you? "To-whit, to-whit, to-whoo," calls the owl from the old oak tree. Though he looks so wise, he knows no better; He speaks the language of an owl. Who represents who? Maybe him represents he. When the editor drops that letter "m," is he playing like an owl? O, tut, tut, why make a fuss?

We ought to be ashamed of us.

The chiding verse (?) was addressed to the Potluck editor, who turned it over to the fellow that put the headline on that editorial. He looked at it for awhile, drew out an old-fashioned fountain pen, and scribbled furiously for a few moments. This is what he wrote:

Who? Or Whom? The questions rise Like pall of doom before my eyes. Whom or Who? The welkin rings With cries from outraged grammar-jings. We search the rule books, high and low, Consult with references, also. We meet confusion twice compounded. Who or whom? is thrice dumbfounded.

Some will give an iron rule, And he who misses is a fool. Others say with expert grace, It doesn't matter, not a trace.

The one I like above the Gives each a choice; its one hebest Is, "Follow usage," and be sure The one you use will never blur.

Thompson, none more expert in the art of quiet diplomacy which the President and Secretary Rusk believe in. The time will come, of course, when Thompson will be entitled to a change. Moscow is a hard post for an American, as Washington, no doubt, is a hard post for a Russian.

The trouble with such an inventory as this one is that, in limiting it to the critical posts, it seems to cast a shadow on all the others. That is not my intention. Moreover, there are a lot of appointments still to be made, and many of them will prove to be very important. One of these, for example, could be that of William Attwood to Guinea. In making this choice the Department of State acted with the kind of freshness of mind that is expected of the Kennedy administration.

For Mr. Attwood and his wife, who are entirely fluent in French, are young enough, adventurous enough, and yet from his wide journalistic experience is quite seasoned enough to take a very interesting gamble. The gamble is to see whether Sekou Toure, who is much involved with the Communists, is not at heart, if he is befriended and understood, in the end and after all, an African nationalist.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

shaken. It has been shaken, he thinks, by our preoccupation during the past several decades with the REST of the world and our relative neglect of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. It is as if, he says, you suddenly lost interest in your neighbors in your own block, or your own town, and began to devote all your interest to PEOPLE ELSEWHERE.

IT IS an interesting thought. In recent decades, we HAVE been paying a lot of attention to the rest of the world and comparatively little attention to our close neighbors.

THE decision to keep Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow and Walter Dowling in Bonn is, in view of all that is pending, a wise one. We have no more competent diplomat than

Thompson, none more expert in the art of quiet diplomacy which the President and Secretary Rusk believe in. The time will come, of course, when Thompson will be entitled to a change. Moscow is a hard post for an American, as Washington, no doubt, is a hard post for a Russian.

The trouble with such an inventory as this one is that, in limiting it to the critical posts, it seems to cast a shadow on all the others. That is not my intention. Moreover, there are a lot of appointments still to be made, and many of them will prove to be very important. One of these, for example, could be that of William Attwood to Guinea. In making this choice the Department of State acted with the kind of freshness of mind that is expected of the Kennedy administration.

For Mr. Attwood and his wife, who are entirely fluent in French, are young enough, adventurous enough, and yet from his wide journalistic experience is quite seasoned enough to take a very interesting gamble. The gamble is to see whether Sekou Toure, who is much involved with the Communists, is not at heart, if he is befriended and understood, in the end and after all, an African nationalist.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

shaken. It has been shaken, he thinks, by our preoccupation during the past several decades with the REST of the world and our relative neglect of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. It is as if, he says, you suddenly lost interest in your neighbors in your own block, or your own town, and began to devote all your interest to PEOPLE ELSEWHERE.

IT IS an interesting thought. In recent decades, we HAVE been paying a lot of attention to the rest of the world and comparatively little attention to our close neighbors.

THE decision to keep Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow and Walter Dowling in Bonn is, in view of all that is pending, a wise one. We have no more competent diplomat than

Thompson, none more expert in the art of quiet diplomacy which the President and Secretary Rusk believe in. The time will come, of course, when Thompson will be entitled to a change. Moscow is a hard post for an American, as Washington, no doubt, is a hard post for a Russian.

The trouble with such an inventory as this one is that, in limiting it to the critical posts, it seems to cast a shadow on all the others. That is not my intention. Moreover, there are a lot of appointments still to be made, and many of them will prove to be very important. One of these, for example, could be that of William Attwood to Guinea. In making this choice the Department of State acted with the kind of freshness of mind that is expected of the Kennedy administration.

For Mr. Attwood and his wife, who are entirely fluent in French, are young enough, adventurous enough, and yet from his wide journalistic experience is quite seasoned enough to take a very interesting gamble. The gamble is to see whether Sekou Toure, who is much involved with the Communists, is not at heart, if he is befriended and understood, in the end and after all, an African nationalist.

(c) 1961 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

shaken. It has been shaken, he thinks, by our preoccupation during the past several decades with the REST of the world and our relative neglect of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. It is as if, he says, you suddenly lost interest in your neighbors in your own block, or your own town, and began to devote all your interest to PEOPLE ELSEWHERE.

IT IS an interesting thought. In recent decades, we HAVE been paying a lot of attention to the rest of the world and comparatively little attention to our close neighbors.

THE decision to keep Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow and Walter Dowling in Bonn is, in view of all that is pending, a wise one. We have no more competent diplomat than

Thompson, none more expert in the art of quiet diplomacy which the President and Secretary Rusk believe in. The time will come, of course, when Thompson will be entitled to a change. Moscow is a hard post for an American, as Washington, no doubt, is a hard post for a Russian.

The trouble with such an inventory as this one is that, in limiting it to the critical posts, it seems to cast a shadow on all the others. That is not my intention. Moreover, there are a lot of appointments still to be made, and many of them will prove to be very important. One of these, for example, could be that of William Attwood to Guinea. In making this choice the Department of State acted with the kind of freshness of mind that is expected of the Kennedy administration.