

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 23 North First St., Ph. 772-9141

Subscription Rates: By Mail - In Advance, Copy 10c Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$15.00

Advertising Representative: NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES

1962 NEWS PAPER 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: July 29, 1952 (Tuesday) Gene R. Brantley, 339 Mae St., Medford, announces his candidacy for Jackson county judge.

20 YEARS AGO: July 29, 1942 (Wednesday) United States bureau of mines announces it will send engineers to study coal deposits in Medford-Ashland area.

30 YEARS AGO: July 29, 1932 (Friday) Local orchardists, packers and shippers plan cooperative program for unemployment relief in southern Oregon.

40 YEARS AGO: July 29, 1922 (Saturday) Man who was "lynched" by local Ku Klux Klan members returned here from southern California by law enforcement officers to give testimony before grand jury.

50 YEARS AGO: July 29, 1912 (Monday) Combination of 96-degree temperatures and cloudy weather sends humidity soaring in Rogue valley.

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

1. During the Renaissance, what invention caused learning to become widespread?

2. According to St. Paul, what are the abiding virtues?

3. Name two games in which the term "balk" is used.

4. Of what island group is Mindoro one?

5. Do stalactites, or stalagmites, hang from the roof of a limestone cavern?

6. What produces ocean waves?

7. In what part of the world is the island of Trinidad?

8. Were any attempts made to establish colonies in what is now New England before the Pilgrims sailed in 1620?

9. What does the legal term curiae mean?

10. Complete the saying: "I didn't know him from..."

Answers: 1. Invention of printing. 2. Faith, hope and charity. 3. Baseball and billiards. 4. The Philippines. 5. Stalactites. 6. Wind. 7. West Indies. 8. Yes; several. 9. Friend of the court. 10. Adam.

Public Forests and Lumber

The National Forests and the O & C forests belong to the people—all the people—of the United States.

They do not belong solely to loggers. They do not belong solely to graziers. They do not belong solely to picnickers or campers.

The people—all the people—have a stake in how they are managed, how they are used or misused, how they are to be preserved and conserved.

IT IS our firm belief that lumber, as Oregon's No. 1 industry, is of vast importance to our economy. No one denies this. Our criticisms arise from what we believe are short-sighted policies which, in the long run, will damage both the industry and the state's economy.

The lumber industry has always been proud of its record of "free enterprise." Running to the federal government for help now, during a period of economic rough going, gives this tradition a wry twist.

Even the federal government cannot repeal the law of supply and demand—although it can hold it in abeyance for a while; witness the farm program. One hopes lumbermen don't wind up in the same fix as the farmers.

WE VIEW askance the increase in the allowable cut on the O & C forests by 150 million board feet per year. It may be the increase is justified and needed, but if so the decision should be made on the basis of the public interest and good forest management practices, not as a result of political pressures applied by a "depressed" industry.

The lumber industry's complaints boil down to low prices for lumber, high prices for stumpage, competition from Canada, and not enough available timber.

How putting an extra 150,000,000 board feet of lumber on the market is going to increase lumber prices, or decrease stumpage prices or ameliorate competition, escapes us.

LOW lumber prices result from low demand and ample supplies.

High prices for stumpage result from competitive bidding by the lumbermen themselves.

Canadian competition in a narrow market undoubtedly hurts. But competitive materials—glass, aluminum, steel, masonry and plastics—hurt just as much or more.

Blaming the ills of the lumber industry on the federal government, and specifically on the Forest Service, is simply refusing to acknowledge some of the economic facts of life.

THE Forest Service's responsibility is to the entire public, and not solely to the lumberman. A recent New York Times editorial entitled "Selling Public Timber," said:

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has announced that more sawtimber is being logged in the National Forests than in any previous period in history, and that the Forest Service has reduced appraised stumpage prices substantially in a "great effort" to help timber purchasers and counteract the depressed conditions of the industry.

We hope the Secretary will keep in mind two facts. One is that the timber he is selling belongs to the public, and the public has a stake in the stumpage prices. The other is that the purposes for which the National Forests were established are broader than the subsidization of the timber industry.

As with every major industry, the lumber manufacturer has experienced periods of over-supply, competition, and recession, as well as prosperity. If the idea becomes fixed that it is the Forest Service's duty to come to the rescue of the industry whenever it is in trouble, it will be difficult to draw the line when the loggers demand access to vital watersheds and wilderness areas. By its opposition to the Wilderness Bill, which proposes to reserve only 8 per cent of the total area of the National Forests for the conservation of scenic and recreational resources, the industry has demonstrated it would not hesitate to demand such access.

LUMBER industry spokesmen pay lip service to the idea of sustained yield and resulting allowable cuts, just as they pay lip service to the idea of wilderness.

One wonders just how deeply committed they are to either. They've certainly tried every way they know how to knife the wilderness bill.

And the pressures such as are being brought on both the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management for increased allowable cuts cause one to wonder if many of them wouldn't just as soon knife the sustained yield principle, too, for the sake of a fast buck now, and to heck with the future.

When we say "lumber industry" obviously we are employing a generalization, for we know personally many highly responsible, thoughtful and sincere lumbermen who are dedicated to true conservation principles.

But many, too many, ignore or disdain the public service and public responsibility aspects of their business, and as long as they're making money, the public interest can go hang.

AS WE see it, here are some basic facts: During the war and shortly afterward, when pent-up demand for lumber was high, lumber mills were built to satisfy this demand. Many fortunes were made quickly. Today, with demand down and competition cutting into the market, there are more mills than can be justified by the market.

Oversupply will not be cured by putting more lumber on the market.

Stumpage prices will not go down until lumbermen stop bidding them so high.

And the federal agencies must be encouraged to resist mounting pressures for actions not in accord with sound forest management nor with the larger public interest.—E.A.

"Direct From Across The Ocean—Ain't That Nice!"



In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Dog Days news: Up in Seattle Dr. William Glasser, a consulting psychiatrist, tells a convention of the National Institute on Crime and Delinquency:

"The proper way to handle a juvenile delinquent is NOT to probe into his subconscious to find out why he broke the law, but to tell him he DID WRONG and warn him not to do it again."

He added: "The more delinquents are convinced that they are emotionally disturbed, and have good reason to be so, the worse they will act."

HMMMMMMMM. It's never easy to understand what a psychiatrist is saying, especially when he is talking to other psychiatrists, but Dr. Glasser seems to be going back to an earlier day when children starting to school were told: "Remember this: If you get a lickin' at school, you'll get another one when you get home."

AS I recall it, that particular approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency tended to discourage actions and activities that might result in a lickin' at school. Maybe that's what Dr. Glasser is trying to say.

THERE'S another old maxim that seems to be falling into disuse in these modern days. It goes like this: "Spare the rod and spoil the child."

THAT one goes a long way back. In the late 15th century, John Skelton, who received the title of Poet Laureate from both Oxford and Cambridge universities and held an unofficial position as Laureate under Henry VIII, put it this way:

"There is nothynge that more displeaseth God Than for their children to spare the rod."

THEN— In the early 1600's— Samuel Butler, in his Hudibras, wrote: "Love is a boy by poets styled; 'They spare the rod and spoil the child.'"

AH, me! How times do change! In these days, the psychiatrists get together to talk about the "hidden dangers of emotional disturbances." Maybe it's small wonder we have juvenile problems.

THE REAL question is why a large part of the public has become, in Senator Goldwater's sense of the word, conservative. The primary reasons are, I believe, earthy, not high-falutin and ideological.

The antagonism to government, which at the extreme is rancorous, has its main source in resentment against taxes, especially the visible direct taxes, levied to pay for a huge military establishment and for the civil welfare and development programs of the federal, state, and local governments. The tax bite is resented because it hurts, and it hurts because we have for some years been paying for defense, welfare, and development out of a sluggish economy.

The hurt expresses itself in a general feeling that government, especially the Washington government, is a kind of enemy alien, and that it should be cut down to size.

THE resentment over the tax bite is aggravated by the chiseling and the corruption and the injustices which turn up in the administration of the big spending program—defense contracts, farm price supports, stockpiling, unemployment relief, public assistance, etc. Even though the scandals are on the fringes, there are enough big and little scandals in almost every town and village to nourish the feeling that government is not only an enemy, but that it is a corrupter of the people's morals.

These are the main sources of the opposition to big government and big spending. This opposition cannot, I believe, be overcome by trying to win the votes of the beneficiaries of a welfare measure like medicare. Indeed, such concentration on welfare measures obscures and distorts the meaning of Kennedy's election and of the New Frontier. Medicare, for example, is highly desirable. But it should not be made the crucial issue on which

Washington Report

By William S. White

TELSTAR DISSENT: Washington—Permit me small and sour dissenting note in the chorus of praise for progress which has followed the success of the satellite Telstar. Telstar has made it possible, and even inevitable, for the whole world to draw together, right enough. And it enables television programs to leap the oceans in all manner of languages. But it is also by way of making the whole world a goldfish bowl to the coldly peering eye of this coldly unhuman device which many of us nonscientific types cannot understand anyhow.

Beyond doubt, it has enormously extended the science of communication. But is this always and necessarily good? One widely held theory is that the more people and nations "understand" each other, the less likely they are to fall into such incivilities as war. The notion is an attractive one, but to this columnist it does not seem to stand up too well in the rude glare of the light of reality.

THE science of communication has infinitely improved since, say, 1900. But the more it has improved, the sadder has become the state of this old earth. Two world wars and now a seemingly endless cold war have befallen man in precisely the period in which he has presumably been far better able to understand all is to forgive man than he used to be.

There is much to be said for the old maxim that to understand all is to forgive all. But there is also something to be said for another maxim: To understand all is, sometimes, to find oneself in the position where forgiveness is the very last thing that comes to mind.

And it is at least questionable anyhow whether men are really better informed than they used to be. Unquestionably they are in possession of much more information of a sort. Unquestionably also, however, a good deal of

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE STALLED PROGRAM: The Republicans are, I believe, right when they say that in his relations with Congress the President's problem is how to rally to his domestic program the large Democratic majorities in both Houses. More over this problem will remain in November the Democrats have a success in that they do not lose any seats, and even if they have a triumph and capture five or ten Republican seats. I do not see how it can be doubted that the resistance in Congress, which involves about a third of the Democrats and about all the Republicans, rests on powerful and stubborn feelings among the voters.

Nobody knows, I suppose, what is the actual division of the voters between those who want the reforms and innovations and those who do not want any more federal spending and federal activity. The resistance must, I should guess, be near to half the voters. For it is, I believe, an unwritten rule of our constitution that important reforms and innovations will fail unless they command at least a two-thirds majority.

THE REAL question is why a large part of the public has become, in Senator Goldwater's sense of the word, conservative. The primary reasons are, I believe, earthy, not high-falutin and ideological.

The antagonism to government, which at the extreme is rancorous, has its main source in resentment against taxes, especially the visible direct taxes, levied to pay for a huge military establishment and for the civil welfare and development programs of the federal, state, and local governments. The tax bite is resented because it hurts, and it hurts because we have for some years been paying for defense, welfare, and development out of a sluggish economy.

The hurt expresses itself in a general feeling that government, especially the Washington government, is a kind of enemy alien, and that it should be cut down to size.

THE resentment over the tax bite is aggravated by the chiseling and the corruption and the injustices which turn up in the administration of the big spending program—defense contracts, farm price supports, stockpiling, unemployment relief, public assistance, etc. Even though the scandals are on the fringes, there are enough big and little scandals in almost every town and village to nourish the feeling that government is not only an enemy, but that it is a corrupter of the people's morals.

These are the main sources of the opposition to big government and big spending. This opposition cannot, I believe, be overcome by trying to win the votes of the beneficiaries of a welfare measure like medicare. Indeed, such concentration on welfare measures obscures and distorts the meaning of Kennedy's election and of the New Frontier. Medicare, for example, is highly desirable. But it should not be made the crucial issue on which

the fate of the administration is staked.

The crucial issue in 1960 between the Democrats and President Eisenhower turned on the charge that the American position and influence in the world needed to be reinforced and that, to do this, the American economy would need to be revived. The primary goals of the Kennedy administration were to make the country stronger for war and for peace, and the key to that greater strength was to turn a stagnant economy into a moving economy.

ON MONDAY at his press conference the President confessed that his administration had "not been able to develop an economic formula" to increase the rate of economic growth.

Why not? Not because a formula cannot be found. There are several variants of the formula being applied successfully in Western Europe today. The formula has not been found because it calls for measures which the conservative opposition rejects absolutely. Thus the sluggish economy, burdened down by the great expenditures for defense, welfare, and development, produces a conservative mood in the country. The conservative mood in its turn prevents the administration from adopting a formula to overcome the sluggishness of the economy. The fact that we are not moving increases the will to stand pat.

There is, of course, only one way in which the President can induce the Congress to give him the measures to get the economy moving. That is by going to the people and persuading large numbers of them that in a revived and dynamic economy lies their best and their only hope of carrying comfortably the necessary burden of defense and the inescapable burden of welfare and development in our rapidly changing society.

With Gorbach, Khrushchev talked about Berlin in much the same way that Gromyko did with Rusk. He too failed to name a date for the peace treaty that may precipitate the final super-crisis over Berlin; but he swore he would sign the treaty before very long. Much more disquieting-

ly, Khrushchev also argued, with seeming conviction, that the U.S. and the other nations lacked the guts to fight for Berlin if directly challenged.

From this Khrushchev-Gorbach meeting originated the widening ripples of renewed alarm about the next stage of the Berlin crisis, which have recently been noticeable in Western policy-making circles. Since June 29, moreover, the alarm has been intensified by certain actions of the Soviet high command in East Germany.

ALONG the crucial autobahn connecting Berlin with East Germany, concrete encroachments have been constructed which will make it easier to strangle traffic or to halt it completely. More recently, Soviet air activity has also increased in the air corridors to Berlin.

For these and other reasons, the majority of Western policymakers are now grimly resigning themselves to an early end of the long lull in the Berlin crisis. They are beginning to believe, in fact, that Khrushchev and those around him have made up their minds to proceed to the final, acutely dangerous test of nerve and will at Berlin.

The U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, Llewellyn Thompson, was reporting all through the winter and spring that the Soviet government appeared to be engaged in an internal debate about alternative courses of action.

The origin of this Kremlin debate, beyond much doubt, was the American response to Khrushchev's Vienna ultimatum, requiring a Berlin settlement on his terms before the end of last year. President Kennedy answered the ultimatum by calling 300,000 men to the colors; and the Vienna ultimatum was finally withdrawn, when Khrushchev announced that he had not really meant to set a time-limit for a Berlin settlement.

AS TO the nature of the Kremlin debate, there is equally little room for doubt. The main argument must have turned on the point, whether it was safe or unsafe to go the limit in challenging the Western powers at Berlin. And the argument about risks must also have been somewhat deformed, so to say, by the deep commitment of Khrushchev's personal prestige to an eventual defeat of the West, resulting from a Berlin settlement on his own terms.

If Khrushchev genuinely believed what he told Chancellor Gorbach, the Kremlin debate has ended with a dangerous downgrading of the Berlin risk. Judging by the other signs already noted, the Kremlin debate has also ended with a decision to go the limit, or at any rate, to go pretty nearly to the limit, in challenging the Western powers at Berlin.

Thus the super-crisis which the Berlin crisis has always threatened to produce may well be produced in deadly earnest before the end of this year. The perils of this possible development are all the greater, because Khrushchev has apparently taken his decision on the basis of a gross miscalculation of Western intentions. Altogether, as the President remarked in his reply to the Vienna ultimatum, "it looks like a cold winter."

Among the illusions to which Argentina and Peru have given the coup de grace, one may hope, is the illusion that since the war it has been American "support" of reactionary and dictatorial regimes that has prevented many peoples from progressing economically in democratic stability. For we have "supported" a long list of democratically inclined regimes, including those in post-Rhee Korea, Burma, Pakistan, Turkey, Sudan, Ghana, Batista Cuba, Ecuador, Argentina and Peru, only to see them fall under military and/or dictatorial rule. Nor are Brazil, Chile or even Venezuela out of danger.

But what matters is what we now say and do in respect to Latin America. We must no longer talk about the Alliance for Progress in the cheer-leading accents of an emergency task force which can, and in a few years, peaceably manage from Washington, D.C., a massive social revolution among 200 million people who must, in hard truth, double their real income in the next 30 years even to maintain their present miserable standards of life—so explosive is their population increase. We cannot continue to talk this way because the inevitable disillusionment will be too harsh.

Peru has made clear to the semi-informed that Argentina, many weeks ago, had already made clear to the well-informed, this is, first of all, that exterior influences in the form of American economic threats or economic promise cannot determine the internal course of events in Latin countries to anywhere near the degree we have so fondly thought they could.

Argentina stands at the top of the Latin American list in literacy and close to the top

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

KHRUSHCHEV'S GRIM CHOICE: Washington—The recent Rusk-Gromyko talks in Geneva were ominously different in tone, both from the earlier conversations between the Secretary of State and the Soviet Foreign Minister, and from the related exchanges between Rusk, Kennedy, and the Soviet Ambassador here, Anatoly Dobrynin.

In these earlier explorations of the unending Berlin crisis, the Russians were unyielding on points of substance but sweetly reasonable in language. At Geneva, however, Gromyko abruptly reverted to the Hitler-style language that Nikita S. Khrushchev used to the President at Vienna in 1961.

The crude menaces, the hectoring boasts, the arrogant insistence on the Soviets' right to change the Berlin position by unilateral action—all the elements made familiar by the Vienna meeting were present at Geneva, excepting only one. Unlike Khrushchev at Vienna, Gromyko at Geneva refrained from naming a date for Soviet signature of a separate peace treaty with the Kremlin's East German puppets.

FURTHERMORE, what happened at Geneva was only a climactic episode in a process that began over a month ago. To be specific, the process began on June 29, when the Chancellor of Austria, Adolphs Gorbach, was received by Khrushchev during a state visit to Moscow.

With Gorbach, Khrushchev talked about Berlin in much the same way that Gromyko did with Rusk. He too failed to name a date for the peace treaty that may precipitate the final super-crisis over Berlin; but he swore he would sign the treaty before very long. Much more disquieting-

ly, Khrushchev also argued, with seeming conviction, that the U.S. and the other nations lacked the guts to fight for Berlin if directly challenged.

From this Khrushchev-Gorbach meeting originated the widening ripples of renewed alarm about the next stage of the Berlin crisis, which have recently been noticeable in Western policy-making circles. Since June 29, moreover, the alarm has been intensified by certain actions of the Soviet high command in East Germany.

ALONG the crucial autobahn connecting Berlin with East Germany, concrete encroachments have been constructed which will make it easier to strangle traffic or to halt it completely. More recently, Soviet air activity has also increased in the air corridors to Berlin.

For these and other reasons, the majority of Western policymakers are now grimly resigning themselves to an early end of the long lull in the Berlin crisis. They are beginning to believe, in fact, that Khrushchev and those around him have made up their minds to proceed to the final, acutely dangerous test of nerve and will at Berlin.

The U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, Llewellyn Thompson, was reporting all through the winter and spring that the Soviet government appeared to be engaged in an internal debate about alternative courses of action.

The origin of this Kremlin debate, beyond much doubt, was the American response to Khrushchev's Vienna ultimatum, requiring a Berlin settlement on his terms before the end of last year. President Kennedy answered the ultimatum by calling 300,000 men to the colors; and the Vienna ultimatum was finally withdrawn, when Khrushchev announced that he had not really meant to set a time-limit for a Berlin settlement.

AS TO the nature of the Kremlin debate, there is equally little room for doubt. The main argument must have turned on the point, whether it was safe or unsafe to go the limit in challenging the Western powers at Berlin. And the argument about risks must also have been somewhat deformed, so to say, by the deep commitment of Khrushchev's personal prestige to an eventual defeat of the West, resulting from a Berlin settlement on his own terms.

If Khrushchev genuinely believed what he told Chancellor Gorbach, the Kremlin debate has ended with a dangerous downgrading of the Berlin risk. Judging by the other signs already noted, the Kremlin debate has also ended with a decision to go the limit, or at any rate, to go pretty nearly to the limit, in challenging the Western powers at Berlin.

Thus the super-crisis which the Berlin crisis has always threatened to produce may well be produced in deadly earnest before the end of this year. The perils of this possible development are all the greater, because Khrushchev has apparently taken his decision on the basis of a gross miscalculation of Western intentions. Altogether, as the President remarked in his reply to the Vienna ultimatum, "it looks like a cold winter."

Among the illusions to which Argentina and Peru have given the coup de grace, one may hope, is the illusion that since the war it has been American "support" of reactionary and dictatorial regimes that has prevented many peoples from progressing economically in democratic stability. For we have "supported" a long list of democratically inclined regimes, including those in post-Rhee Korea, Burma, Pakistan, Turkey, Sudan, Ghana, Batista Cuba, Ecuador, Argentina and Peru, only to see them fall under military and/or dictatorial rule. Nor are Brazil, Chile or even Venezuela out of danger.

But what matters is what we now say and do in respect to Latin America. We must no longer talk about the Alliance for Progress in the cheer-leading accents of an emergency task force which can, and in a few years, peaceably manage from Washington, D.C., a massive social revolution among 200 million people who must, in hard truth, double their real income in the next 30 years even to maintain their present miserable standards of life—so explosive is their population increase. We cannot continue to talk this way because the inevitable disillusionment will be too harsh.

Peru has made clear to the semi-informed that Argentina, many weeks ago, had already made clear to the well-informed, this is, first of all, that exterior influences in the form of American economic threats or economic promise cannot determine the internal course of events in Latin countries to anywhere near the degree we have so fondly thought they could.

Argentina stands at the top of the Latin American list in literacy and close to the top

Among the illusions to which Argentina and Peru have given the coup de grace, one may hope, is the illusion that since the war it has been American "support" of reactionary and dictatorial regimes that has prevented many peoples from progressing economically in democratic stability. For we have "supported" a long list of democratically inclined regimes, including those in post-Rhee Korea, Burma, Pakistan, Turkey, Sudan, Ghana, Batista Cuba, Ecuador, Argentina and Peru, only to see them fall under military and/or dictatorial rule. Nor are Brazil, Chile or even Venezuela out of danger.

But what matters is what we now say and do in respect to Latin America. We must no longer talk about the Alliance for Progress in the cheer-leading accents of an emergency task force which can, and in a few years, peaceably manage from Washington, D.C., a massive social revolution among 200 million people who must, in hard truth, double their real income in the next 30 years even to maintain their present miserable standards of life—so explosive is their population increase. We cannot continue to talk this way because the inevitable disillusionment will be too harsh.

Peru has made clear to the semi-informed that Argentina, many weeks ago, had already made clear to the well-informed, this is, first of all, that exterior influences in the form of American economic threats or economic promise cannot determine the internal course of events in Latin countries to anywhere near the degree we have so fondly thought they could.

Argentina stands at the top of the Latin American list in literacy and close to the top

Among the illusions to which Argentina and Peru have given the coup de grace, one may hope, is the illusion that since the war it has been American "support" of reactionary and dictatorial regimes that has prevented many peoples from progressing economically in democratic stability. For we have "supported" a long list of democratically inclined regimes, including those in post-Rhee Korea, Burma, Pakistan, Turkey, Sudan, Ghana, Batista Cuba, Ecuador, Argentina and Peru, only to see them fall under military and/or dictatorial rule. Nor are Brazil, Chile or even Venezuela out of danger.

But what matters is what we now say and do in respect to Latin America. We must no longer talk about the Alliance for Progress in the cheer-leading accents of an emergency task force which can, and in a few years, peaceably manage from Washington, D.C., a massive social revolution among 200 million people who must, in hard truth, double their real income in the next 30 years even to maintain their present miserable standards of life—so explosive is their population increase. We cannot continue to talk this way because the inevitable disillusionment will be too harsh.

Peru has made clear to the semi-informed that Argentina, many weeks ago, had already made clear to the well-informed, this is, first of all, that exterior influences in the form of American economic threats or economic promise cannot determine the internal course of events in Latin countries to anywhere near the degree we have so fondly thought they could.

Argentina stands at the top of the Latin American list in literacy and close to the top

Among the illusions to which Argentina and Peru have given the coup de grace, one may hope, is the illusion that since the war it has been American "support" of reactionary and dictatorial regimes that has prevented many peoples from progressing economically in democratic stability. For we have "supported" a long list of democratically inclined regimes, including those in post-Rhee Korea, Burma, Pakistan, Turkey, Sudan, Ghana, Batista Cuba, Ecuador, Argentina and Peru, only to see them fall under military and/or dictatorial rule. Nor are Brazil, Chile or even Venezuela out of danger.

But what matters is what we now say and do in respect to Latin America. We must no longer talk about the Alliance for Progress in the cheer-leading accents of an emergency task force which can, and in a few years, peaceably manage from Washington, D.C., a massive social revolution among 200 million people who must, in hard truth, double their real income in the next 30 years even to maintain their present miserable standards of life—so explosive is their population increase. We cannot continue to talk this way because the inevitable disillusionment will be too harsh.

Peru has made clear to the semi-informed that Argentina, many weeks ago, had already made clear to the well-informed, this is, first of all, that exterior influences in the form of American economic threats or economic promise cannot determine the internal course of events in Latin countries to anywhere near the degree we have so fondly thought they could.

Argentina stands at the top of the Latin American list in literacy and close to the top

Among the illusions to which Argentina and Peru have given the coup de grace, one may hope, is the illusion that since the war it has been American "support" of reactionary and dictatorial regimes that has prevented many peoples from progressing economically in democratic stability. For we have "supported" a long list of democratically inclined regimes, including those in post-Rhee Korea, Burma, Pakistan, Turkey, Sudan, Ghana, Batista Cuba, Ecuador, Argentina and Peru, only to see them fall under military and/or dictatorial rule. Nor are Brazil, Chile or even Venezuela out of danger.

But what matters is what we now say and do in respect to Latin America. We must no longer talk about the Alliance for Progress in the cheer-leading accents of an emergency task force which can, and in a few years, peaceably manage from Washington, D.C., a massive social revolution among 200 million people who must, in hard truth, double their real income in the next 30 years even to maintain their present miserable standards of life—so explosive is their population increase. We cannot continue to talk this way because the inevitable disillusionment will be too harsh.

Peru has made clear to the semi-informed that Argentina, many weeks ago, had already made clear to the well-informed, this is, first of all, that exterior influences in the form of American economic threats or economic promise cannot determine the internal course of events in Latin countries to anywhere near the degree we have so fondly thought they could.