

Herald and News

FRANK JENKINS
Editor

BILL JENKINS
Managing Editor

Entered as second class matter at the post office of Klamath Falls, Ore., on August 20, 1904 under act of Congress, March 8, 1879.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for publication of all the local news printed in this newspaper as well as all AP news.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES	
MAIL	BY CARRIER
1 month \$ 1.35	1 month \$ 1.25
6 months \$ 6.50	6 months \$ 6.10
1 year \$11.00	1 year \$10.20

BILLBOARD

By BILL JENKINS

Congratulations to Dean Callas and Lonnie Lewis on their winning of the Sportsman's awards for the outstanding sportsman and outstanding landowner of the year.

It isn't the award itself that means so much as the idea behind it. That of good sportsmanship and the willingness to cooperate to make hunting a sport for everyone and a trial to no one.

Along the sports line we got a letter from our old friend Bill Gorsch out at Quartz Mountain yesterday. Bill says, and I quote: "A salute from the rabble in the provinces. We are alright but are planning 'the grand revolution.' I lost out to Walt Lowe, the trapper, for the office of justice of the peace. He sneaked up on me and called an election at three o'clock in the morning for said office. The vote was 1 to 0 in his favor. Otherwise I would be an absolute dictator. I have done some campaigning to regain all offices, but the black dog and the wildcat have both shown their democratic tendencies by biting me again, one in the leg and the other in the hand. I purged the bear by selling him down the river to Wild Bill Houston. However, I think I can make it by the starvation method. Then the whole mountain will be mine alone, and I shall immediately deliver it to the guy who took Stalin's place and from here we can atom bomb Bly, Camp Six, Cougar Peak Lookout and the old miner's cabin on the Ewauwa Camp road. Boy, you won't stay away so long when you see my new uniform and medals. I got it made."

Which gives one a small insight into the character of such a character as Gorsch. But what he had in mind, after all that preamble, was a publicity plug about the ski prospects at his Quartz Mountain hangout. He says the Boy Scouts have put in a ski tow of sorts at the place (although he doesn't say which scouts did the building) and he just happens to have some cabins available for tenancy for weekend skiers. If they happen to be the rugged type.

He goes on to say: "... cabins are available but a little rough ... Blankets, gas lamps would be required (at least until I get my light plant going, and I would if business warranted it) ... there are beds, mattresses and cooking and heating stoves in every cabin. I just have the idea that a lot of guys and girls would like to rough it for a weekend. I would open the restaurant if I could make it pay or even break even. The charge would be nominal. ... It isn't for sissies, just people who would really enjoy a taste of real mountain living."

So, if you feel like spending a little time in the mountains and roughing it, Gorsch style, just call him up and let him you're on the way. You'll get a rousing welcome.

Don Fisher, the boss of the Lava Beds, was in yesterday with a pretty good advertising idea for the community. He says why not put up a sign at the canal bridge advertising our hot grid pavement there?

And why not? It has had national publicity and is a unique feature of Oregon's highways.

If the idea is put over, however, let's all buckle down and see if we can't get the engineers to put the sign up crossways of the traffic so you can read it.

Oregon's mileage signs are almost worthless, being mounted parallel to the road so you have to come to a virtual stop to read 'em.

TOWER TALK



with the
Ground Observer Corps

By ELSIE BARKER

Jan. 27, marks the date of the first anniversary of the Ground Observer Corps of the Klamath Falls Post at the airport.

Our thanks to Wallace Reed, County Coordinator, and Lucille Jones, who worked so hard to get this post started. It is not an easy job to get a post going and the opinions are still there—Vigilant, Avery, Elsie Barker, Hope Berry, John Barker, Helen Bullard, Merry Clark, Laura French, Walter French, Claude Fetter, Serilda Fetter, Bill Golden, Beulah Golden, Helen Golden, Wilma Groves, Hazel Hillman, Maurice Hillman, John Hillbronner, Jerry Kesse, Alta Lovell, Pat Lilya, Pearl Nason, Erwin Padgett, R. W. Toycon, all of these are the ones who volunteered in January, 1953, or before and are still standing active watches (I hope I didn't miss anyone).

As each week has rolled by many more have joined the ranks and are equally as faithful to the GOC. We have been very glad to welcome them and are happy to have them as part of the organization. Their efforts have been fully recognized. We have come a long way since that opening day—I remember the first watch I stood. There wasn't any heater and Troy Chambers went and borrowed a small one. I think that was the first heat that had been up there since the Navy left the base. Now we finally have a nice 4000 watt radiant heater and it is really quite comfortable up there—thanks to GOC week and the response of the people to buy tickets to finance the expense.

At this time I would like to thank each and every one for your faithful service and the wonderful cooperation you have given when called on to stand extra watches, which never a week goes by without several. It has truly been the watch and spirit among all that has kept this post in operation. To the teenagers who have been so good to go when I know you were giving up something else you really wanted to do, a special thanks for helping to keep the post on 24 hour basis.

We would also like to take this opportunity to thank Mayor Landry, Judge Blackmer, the City Council, Orville Hamilton and the police force for their fine cooperation during "Ground Observer Corps Week."

Thanks to Menti-Newlan Flying Service, J. C. Penney Co., Baisler Motor Co., First National Bank, U.S. National Bank, First Federal Savings and Loan, Herald & News, KFJR and KFJW, Do-Si-Do Club, Heibronner Fuel Co., Malley's Market, Carters' Food Store, Jurgensen's Grocery, Mac's Bakery, Polly Ann Bakery, Ward Chicken Sille, Mason-Erman Co., Pioneer Tobacco, Coca Cola, Conner's Service, Derby's Music Store, and to all others who donated in any way to this week. Thank you from all the members of the GOC.

Dec. 15, Mr. Barker and I resigned as supervisor and chief observer. We have been standing by until new ones were appointed. As in all lodges, clubs or organizations, new officials bring fresh enthusiasm, ideas and zeal. Trying to keep this post going with never enough volunteers is a very exhausting job. I sincerely hope the people of Klamath will try to make a better effort in 1954 to support this organization and give a little more of their time. More than their share has already been given by the now active members, so how about giving them some help.

Best wishes and best of luck to the new Supervisor, Russ Avery and Chief Observer, Lucille Jones, who were appointed and accepted Friday, Jan. 15.

If you have two spare hours a week call 2-1498 or 3963, volunteer today. 'Bye now.

As each week has rolled by many more have joined the ranks and are equally as faithful to the GOC. We have been very glad to welcome them and are happy to have them as part of the organization. Their efforts have been fully recognized. We have come a long way since that opening day—I remember the first watch I stood. There wasn't any heater and Troy Chambers went and borrowed a small one. I think that was the first heat that had been up there since the Navy left the base. Now we finally have a nice 4000 watt radiant heater and it is really quite comfortable up there—thanks to GOC week and the response of the people to buy tickets to finance the expense.

THE DOCTOR SAYS

By EDWIN P. JORDAN, M. D.

A correspondent writes that she knows a man who is suffering from a condition which has been diagnosed as dementia praecox and she asks for a discussion.

This is really another name for a mental disease which has been discussed in this column several times before, usually under the preferred term of schizophrenia. It is one of the most important forms of mental illness, and although people who suffer from it behave in different fashions, its particular characteristic is what is known as a split-personality.

In simple terms, this means that a person afflicted with schizophrenia is likely to show perfectly normal behavior in some respects, but act completely off the beam in others.

Schizophrenia cannot be applied to the conflicting impulses for good and evil which affect practically all normal people. It is not insanity. It is only when a person acts like two people, one good and one bad, that mental disease is said to exist.

The cause for the development of schizophrenia is not known. It is most likely to start between the ages of 15 and 30. At first disorders of mood and lack of cleanliness may be the only signs. Many victims also become unduly suspicious and feel that they are being persecuted. As time goes on, hearing or seeing objects which are not there, changes in thinking and judgment, stealing, and other alterations in behavior tend to arise. It is a distressing thing to family and friends.

The sufferer must somehow be

examined by a psychiatrist, and if this mental disease is really present in sufficiently severe form, the courts can be asked to commit the patient to an institution.

This is not the only form of mental disease but it is surely one of the most important. Many have been helped by electric shock treatments, or by an operation on the brain. All should remember that mental disease is no disgrace; the sufferer does not intend to become ill any more than anyone tries to contract pneumonia.

They'll Do It Every Time



Letter From Washington

HARRIS ELSWORTH, M.C.
4th District, Oregon

It takes a while after a Congressional session convenes for legislation to reach the House floor for action. In other words, the first three weeks of January will probably not develop activity on the floor but the committees are busy. The reason for the slow start of a session is obvious. It is always the practice to bring up and act on nearly all bills that are ready for floor consideration before a session adjourns. We pretty well cleaned the slate in August so it takes some time for the committees to get some more bills ready for action.

Meanwhile what seems to be a lull certainly does not mean an easy life for the congressman. I could not possibly be any busier than I am right now and have been since I arrived back in Washington, D.C. A member of Congress, particularly a member from the West, has much more to do than attend committee meetings and sessions of the House.

To list but a few of the many things which I and my office are concerned with now:

(1) The Williams Valley flood control project is well along toward completion but is out of balance until two small but key dams can be constructed. These dams are known as Cougar on the McKenzie and Green Peter on the South Santiam. Legislation authorizing power for those dams must be passed. Planning money must be included in the appropriations bill.

(2) The south jetty at the mouth of the Coquille River (Port of Bandon) is so badly in need of repairs that it is ineffective. This condition has directly or indirectly been the cause of two ship wrecks recently. One wreck is even now on the submerged jetty rocks awaiting salvage. Money must be made available for that job this year.

(3) On the Oregon coast in addition to the problem at Bandon are harbor improvement projects in

various stages from preliminary survey to being eligible for appropriations including the ports at Florence, Port of Umpqua at Reedsport, Winchester Bay, Coos Bay and Charleston, an approved project at old Beach, and a preliminary survey for shipping facilities in the Cheteo Cove at Brookings. All of these require work on my part.

(4) The pear industry in the Rogue River Valley has a heavy surplus of winter pears. They need to participate in current government purchase programs. I have been having conferences with Department of Agriculture people on that problem.

(5) The government (General Services Administration) is about to sell the war alcohol plant at Springfield. I have been keeping in close touch with that situation.

(6) One of the first public appearances I made in Oregon last year after the session of Congress adjourned was at Camp White in Medford. The occasion was to honor the new manager of the facility, Eugene K. Rieker, and his staff the evening of Sept. 18. I made a pledge to the veterans and to the community on that occasion which was reported in the Medford Mail - Tribune Sunday, Sept. 20, as follows: "The Allied Veterans Council of Jackson County received definite assurances Friday night from Congressman Harris Ellsworth that the needs of this district for a hospital center at Camp White will be presented conclusively to the Veterans Administration upon his return to Washington." I hope a substantial number of general medical hospital beds can be established at Camp White without it being necessary to resort to legislation. Accordingly I have been assembling the necessary facts and have conferred with V. A. officials. I plan to take the matter before the Administrator soon.

In a future letter I will discuss the various bills I have pending in the House and make a progress report on each.

But on balance most of these ideas have been in the hopper since 1949, when the late Senator Taft himself introduced many of them. At that time the senator succeeded in steering a substantial list of amendments to Senate passage, but they foundered in the House on the rock of Democratic-Labor opposition committed to full repeal.

Certainly the time is at hand to reshape Taft-Hartley in the light of working experience. Reasonable change will benefit workers, employers and the public, all of which the law must serve fairly. Congress should not be turned aside from this goal by the pleas of extremists on either side.

Neither of these positions appears to reflect maximum concern for the general public interest.

Union leaders dub Taft-Hartley "antilabor," but their definition of "antilabor" is anything that restricts labor's behavior in any way. Since labor must be expected to be responsive to reasonable restraint to less than other segments of society, the leader's attitude is plainly narrow and selfish.

No more can be said for the NAM viewpoint. Taft-Hartley is a massive law containing more than 100 clauses. Though many of these are pickups from the old Wagner Act, much of the law was new when passed in 1947. It would be a miracle if nearly seven years' experience with it did not indicate considerable need for improvement.

To shut the door on change is merely to ape labor's approach—with reverse English.

The President's program ought to get from Congress a more rational and more moderate appraisal than these extremes can promise. Whether it will remain to be seen.

Mr. Eisenhower's proposals are not without their controversial aspect. He wants to soften the ban on the secondary boycott, and this is a proposal that needs to be examined with great care. He suggests, too, that Federal labor strike ballots be taken in labor disputes: the exact intent of this

provision is not entirely clear.

But on balance most of these ideas have been in the hopper since 1949, when the late Senator Taft himself introduced many of them. At that time the senator succeeded in steering a substantial list of amendments to Senate passage, but they foundered in the House on the rock of Democratic-Labor opposition committed to full repeal.

Certainly the time is at hand to reshape Taft-Hartley in the light of working experience. Reasonable change will benefit workers, employers and the public, all of which the law must serve fairly. Congress should not be turned aside from this goal by the pleas of extremists on either side.

Neither of these positions appears to reflect maximum concern for the general public interest.

Union leaders dub Taft-Hartley "antilabor," but their definition of "antilabor" is anything that restricts labor's behavior in any way. Since labor must be expected to be responsive to reasonable restraint to less than other segments of society, the leader's attitude is plainly narrow and selfish.

No more can be said for the NAM viewpoint. Taft-Hartley is a massive law containing more than 100 clauses. Though many of these are pickups from the old Wagner Act, much of the law was new when passed in 1947. It would be a miracle if nearly seven years' experience with it did not indicate considerable need for improvement.

To shut the door on change is merely to ape labor's approach—with reverse English.

The President's program ought to get from Congress a more rational and more moderate appraisal than these extremes can promise. Whether it will remain to be seen.

Mr. Eisenhower's proposals are not without their controversial aspect. He wants to soften the ban on the secondary boycott, and this is a proposal that needs to be examined with great care. He suggests, too, that Federal labor strike ballots be taken in labor disputes: the exact intent of this

provision is not entirely clear.

But on balance most of these ideas have been in the hopper since 1949, when the late Senator Taft himself introduced many of them. At that time the senator succeeded in steering a substantial list of amendments to Senate passage, but they foundered in the House on the rock of Democratic-Labor opposition committed to full repeal.

Certainly the time is at hand to reshape Taft-Hartley in the light of working experience. Reasonable change will benefit workers, employers and the public, all of which the law must serve fairly. Congress should not be turned aside from this goal by the pleas of extremists on either side.

BRUCE BLOSSAT

President Eisenhower has made some constructive proposals for improvement of the Taft-Hartley Act. They deserve the earnest consideration of Congress, and probably the bulk of them merit adoption.

Not unexpectedly, the country's top labor leaders dismissed the recommendations as either bad or just secondary. For years they have made it clear that nothing less than outright repeal of the law would satisfy them.

On the other hand, even in advance of the President's presentation, the National Association of Manufacturers declared it favored no changes at all.

Neither of these positions appears to reflect maximum concern for the general public interest.

Union leaders dub Taft-Hartley "antilabor," but their definition of "antilabor" is anything that restricts labor's behavior in any way. Since labor must be expected to be responsive to reasonable restraint to less than other segments of society, the leader's attitude is plainly narrow and selfish.

No more can be said for the NAM viewpoint. Taft-Hartley is a massive law containing more than 100 clauses. Though many of these are pickups from the old Wagner Act, much of the law was new when passed in 1947. It would be a miracle if nearly seven years' experience with it did not indicate considerable need for improvement.

To shut the door on change is merely to ape labor's approach—with reverse English.

The President's program ought to get from Congress a more rational and more moderate appraisal than these extremes can promise. Whether it will remain to be seen.

Mr. Eisenhower's proposals are not without their controversial aspect. He wants to soften the ban on the secondary boycott, and this is a proposal that needs to be examined with great care. He suggests, too, that Federal labor strike ballots be taken in labor disputes: the exact intent of this

provision is not entirely clear.

But on balance most of these ideas have been in the hopper since 1949, when the late Senator Taft himself introduced many of them. At that time the senator succeeded in steering a substantial list of amendments to Senate passage, but they foundered in the House on the rock of Democratic-Labor opposition committed to full repeal.

Certainly the time is at hand to reshape Taft-Hartley in the light of working experience. Reasonable change will benefit workers, employers and the public, all of which the law must serve fairly. Congress should not be turned aside from this goal by the pleas of extremists on either side.

Neither of these positions appears to reflect maximum concern for the general public interest.

Union leaders dub Taft-Hartley "antilabor," but their definition of "antilabor" is anything that restricts labor's behavior in any way. Since labor must be expected to be responsive to reasonable restraint to less than other segments of society, the leader's attitude is plainly narrow and selfish.

No more can be said for the NAM viewpoint. Taft-Hartley is a massive law containing more than 100 clauses. Though many of these are pickups from the old Wagner Act, much of the law was new when passed in 1947. It would be a miracle if nearly seven years' experience with it did not indicate considerable need for improvement.

To shut the door on change is merely to ape labor's approach—with reverse English.

The President's program ought to get from Congress a more rational and more moderate appraisal than these extremes can promise. Whether it will remain to be seen.

Mr. Eisenhower's proposals are not without their controversial aspect. He wants to soften the ban on the secondary boycott, and this is a proposal that needs to be examined with great care. He suggests, too, that Federal labor strike ballots be taken in labor disputes: the exact intent of this

provision is not entirely clear.

But on balance most of these ideas have been in the hopper since 1949, when the late Senator Taft himself introduced many of them. At that time the senator succeeded in steering a substantial list of amendments to Senate passage, but they foundered in the House on the rock of Democratic-Labor opposition committed to full repeal.

Certainly the time is at hand to reshape Taft-Hartley in the light of working experience. Reasonable change will benefit workers, employers and the public, all of which the law must serve fairly. Congress should not be turned aside from this goal by the pleas of extremists on either side.

Neither of these positions appears to reflect maximum concern for the general public interest.

Union leaders dub Taft-Hartley "antilabor," but their definition of "antilabor" is anything that restricts labor's behavior in any way. Since labor must be expected to be responsive to reasonable restraint to less than other segments of society, the leader's attitude is plainly narrow and selfish.

No more can be said for the NAM viewpoint. Taft-Hartley is a massive law containing more than 100 clauses. Though many of these are pickups from the old Wagner Act, much of the law was new when passed in 1947. It would be a miracle if nearly seven years' experience with it did not indicate considerable need for improvement.

To shut the door on change is merely to ape labor's approach—with reverse English.

The President's program ought to get from Congress a more rational and more moderate appraisal than these extremes can promise. Whether it will remain to be seen.

Mr. Eisenhower's proposals are not without their controversial aspect. He wants to soften the ban on the secondary boycott, and this is a proposal that needs to be examined with great care. He suggests, too, that Federal labor strike ballots be taken in labor disputes: the exact intent of this

provision is not entirely clear.

But on balance most of these ideas have been in the hopper since 1949, when the late Senator Taft himself introduced many of them. At that time the senator succeeded in steering a substantial list of amendments to Senate passage, but they foundered in the House on the rock of Democratic-Labor opposition committed to full repeal.

Certainly the time is at hand to reshape Taft-Hartley in the light of working experience. Reasonable change will benefit workers, employers and the public, all of which the law must serve fairly. Congress should not be turned aside from this goal by the pleas of extremists on either side.

Neither of these positions appears to reflect maximum concern for the general public interest.

Union leaders dub Taft-Hartley "antilabor," but their definition of "antilabor" is anything that restricts labor's behavior in any way. Since labor must be expected to be responsive to reasonable restraint to less than other segments of society, the leader's attitude is plainly narrow and selfish.

No more can be said for the NAM viewpoint. Taft-Hartley is a massive law containing more than 100 clauses. Though many of these are pickups from the old Wagner Act, much of the law was new when passed in 1947. It would be a miracle if nearly seven years' experience with it did not indicate considerable need for improvement.

To shut the door on change is merely to ape labor's approach—with reverse English.

The President's program ought to get from Congress a more rational and more moderate appraisal than these extremes can promise. Whether it will remain to be seen.

Mr. Eisenhower's proposals are not without their controversial aspect. He wants to soften the ban on the secondary boycott, and this is a proposal that needs to be examined with great care. He suggests, too, that Federal labor strike ballots be taken in labor disputes: the exact intent of this

provision is not entirely clear.

But on balance most of these ideas have been in the hopper since 1949, when the late Senator Taft himself introduced many of them. At that time the senator succeeded in steering a substantial list of amendments to Senate passage, but they foundered in the House on the rock of Democratic-Labor opposition committed to full repeal.

Certainly the time is at hand to reshape Taft-Hartley in the light of working experience. Reasonable change will benefit workers, employers and the public, all of which the law must serve fairly. Congress should not be turned aside from this goal by the pleas of extremists on either side.

Neither of these positions appears to reflect maximum concern for the general public interest.

Union leaders dub Taft-Hartley "antilabor," but their definition of "antilabor" is anything that restricts labor's behavior in any way. Since labor must be expected to be responsive to reasonable restraint to less than other segments of society, the leader's attitude is plainly narrow and selfish.

No more can be said for the NAM viewpoint. Taft-Hartley is a massive law containing more than 100 clauses. Though many of these are pickups from the old Wagner Act, much of the law was new when passed in 1947. It would be a miracle if nearly seven years' experience with it did not indicate considerable need for improvement.

To shut the door on change is merely to ape labor's approach—with reverse English.

The President's program ought to get from Congress a more rational and more moderate appraisal than these extremes can promise. Whether it will remain to be seen.

Mr. Eisenhower's proposals are not without their controversial aspect. He wants to soften the ban on the secondary boycott, and this is a proposal that needs to be examined with great care. He suggests, too, that Federal labor strike ballots be taken in labor disputes: the exact intent of this

By Jimmy Hatlo



James Marlow

WASHINGTON (AP)—When President Eisenhower hopped out of bed this morning and looked in the mirror, he may have thought: "How did I ever come to let myself in for this?"

He had moved into the White House one year ago. And it had been a tough, grinding year. The face which gazed back at him in the mirror looked a little older. Not much. Just a little.

But if he wondered why he had been willing to carry on his back that mountain called the presidency, it was probably a thought that lasted only an instant.

He was still as jaunty as ever, working harder and longer hours, perhaps, than any he had endured since those days on the eve of the invasion of Normandy, nearly 10 years ago.

He seemed, judging from the quick grin he could produce, to be enjoying his job. He was still enormously popular. And he was still amazingly free from personal abuse.

He was wiser, no doubt, than he had been that day a year ago when he stood for hours watching the Inaugural Parade. In his first year, he frankly concedes, he was a political novice. He doesn't claim political mastery now.

His handling of Congress this year will illustrate his political development, or lack of it. Last year he was mild and gentle with the lawmakers. Some of his critics said he was more anxious to be liked than to lead.

"His friends gave another explanation: he was using 1953 to get his program ready for 1954, so there was no reason in 1953 to antagonize legislators whose help he might otherwise get for his program this year.

Last year he had Sen. Robert A. Taft of Ohio doing much of the in-fighting for him at the Capitol. Taft's dead now, and no one around can take Taft's place in a hurry.

Toward the end of his first year, Eisenhower gave signs of a toughening attitude, which may be an indication of the mood he'll use in 1954.

That was when Sen. McCarthy (R-Wis) made his unexpected criticism of Eisenhower's continued aid to allies who trade with Red China. Secretary of State Dulles replied, defending his policy, and Eisenhower backed Dulles.

If that wasn't Eisenhower's notification to Congress his novice days were over, maybe this was: his statement that the Republicans don't deserve to keep control of Congress in November's elections unless they pass a progressive program.

It was advice which seemed like water off the backs of some of his Republicans whose response to parts of his program, particularly his farm program, was not enthusiastic.

Will he fight for his program? Everybody's waiting to see. If he does, it may not be audible. Instead of public denunciations and urgings, he may work out of sight: over the telephone, through en-

voys, or by calling the legislators to the White House for a private lecture.

In his State of the Union message Eisenhower sounded pretty confident this country had seized the initiative from the Russians, a view which may turn out to be more assumption than fact. In this kind of war, it's the final results that count.

WASHINGTON (AP)—When President Eisenhower hopped out of bed this morning and looked in the mirror, he may have thought: "How did I ever come to let myself in for this?"

He had moved into the White House one year ago. And it had been a tough, grinding year. The face which gazed back at him in the mirror looked a little older. Not much. Just a little.

But if he wondered why he had been willing to carry on his back that mountain called the presidency, it was probably a thought that lasted only an instant.

He was still as jaunty as ever, working harder and longer hours, perhaps, than any he had endured since those days on the eve of the invasion of Normandy, nearly 10 years ago.

He seemed, judging from the quick grin he could produce, to be enjoying his job. He was still enormously popular. And he was still amazingly free from personal abuse.

He was wiser, no doubt, than he had been that day a year ago when he stood for hours watching the Inaugural Parade. In his first year, he frankly concedes, he was a political novice. He doesn't claim political mastery now.

His handling of Congress this year will illustrate his political development, or lack of it. Last year he was mild and gentle with the lawmakers. Some of his critics said he was more anxious to be liked than to lead.

"His friends gave another explanation: he was using 1953 to get his program ready for 1954, so there was no reason in 1953 to antagonize legislators whose help he might otherwise get for his program this year.

Last year he had Sen. Robert A. Taft of Ohio doing much of the in-fighting for him at the Capitol. Taft's dead now, and no one around can take Taft's place in a hurry.

Toward the end of his first year, Eisenhower gave signs of a toughening attitude, which may be an indication of the mood he'll use in 1954.

That was when Sen. McCarthy (R-Wis) made his unexpected criticism of Eisenhower's continued aid to allies who trade with Red China. Secretary of State Dulles replied, defending his policy, and Eisenhower backed Dulles.

If that wasn't Eisenhower's notification to Congress his novice days were over, maybe this was: his statement that the Republicans don't deserve to keep control of Congress in November's elections unless they pass a progressive program.

It was advice which seemed like water off the backs of some of his Republicans whose response to parts of his program, particularly his farm program, was not enthusiastic.

Will he fight for his program? Everybody's waiting to see. If he does, it may not be audible. Instead of public denunciations and urgings, he may work out of sight: over the telephone, through en-

voys, or by calling the legislators to the White House for a private lecture.

In his State of the Union message Eisenhower sounded pretty confident this country had seized the initiative from the Russians, a view which may turn out to be more assumption than fact. In this kind of war, it's the final results that count.

WASHINGTON (AP)—When President Eisenhower hopped out of bed this morning and looked in the mirror, he may have thought: "How did I ever come to let myself in for this?"

He had moved into the White House one year ago. And it had been a tough, grinding year. The face which gazed back at him in the mirror looked a little older. Not much. Just a little.

But if he wondered why he had been willing to carry on his back that mountain called the presidency, it was probably a thought that lasted only an instant.

He was still as jaunty as ever, working harder and longer hours, perhaps, than any he had endured since those days on the eve of the invasion of Normandy, nearly 10 years ago.

He seemed, judging from the quick grin he could produce, to be enjoying his job. He was still enormously popular. And he was still amazingly free from personal abuse.

He was wiser, no doubt, than he had been that day a year ago when he stood for hours watching the Inaugural Parade. In his first year, he frankly concedes, he was a political novice. He doesn't claim political mastery now.

His handling of Congress this year will illustrate his political development, or lack of it. Last year he was mild and gentle with the lawmakers. Some of his critics said he was more anxious to be liked than to lead.

"His friends gave another explanation: he was using 1953 to get his program ready for 1954, so there was no reason in 1953 to antagonize legislators whose help he might otherwise get for his program this year.

Last year he had Sen. Robert A. Taft of Ohio doing much of the in-fighting for him at the Capitol. Taft's dead now, and no one around can take Taft's place in a hurry.

Toward the end of his first year, Eisenhower gave signs of a toughening attitude, which may be an indication of the mood he'll use in 1954.

That was when Sen. McCarthy (R-Wis) made his unexpected criticism of Eisenhower's continued aid to allies who trade with Red China. Secretary of State Dulles replied, defending his policy, and Eisenhower backed Dulles.

If that wasn't Eisenhower's notification to Congress his novice days were over, maybe this was: his statement that the Republicans don't deserve to keep control of Congress in November's elections unless they pass a progressive program.

It was advice which seemed like water off the backs of some of his Republicans whose response to parts of his program, particularly his farm program, was not enthusiastic.

Will he fight for his program? Everybody's waiting to see. If he does, it may not be audible. Instead of public denunciations and urgings, he may work out of sight: over the telephone, through en-

voys, or by calling the legislators to the White House for a private lecture.

In his State of the Union message Eisenhower sounded pretty confident this country had seized the initiative from the Russians, a view which may turn out to be more assumption than fact. In this kind of war, it's the final results that count.

WASHINGTON (AP)—When President Eisenhower hopped out of bed this morning and looked in the mirror, he may have thought: "How did I ever come to let myself in for this?"

He had moved into the White House one year ago. And it had been a tough, grinding year. The face which gazed back at him in the mirror looked a little older. Not much. Just a little.

But if he wondered why he had been willing to carry on his back that mountain called the presidency, it was probably a thought that lasted only an instant.

He was still as jaunty as ever, working harder and longer hours, perhaps, than any he had endured since those days on the eve of the invasion of Normandy, nearly 10 years ago.

He seemed, judging from the quick grin he could produce, to be enjoying his job. He was still enormously popular. And he was still amazingly free from personal abuse.

He was wiser, no doubt, than he had been that day a year ago when he stood for hours watching the Inaugural Parade. In his first year, he frankly concedes, he was a political novice. He doesn't claim political mastery now.

His handling of Congress this year will illustrate his political development, or lack of it. Last year he was mild and gentle with the lawmakers. Some of his critics said he was more anxious to be liked than to lead.

"His friends gave another explanation: he was using 1953 to get his program ready for 1954, so there was no reason in 1953 to antagonize legislators whose help he might otherwise get for his program this year.

Last year he had Sen. Robert A. Taft of Ohio doing much of the in-fighting for him at the Capitol. Taft's dead now, and no one around can take Taft's place in a hurry.

Toward the end of his first year, Eisenhower gave signs of a toughening attitude, which may be an indication of the mood he'll use in 1954.

That was when Sen. McCarthy (R-Wis) made his unexpected criticism of Eisenhower's continued aid to allies who trade with Red China. Secretary of State Dulles replied, defending his policy, and Eisenhower backed Dulles.

If that wasn't Eisenhower's notification to Congress his novice days were over, maybe this was: his statement that the Republicans don't deserve to keep control of Congress in November's elections unless they pass a progressive program.

It was advice which seemed like water off the backs of some of his Republicans whose response to parts of his program, particularly his farm program, was not enthusiastic.

Will he fight for his program? Everybody's waiting to see. If he does, it may not be audible. Instead of public denunciations and urgings, he may work out of sight: over the telephone, through en-

voys, or by calling the legislators to the White House for a private lecture.

In his State of the Union message Eisenhower sounded pretty confident this country had seized the initiative from the Russians, a view which may turn out to be more assumption than fact. In this kind of war, it's the final results that count.

WASHINGTON (AP)—When President Eisenhower hopped out of bed this morning and looked in the mirror, he may have thought: "How did I ever come to let myself in for this?"

He had moved into the White House one year ago. And it had been a tough, grinding year. The face which gazed back at him in the mirror looked a little older. Not much. Just a little.

But if he wondered why he had been willing to carry on his back that mountain called the presidency, it was probably a thought that lasted only an instant.

He was still as jaunty as ever, working harder and longer hours, perhaps, than any he had endured since those days on the eve of the invasion of Normandy, nearly 10 years ago.

He seemed, judging from the quick grin he could produce, to be enjoying his job. He was still enormously popular. And he was still amazingly free from personal abuse.

He was wiser, no doubt, than he had been that day a year ago when he stood for hours watching the Inaugural Parade. In his first year, he frankly concedes, he was a political novice. He doesn't claim political mastery now.

His handling of Congress this year will illustrate his political development, or lack of it. Last year he was mild and gentle with the lawmakers. Some of his critics said he was more anxious to be liked than to lead.

"His friends gave another explanation: he was using 1953 to get his program ready for 1954, so there was no reason in 1953 to antagonize legislators whose help he might otherwise get for his program this year.

Last year he had Sen. Robert A. Taft of Ohio doing much of the in-fighting for him at the Capitol. Taft's dead now, and no one around can take Taft's place in a hurry.

Toward the end of his first year, Eisenhower gave signs of a toughening attitude, which may be an indication of the mood he'll use in 1954.

That was when Sen. McCarthy (R-Wis) made his unexpected criticism of Eisenhower's continued aid to allies who trade with Red China. Secretary of State Dulles replied, defending his policy, and Eisenhower backed Dulles.

If that wasn't Eisenhower's notification to Congress his novice days were over, maybe this was: his statement that the Republicans don't deserve to keep control of Congress in November's elections unless they pass a progressive program.

It was advice which seemed like water off the backs of some of his Republicans whose response to parts of his program, particularly his farm program, was not enthusiastic.

Will he fight for his program? Everybody's waiting to see. If he does, it may not be audible. Instead of public denunciations and urgings, he may work out of sight: over the telephone, through en-

voys, or by calling the legislators to the White House for a private lecture.

In his State of the Union message Eisenhower sounded pretty confident this country had seized the initiative from the Russians, a view which may turn out to be more assumption than fact. In this kind of war, it's the final results that count.

WASHINGTON (AP)—When President Eisenhower hopped out of bed this morning and looked in the mirror, he may have thought: "How did I ever come to let myself in for this?"

He had moved into the White House one year ago. And it had been a tough, grinding year. The face which gazed back at him in the mirror looked a little older. Not much. Just a little.

But if he wondered why he had been willing to carry on his back that mountain called the presidency, it was probably a thought that lasted only an instant.

He was still as jaunty as ever, working harder and longer hours, perhaps, than any he had endured since those days on the eve of the invasion of