

Trail Rules Sensible

The Bureau of Land Management has, as many expected, issued regulations for the use of the recently-improved Rogue River trail which ban the use of both motorized vehicles and horses.

The regulations make sense. We certainly are not in favor of a universal ban on horses or scooters in the nation's forests and other public lands. But in some cases, such a prohibition is decidedly in order. The Rogue River trail is one of these.

IT MAY COME as a blow to scooter or horse enthusiasts to find themselves unwelcome. But the nature of the area in question admits of no other course.

The valleys and gorges along the Rogue are narrow, and the soil itself, in many places, is susceptible to erosion. The campsites are relatively small, and in spots the trail is quite narrow. Both horses' hooves and scooters' tires contribute to soil erosion dangers, to say nothing of discommoding hikers on the trail. Horses need forage, and it is limited in this area. Too, the obvious unpleasantness—and outright danger—of the indiscriminate depositing of horse manure, with its attendant smell and flies, adds to the logic of the order.

THERE ARE, in the west, vast stretches of land, much of it beautifully forested and with lakes and streams, which can be used by vehicles and stock without danger or inconvenience to others.

By the same token, there are areas which by their very nature should be reserved to hikers and fishermen. The Rogue trail is one of these. If it were not for increased population, and increased use of the outdoors by more and more people, the regulations would be unnecessary. But as population and outdoor usage increases, more rules and regulations and prohibitions become necessary, simply to protect people from each other. — E. A.

For an End to Cruelty

The current session of Congress, faced with such vital matters as the test ban treaty, civil rights legislation, tax reform and reduction, railroad strike legislation, and others of significance, has shown no hurry on doing a job on any of them.

In the field of lesser legislation, too, it has written a record that leaves much to be desired. One such measure which surely merits enactment is one to guard against needless cruelty to animals used in scientific experiments. Several bills to this end are now in committee.

DON'T misunderstand. We are not calling for an end to experimentation on animals, for some of the most significant and important discoveries in the past century have come from them. We are no anti-vivisectionist. But it has been amply documented that cruelty to animals which is wholly unnecessary and gratuitous does indeed exist in some scientific laboratories, either the result of neglect, or of simple carelessness.

Great Britain has a humane treatment law which dates well into the last century, and it has not hampered legitimate animal experimentation. Surely this country is at least as concerned over animals who cannot speak on their own behalf as is Britain.

THIS IS A live subject to many people. Cleveland Amory, writing in the Saturday Review, says a piece he wrote on the need for humane legislation in this field drew more response than any other in his memory. A later article by him in the Saturday Evening Post has also drawn much attention.

There is no excuse for the present situation, which permits cruelty—either for cruelty's sake (rarely, one hopes), or by thoughtless inadvertence or a "don't care" attitude.

We hope Congress can bestir itself this year, not only to enact legislation vital to the country's needs, but also to remove a blot of shame which a simple piece of tested legislation could do. — E. A.

Trilogy Nominated

Yesterday we inquired editorially what our readers would nominate as the American novel which would best represent the United States to a foreign reader.

One of the first responses came from a member of our own staff who, after brief reflection, said this:

"I'd pick, I think, Dos Passos' U.S.A. trilogy. No one book, probably, is going to catch the American spirit or dream adequately because our people have been in a constant state of flux and transition. (This gives historians fits.)

"U.S.A., however, is valuable NOW for export because it documents—in a not altogether successful style—the social and economic struggles that broke us loose from the 19th century and enable us to be where we are (?) in the mid-20th century.

"Old Man of the Sea" is, granted, a miniature classic, but there is nothing American about it in the slightest. The virtues of the old fisherman are common to all nationalities."

"Any agreements? Any disagreements? Or added nominations? — E. A."



"It's a good thing nature provided us with vast, open spaces. Where else would we throw our junk?"

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.

Social Idiocy To The Editor: Why should the jobless worker stand in line for long hours to demean himself before some bureaucrat in order to qualify for a "dol"? He feels this degradation keenly. If he exhausts his unemployment compensation and goes on relief the humiliation to which he is subjected is many times worse. His private affairs are prided into. He and his family are regimented in a kind of purgatory of poverty that erodes his manhood.

In America we have everything it takes to make our country a veritable paradise. We have an abundance of skilled, technical and scientific labor. We have the tools. We have the raw materials. In short, we have the physical means with which to produce abundance for all. But what stands in the way is the outmoded system of private ownership of industry and the workers' failure to see themselves for what they are under this system—namely, wage slaves, enslaved as a class to the capitalists as a class.

The solution to the problem of unemployment is not a complicated one. If, instead of being owned privately and operated to produce things for sale and profit, the industries were owned socially—that is, collectively by all the people, and operated to produce things for use, there could be no such thing as involuntary idleness.

Instead of kicking workers out of jobs, automation would shorten the work day, work week and work year, and at the same time vastly increase material well-being. Technological progress would no longer be something for workers to fear, but an unequalled blessing that would insure abundance and leisure for all to enjoy.

Production for use, combined with a system under which each worker receives directly and indirectly, all that he produces, would end forever the social idiosyncrasy of want in the midst of plenty.

Lydia Burnham 814 Warne St. Prescott, Ariz.

Memorial Co-Op To The Editor: I have sent the following letter to the editor of the Capitol Press in Salem, who recently reprinted an editorial of yours:

You are to be commended for reprinting the guest editorial "Rites of Death"; the editor of the Medford Mail Tribune and likewise the minister who urged his congregation to read the Atlantic magazine article entitled "The Undertakers' Racket" by Jessica Mitford—all are to be commended.

We thought you might be interested in an organization that has served the people of Yamhill county for almost 30 years, incorporated under the name Yamhill County Cooperative Funeral Home, but popularly called by the members "The Memorial Service Cooperative" or simply "The Co-Op."

The \$10 membership fee entitles a person to the benefits of the organization in the event of the death of any person for whom the member is financially responsible. The financial savings amount to approximately 500 per cent of the membership fee for each service required.

However, not the least benefit from belonging to the "Co-Op" is the fellowship of like-minded people and the assistance that members get in pre-planning.

This is not a group of droopy-chin dispensers of gloom. Once each Fall we hold the annual turkey dinner with movies or other entertainment. In February an all-

day business meeting is held, with the morning session given to social and educational features, potluck dinner at noon, and business matters in the afternoon.

In the early Summer comes another social evening—potluck dinner and entertainment numbers. Some of the people drive good distances to be present. A real good feeling exists. Since we have been working together for many years the dinner chores are handled by experienced members who count it a pleasure.

Speakers have been ministers, authorities on wills, heart specialists, historians, farm leaders, etc. One minister gave up a motto: "Do all these things in preparation for your death—then postpone it as long as you can!"

Paul Youngman Route 2, Box 127 McMinnville, Ore.

Kids and Crops To The Editor: I notice that the pear growers of Jackson county are greatly concerned about not being able to get outside help to harvest their crop.

I would like to mention to these growers what the State of Maine potato growers do to obtain the extra help at harvest time.

Aroostook county, Maine, as most people know, grows about 50 million bushels per year. It is not uncommon for one farmer to grow 500 acres or more. Their harvest season being about a month to six weeks, does of course, require a tremendous amount of outside help.

While visiting there last fall during the harvest season, I noticed hundreds of school children out in the fields picking potatoes.

Six-Months-Old Franco-German Treaty Already Showing Signs of Disruption

By JOSEPH W. GRIGG United Press International Paris—The six-months old French-German alliance is taking a heavy beating.

Many Frenchmen are asking seriously if much of it is left at all. The treaty was signed at the Elysee Palace here on Jan. 22 by President Charles de Gaulle of France and West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. It was sealed by a kiss between Europe's two "grand old men."

Its aim was to end centuries of bloodshed between the two nations that had been pinpointed by history as the "traditional enemies" of Western Europe. In place of fighting each other they were to work together in future as close allies.

But the ink was hardly dry on their signatures when De Gaulle began to find the treaty was not everything he had hoped for.

Adenauer made no secret of the fact that he did not support De Gaulle's veto against Great Britain's admission into the European Common Market.

Then the West Germans refused to bow to De Gaulle's demands that they should bring their farm prices down to the level of those in France to make possible an agreement on a joint agricultural policy for the Common Market.

The farm price dispute still simmers between the two allies. West Germany plumped enthusiastically for President Kennedy's plan for an integrated multinational nuclear force inside the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). De Gaulle flatly rejected it.

When Kennedy visited West Germany and West Berlin in June he received an overwhelmingly spontaneous ovation from the German people that made De Gaulle's visit to Bonn soon afterwards something of a letdown.

Then the Germans refused to cooperate with the French in production of a European tank. Instead, they agreed to a joint tank development program with the United States.

Last week end Adenauer punched still another hole in what was to have been his solid policy front with De Gaulle. He decided to sign the Moscow nuclear test ban pact, although De Gaulle has refused to do so and had urged him not to.

Overnight, the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will take on a fuller meaning for us all. Overnight, half the restrooms in the South can be shut down for good, a savings in millions for the many Southern depressed areas. Overnight, everybody will be dyeing for superiority, for it has always proved a more rousing cause in human history than mere quality.

So all that remains is to ask what shade of Blue we should dye ourselves. Personally, I feel the question crucial. You know how the ladies are. Moreover, we must think of the effects. Would Baby Blue, for example, make us look infantile? Would Royal Blue bring out latent monarchist tendencies in our leaders? Indigo, perhaps; Azure? Cerulean?

After considerable thought, I put this crucial question to that realistic, hard-headed practical thinker, Mr. Dunlap. He hesitated not an eyelash's bat. "True Blue!" he snapped.

Ah, what genius. Production has begun. The dye vat is a-bubbling. And any day now we will at long last enter that new and happy era of equality in which everybody will become a True Blue American. Just like that.

So remember our motto: If you want to feel superior because of the color of your skin, go jump in a vat.

It's a vivid solution. For the basic problem, of course, is superiority. Everybody has to feel superior to somebody. So the Whites, like Mr. Barnett, enjoy feeling superior to the Blacks. And the Blacks, like Mr. Malcolm X, enjoy feeling superior to the Whites.

But blue! Blue is unarguably a color superior to both. It has brilliance, luster, depth. In a word, it has class.

Thus, once everybody is Blue, everybody will feel superior. And all of us Blues can go around saying now su-

perior we are to BOTH the Whites and the Blacks. Which will automatically double our superiority right there. Nor will we hurt anyone's feelings, for there won't be any Blacks or Whites left whose feelings might be hurt.

Overnight, the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will take on a fuller meaning for us all. Overnight, half the restrooms in the South can be shut down for good, a savings in millions for the many Southern depressed areas. Overnight, everybody will be dyeing for superiority, for it has always proved a more rousing cause in human history than mere quality.

So all that remains is to ask what shade of Blue we should dye ourselves. Personally, I feel the question crucial. You know how the ladies are. Moreover, we must think of the effects. Would Baby Blue, for example, make us look infantile? Would Royal Blue bring out latent monarchist tendencies in our leaders? Indigo, perhaps; Azure? Cerulean?

After considerable thought, I put this crucial question to that realistic, hard-headed practical thinker, Mr. Dunlap. He hesitated not an eyelash's bat. "True Blue!" he snapped.

Ah, what genius. Production has begun. The dye vat is a-bubbling. And any day now we will at long last enter that new and happy era of equality in which everybody will become a True Blue American. Just like that.

So remember our motto: If you want to feel superior because of the color of your skin, go jump in a vat.

It's a vivid solution. For the basic problem, of course, is superiority. Everybody has to feel superior to somebody. So the Whites, like Mr. Barnett, enjoy feeling superior to the Blacks. And the Blacks, like Mr. Malcolm X, enjoy feeling superior to the Whites.

But blue! Blue is unarguably a color superior to both. It has brilliance, luster, depth. In a word, it has class.

Thus, once everybody is Blue, everybody will feel superior. And all of us Blues can go around saying now su-

perior we are to BOTH the Whites and the Blacks. Which will automatically double our superiority right there. Nor will we hurt anyone's feelings, for there won't be any Blacks or Whites left whose feelings might be hurt.

Overnight, the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will take on a fuller meaning for us all. Overnight, half the restrooms in the South can be shut down for good, a savings in millions for the many Southern depressed areas. Overnight, everybody will be dyeing for superiority, for it has always proved a more rousing cause in human history than mere quality.

So all that remains is to ask what shade of Blue we should dye ourselves. Personally, I feel the question crucial. You know how the ladies are. Moreover, we must think of the effects. Would Baby Blue, for example, make us look infantile? Would Royal Blue bring out latent monarchist tendencies in our leaders? Indigo, perhaps; Azure? Cerulean?

Strictly Personal

By Sydney J. Harris Field Enterprises, Inc.

LIBERTY DOWN THE DRAIN My old and dear friend, Milton Mayer, has filed suit in the Federal Court in Washington, D. C., to force the State Department to issue him a passport.

Milton Mayer is, in my opinion, the most brilliant journalist in our country and our time. He would be an adornment in any country and any time. He writes powerfully, thinks clearly, and has the courage to live as he writes and thinks.

He has been an anti-communist the 25 years I have known him—and for years before that. Bue he refuses to sign the non-communist oath which became a part of U.S. passport applications last year. For this reason, the State Department is refusing to reissue his passport, which expired last spring.

He will not take an oath under duress. "My views on communism are widely known," he has said, "but I express them because I wish to, I will not do so under duress."

It would be simple for him to take the oath, as most of us would. He is contractually obligated to three publishers and two church organizations for assignments in Europe this year. But as a matter of principle, he refuses to deny a crime with which he has not been charged.

Such a test oath, he believes, "is the historic instrument of tyrannies for the reduction of free men to servility. It is unworthy of my country and my government and I must make my protest against it."

I know scores of upstanding, high-principled conservatives, who inveigh daily against government authority and restrictions—but only when these directly affect their earning capacity, their schedule, and their business procedures. Most of them would be heartily in favor of the non-communist oath for passports.

Likewise, most of the liberals I know concentrate only on one aspect of "freedom"—that part which coincides with their political and economic beliefs. They are not unduly concerned about government infringement of the business area, even if it is unjust.

But "freedom," if it means anything, is indivisible. We cannot be for it in one sector, and indifferent to its abuse in another sector. We cannot ask the government to move in when it serves our interest, and to stay out when our interest is threatened. But this is exactly what most of us want.

Milton Mayer stands to gain nothing personally, and to lose a lot, by refusing to take the passport oath. He is fighting our battle more than his. For, as he says, "Liberty goes down the drain, little by little, while nobody is looking."

He was opposing the communists long before most of us knew what was going on. Now he is opposing the government. In both fights, he is right, and the rest of us are put to shame.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

A Cause We Could Dye For

By Arthur Hoppe

A CAUSE WE COULD DYE FOR Many kindly-motivated people have suggested solving the racial crisis in one fell swoop through modern chemistry. Unfortunately, like most do-gooders, these people are sharply divided on methods, one faction clamoring to dye all White people black and the other vociferously in favor of bleaching all Black people white.

While praiseworthy in concept, I feel both positions illustrate the starchy-eyed, impractical solutions of the do-gooder. Would Governor Barnett dye for equality? Perish the thought. Or, on the other hand, would a militant Black Muslim consent for a moment to become a Bleached Muslim? Nonsense.

So obviously what we need in this hour of crisis is some realistic, hard-headed practical thinking. And thank goodness for my friend, Mr. Jim Dunlap, who has come up with a realistic, hard-headed, practical thought: "We must," says Mr. Dunlap, "dye everybody blue."

It's a vivid solution. For the basic problem, of course, is superiority. Everybody has to feel superior to somebody. So the Whites, like Mr. Barnett, enjoy feeling superior to the Blacks. And the Blacks, like Mr. Malcolm X, enjoy feeling superior to the Whites.

But blue! Blue is unarguably a color superior to both. It has brilliance, luster, depth. In a word, it has class.

Thus, once everybody is Blue, everybody will feel superior. And all of us Blues can go around saying now su-

perior we are to BOTH the Whites and the Blacks. Which will automatically double our superiority right there. Nor will we hurt anyone's feelings, for there won't be any Blacks or Whites left whose feelings might be hurt.

Overnight, the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will take on a fuller meaning for us all. Overnight, half the restrooms in the South can be shut down for good, a savings in millions for the many Southern depressed areas. Overnight, everybody will be dyeing for superiority, for it has always proved a more rousing cause in human history than mere quality.

So all that remains is to ask what shade of Blue we should dye ourselves. Personally, I feel the question crucial. You know how the ladies are. Moreover, we must think of the effects. Would Baby Blue, for example, make us look infantile? Would Royal Blue bring out latent monarchist tendencies in our leaders? Indigo, perhaps; Azure? Cerulean?

After considerable thought, I put this crucial question to that realistic, hard-headed practical thinker, Mr. Dunlap. He hesitated not an eyelash's bat. "True Blue!" he snapped.

Ah, what genius. Production has begun. The dye vat is a-bubbling. And any day now we will at long last enter that new and happy era of equality in which everybody will become a True Blue American. Just like that.

So remember our motto: If you want to feel superior because of the color of your skin, go jump in a vat.

It's a vivid solution. For the basic problem, of course, is superiority. Everybody has to feel superior to somebody. So the Whites, like Mr. Barnett, enjoy feeling superior to the Blacks. And the Blacks, like Mr. Malcolm X, enjoy feeling superior to the Whites.

But blue! Blue is unarguably a color superior to both. It has brilliance, luster, depth. In a word, it has class.

Thus, once everybody is Blue, everybody will feel superior. And all of us Blues can go around saying now su-

perior we are to BOTH the Whites and the Blacks. Which will automatically double our superiority right there. Nor will we hurt anyone's feelings, for there won't be any Blacks or Whites left whose feelings might be hurt.

Overnight, the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will take on a fuller meaning for us all. Overnight, half the restrooms in the South can be shut down for good, a savings in millions for the many Southern depressed areas. Overnight, everybody will be dyeing for superiority, for it has always proved a more rousing cause in human history than mere quality.

So all that remains is to ask what shade of Blue we should dye ourselves. Personally, I feel the question crucial. You know how the ladies are. Moreover, we must think of the effects. Would Baby Blue, for example, make us look infantile? Would Royal Blue bring out latent monarchist tendencies in our leaders? Indigo, perhaps; Azure? Cerulean?

After considerable thought, I put this crucial question to that realistic, hard-headed practical thinker, Mr. Dunlap. He hesitated not an eyelash's bat. "True Blue!" he snapped.

Ah, what genius. Production has begun. The dye vat is a-bubbling. And any day now we will at long last enter that new and happy era of equality in which everybody will become a True Blue American. Just like that.

So remember our motto: If you want to feel superior because of the color of your skin, go jump in a vat.

It's a vivid solution. For the basic problem, of course, is superiority. Everybody has to feel superior to somebody. So the Whites, like Mr. Barnett, enjoy feeling superior to the Blacks. And the Blacks, like Mr. Malcolm X, enjoy feeling superior to the Whites.

But blue! Blue is unarguably a color superior to both. It has brilliance, luster, depth. In a word, it has class.

Thus, once everybody is Blue, everybody will feel superior. And all of us Blues can go around saying now su-

perior we are to BOTH the Whites and the Blacks. Which will automatically double our superiority right there. Nor will we hurt anyone's feelings, for there won't be any Blacks or Whites left whose feelings might be hurt.

Overnight, the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will take on a fuller meaning for us all. Overnight, half the restrooms in the South can be shut down for good, a savings in millions for the many Southern depressed areas. Overnight, everybody will be dyeing for superiority, for it has always proved a more rousing cause in human history than mere quality.

So all that remains is to ask what shade of Blue we should dye ourselves. Personally, I feel the question crucial. You know how the ladies are. Moreover, we must think of the effects. Would Baby Blue, for example, make us look infantile? Would Royal Blue bring out latent monarchist tendencies in our leaders? Indigo, perhaps; Azure? Cerulean?

After considerable thought, I put this crucial question to that realistic, hard-headed practical thinker, Mr. Dunlap. He hesitated not an eyelash's bat. "True Blue!" he snapped.

Ah, what genius. Production has begun. The dye vat is a-bubbling. And any day now we will at long last enter that new and happy era of equality in which everybody will become a True Blue American. Just like that.

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

REASONABLE HOPES The apparent ease with which Secretary Rusk satisfied Dr. Adenauer's objections to the test ban treaty is a good sign. Mr. Rusk was able to succeed in Bonn, because Mr. Harriman and he were able to persuade Mr. Khrushchev that the test ban treaty would be jeopardized if any political conditions were attached to it. Mr. Khrushchev has had the good sense to understand this and to realize that, since the test ban treaty itself will slow down armaments, it is a most significant non-aggression pact. Had Mr. Khrushchev insisted on attaching to it a formal non-aggression pact, the treaty might not have been ratified by the Senate.

Moreover, the West Germans might have abstained, not because they themselves intend to test, but in order to show solidarity with Gaullist France.

IT IS, moreover, a good sign that the main lines of West German policies are in fact oriented toward the Atlantic partnership rather than toward a Franco-German axis. President Kennedy has been proved to be right, in spite of the doubters, among them myself, about his trip to Germany.

For Bonn to diverge from Paris on the issue of nuclear testing is a sharp deviation from the treaty with General De Gaulle. It leaves Gaullist France isolated, not only from all the other world except Red China, but in the heart of the European continent itself.

It is also, I think, a good sign that Mr. Khrushchev is able to be relaxed about the difficult next steps. It indicates that he is under no serious pressure at home and that he does not regard the hostilities of Red China as an imminent practical threat to Soviet security or world peace.

The making of peace between the Soviet Union and the West, insofar as that is possible between two such rival social orders, is necessarily a long and slow process. For such peacemaking requires

an advance through the vast minefields of the cold war.

THERE are perhaps peripler agreements which can be made in the field of the reduction of armaments and the changes in their deployment. But everyone knows that the crucial issue is the status of West Berlin and the reunification of the two Germans.

If the foundations of genuine peace are to be laid in Europe, the cornerstone will be an agreement among the victors of World War II that the German problem is to be solved by eventual reunification—not by permanent partition.

It will take time, which will bring changes in the minds of men and in their rulers; to arrive at such an agreement, France and Great Britain, among the smaller West European countries and indeed in most of Adenauer's Germany, there is, to put it mildly, a great distaste for German reunification. The institutions of postwar Europe, notably NATO and the Common Market, are founded on the premise that Germany is divided. German reunification, as a French official once said, is like heaven, a place we all want to go to, but not any sooner than we have to.

MR. KHRUSHCHEV himself, I believe, in favor of partition, assuming as he does that there is no prospect in the foreseeable future that the two Germans will unite as one Communist state. Yet no durable settlement can be made in Europe if Germany remains divided. And therefore, if there is to be progress toward peace, there will have to be an important change of mind in Moscow and in Paris primarily, in Bonn and the other allied capitals as well.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.

There is little reason to think that these changes of mind can happen during the political lifetime of the generation that conducted the world war and its aftermath in the cold war.

But the new generation is arriving, and if it can be enabled to work without the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust hanging over it, the older generation will not have done too badly.