

Herald and News Editorial Page

The Cruel Tax On Freedom

What would life be like for us today if there had never been a cold war, if Russia and Red China were governed by men bent on living at peace within their own borders?

We know, of course, we would not be wholly free of international disputes. The controversies that embroil the Western allies even when they confront joint peril offer sufficient proof of that.

We know, too, that we would still be engulfed in a tide of great problems, not the least of them the tremendous burst of world and national population.

Nevertheless, we would have saved incredible sums of money that have been lavished on our defense establishment, and that of our friends and allies abroad, wholly and solely because of the existence of the aggressive threat from Moscow and Peiping.

Before World War II, in the 1936-40 span, we averaged a yearly outlay of \$1,350,000,000 for defense.

In the first postwar years, the figure ranged from \$12 billion to \$15 billion, what with higher prices, more elaborate and costlier equipment, enlarged population and bigger notions of a "safe" defense.

If we arbitrarily add another \$5 billion to cover additional changes in these directions, we have a figure of \$20 billion.

It might be regarded as a reasonable annual defense charge covering requirements for internal security, plus our share in any conceivable world policing effort.

Take 1950, at the outbreak of the Korean War, as the point where Communist aggression really began to force our defense outlays

above "minimum" levels suitable in a peaceful world.

From that point until the middle of 1962, we will have spent \$270 billion more than the proper minimum.

That \$270 billion is the staggering price we, as the principal guardian of the free world, have had to pay to buy security in a world imperiled by marauding Communist tyrants.

That is the fabulous insurance premium that has helped us to stem their aggressions, not only against the industrial West but against the weak, underdeveloped and pitifully timid "neutrals" who, standing behind our shield, indulge the luxury of attacking us as "warlike."

Without that shield they would not long be either independent or vocal.

A thoroughly modern high school with full facilities for 2,500 students can cost \$7 million today. That extra \$270 billion in defense cost could build enough schools to house 100 million such students. (Actually, we only have 46 million students today at all levels.)

Builders and housing officials think of a \$20,000 house as a good deal better than minimum accommodations. For \$270 billion, we could have built 13,500,000 houses at that price, enough to replace one in every four dwelling units in this country.

In the houses, schools, hospitals and roads unbuild, here and elsewhere in the world, we measure the cruel tax Moscow and Peiping have levied upon free humanity as it seeks to ward off their depredations, done cynically in humanity's very name.

More Spent On Welfare Than Defense

(The Corvallis Gazette - Times)

Despite impressions to the contrary, Americans are not spending more on defense than on what might loosely be called "self-improvement." Even in tax expenditures alone, the defense budget is less than the budget for health, education and welfare. Authority for this interesting statement is Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff.

The nation spent \$79 billion in tax money on health, education and welfare in 1960 and \$44 billion on defense. These figures will be higher this year but even with the increased defense budget for the stepped-up preparedness program money spent in the other three categories will be half again as much.

The reason this isn't as obvious as it might be is that defense is wholly a federal expenditure and makes up about half of the federal budget. We are all the more conscious of it because it takes more than half of the income tax dollars we pay as individuals and corporations.

Health, education and welfare is a joint effort of federal, state and local communities

and private agencies. The public share, maintained by taxes split among the various taxing authorities comes to \$50,940,000,000. The private share is \$28,060,000,000. Ribicoff gives this breakdown:

Welfare and social insurance—\$31 billion of which 86 per cent or \$26.66 billion is public and 14 per cent or \$4.34 billion is private.

Health — \$26 billion, of which 24 per cent or \$6.24 billion is public and 76 per cent or \$19.76 billion is private.

Education — \$22 billion of which 82 per cent or \$18.04 billion is public and 18 per cent or \$3.96 billion is private.

"Instead of telling—indeed shouting—our American story, the story of our advances in and our concern for health, education and welfare, we apologize for them," Ribicoff said. "On the other hand, the Soviet Union is telling the world it is the model for the state which has the greatest concern for the welfare of every man."

Certainly we do have a story to tell in this respect. It is only in the administration of our welfare program that we should apologize.



CROMLEY IN WASHINGTON

By RAY CROMLEY
Washington Correspondent.
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.
WASHINGTON (NEA) — With all the reports of Russia's 50-megaton bomb and Red achievements in space and in oceanography, there is a need to put the United States and Russian science and defense achievements in balance.

U.S. military scientists are now convinced Nikita Khrushchev is running a major bluff as to his

armed might. Here is why they think so:

Recent adjustments in the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile have put it ahead of the big Soviet ICBMs in accuracy, say military men.

This has shown up in target shooting with Atlases in which all missiles fired grouped in a tight pattern far closer to the target than the two miles previously announced.

Recent Soviet tests indicate the big Soviet birds cannot match

this accuracy, Air Force officers report.

The Pentagon experts attribute this to certain lacks in the Soviet guidance systems. Government scientists report Russia is still trying to lick the solid fuel problem on its big missiles.

The United States has considerably more operational intercontinental missiles and many more intercontinental bombers than the Russians, reports coming to the government indicate. Military analyses indicate the Russians have never been ahead of the U.S. in ready-to-fire intercontinental missiles, despite the previous missile gap reports.

Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Glenn Seaborg reports the U.S. is ahead of the Soviets in atomic development, despite the big series of Soviet tests.

Military men say the U.S. has a wider selection of bomb and warhead types. Government scientists say the U.S. can put a larger punch in smaller warheads than can Russia.

The U.S. has known how to make 50-megaton and 100-megaton H-bombs for more than five years. With U.S. missile accuracy, these big bombs are militarily

uneconomical. With Soviet missile lack of accuracy they're a necessity.

For the next major development in atomic warfare, the key problem is to know more about the inside of the atom and the forces which hold that tiny heart of all matter together.

In this field of high-energy physics, the U.S. is well in the lead. Though the Russians are pushing hard, they've had some serious problems which have slowed down their research, government scientists in the field report here.

In this inside-the-atom field, the American scientists are not only ahead, but possibly gaining on the Russians.

Air Force scientists who have now analyzed carefully the characteristics of the new Russian military airplanes shown at this year's big Soviet air show, say the Soviet planes were scientifically well designed but that they are well behind U.S. developments. There is no indication the Reds are catching up here.

Air Force scientists believe the United States is ahead of the Russians in developing a 1,000-mile air-to-ground ballistic missile which will allow a bomber

to stand off outside of Russia and hit targets well inside her borders.

Navy men who watched recent Russian naval reviews were unimpressed. They report that missile launcher mechanisms on Red missile ships are crude. They saw no innovations that would indicate the Soviets' surface fleet is gaining on the American fleet.

Despite Khrushchev's boasts, U.S. Navy men have seen no operational Russian atomic submarines. From other evidence they believe the Reds are now in the process of testing and trying such subs.

Navy men say they have no evidence that the Russians have yet developed a workable, fleet-ready, Polaris-type missile that can be fired 1,200 miles or more from a submerged submarine.

The best the Reds have thus far, the Navy men say, is a submarine which can surface and fire 200 to 300-mile missiles.

The Russians have made remarkable progress in chemical and biological warfare, studies of their scientific publications indicate. Army chemical men say there is no certainty whether the Reds are ahead of or behind the U.S. developments.

Can This Report Be Trusted?

The reader is justified in asking this question when he reads an analysis such as that in a nearby column by Col. Ray Cromley, our Newspaper Enterprise expert in Washington.

Colonel Cromley, U.S. Army Reserve, has many years of military and newspaper service. He is a graduate in nuclear physics from California Institute of Technology. He has been a student of the Communists since he served as a U.S. army liaison officer with Red troops at Yenan, China, during World War II.

Colonel Cromley is highly trusted by official quarters in Washington. He is also highly trusted by newspapers which, like The Herald and News, subscribe to NEA and use his dispatches.

Your editor believes balanced, unemotional reports such as this are an invaluable aid to an informed citizenry which wants to help our government preserve peace and freedom.



THE DOCTOR SAYS . . .

Drug Causes Some Ill Side Effects

By HAROLD T. HYMAN, M.D.
Written for
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

Q—My husband has been taking medicine for the relief of angina for the past year. His pain has been greatly lessened and he rarely gets attacks any more. But he started to lose his hair. Now he's almost bald and his eye-

brows are so thin you can hardly see them. Could this be caused by his medicine?

A—I'm afraid it could. A recently introduced drug of considerable value (trapanol or MER-29) may cause fading of hair color, loss of hair (alopecia) and marked skin dryness. If your husband has been taking this drug,

he may be showing these side effects that should disappear after medication has been discontinued.

Q—I have had diabetes insipidus since 1950 and have been controlling it with daily injections of pitressin taminate in oil. But I'm so sore from the injections I just don't know what to do. I've made many inquiries but no one knows of any substitute for the injections. Have you any suggestions?

A—Since diabetes insipidus, as its name implies, is a harmless disturbance causing nothing more than a tremendous thirst and the minor nuisances that go with the necessity for frequent eliminations of the enormous amounts of ingested fluid, why don't you just sign off on your injections and use your affliction as a fine excuse for keeping your kidneys well flushed?

Q—A neighbor recommended finger surgery to help restore my hearing. Is this worth a trial? I am getting quite deaf.

A—Sorry, but, despite claims for success by some enthusiasts, a recent report in the Archives of Otolaryngology is most discouraging. In this study, done on deaf children (to eliminate the factor of suggestion) and controlled by delicate hearing tests (audiograms), "no change in hearing levels was observed" when audiograms were compared before and after treatment. In all fairness, it should be noted that parents of the children disagreed with the results of the tests. They thought the youngsters "actually heard better."

Well-wishers are apt to be influenced by a desire to note improvement. Hence the evidence presented by the machine is more reliable.

Q—Will a tapeworm thrive or be discouraged by the use of alcohol as a beverage?

A—if the tapeworm happened to be a total abstainer or a member in good standing of Alcoholics Anonymous, I imagine he'd be "discouraged." Otherwise, like many of us he "might take it or leave it," depending on how he happened to feel as the beverage passed by.



NOTHING SPECIAL

(W. B. S.)

I am frequently reminded of the kindness and solicitude of "neighbors"—but never has there been a more touching instance of their usefulness than is represented in the following dispatch from Nelson Reed:

Nothing Special
Herald and News,
Klamath Falls, Ore.
Dear B:

Thanks to my neighborhood "clipping bureau" which always keeps me informed when my name appears in Police Court Annals, NOTHING SPECIAL COLUMNS, and such other noteworthy public news items, I learned last evening that my name had been linked with those famous gentlemen J. T. Torquemada and Quintas Ecerwal. I thought at first that they were "wetbacks" up to dig spuds 'til I borrowed a children's encyclopedia from the neighbors.

I am flattered that at my age I should be suspected of galloping around the neighborhood after midnight like a Halloween Witch, hurling rolls of toilet paper into the high trees of my admirers or otherwise. Unfortunately, before I have even got far enough along in reading the Editorial Page of the evening paper to glance at the "Nothing Special" column, I fall asleep. So you see I cannot run around nights like I used to. For this very same unfortunate inability to stay awake while reading your very admirable advice to us juveniles, I missed your comments about the toilet tissue hurling.

It is my own somewhat prejudiced opinion that it was done by some Patriotic Citizen who was only following our Dear President's own behavior and advice, to throw things away generously and without thought, and thus help our poor depressed economy.

Nelson Reed

I suppose you've all heard about the jungle potentate who amused himself by capturing and broiling rival chiefs and taking home their regal thrones as loot. He had so many of these that he was forced to store them up in the rafters of his grass shack and as time went on the weight of these treasures began to make the rafters sag. One day the rafters gave way with a thunderous crash, all the thrones fell down and the potentate was killed.

The moral is this: people who live in grass houses shouldn't store thrones.

I'm hoping that early reports that OIT's new buildings will be entirely of glass and steel construction just ain't so. About the only benefit the area would get under such conditions would be the sale of sand and water for the little bit of concrete slab required. It would be most unfortunate if plans and specifications for the buildings called for materials and construction methods precluding use of our own native resources such as wood and brick manufactured in the Klamath area. Another bad element is that pre-cast concrete columns, and roof structures and glass and steel type of construction would mean that very little local labor would be used as compared with structures of more conventional type.

In the Medford Mail-Tribune recently was this comment — and pertinent (I think) query:

"Hedrick Junior High School's ninth grade football team whipped Klamath Falls 26 to 6 Saturday at Klamath Falls. But it was a costly victory."

"Quarterback Jim Cox suffered a broken leg, quarterback Jack Mullen received a broken hand and halfback George Way and end Lynn Flanders sprained ankles."

How is this to be explained? the Mail - Tribune asks. Bad coaching? Poor training? Inadequate equipment? Lack of judgment? A bad night? Or, could it just possibly be an outrageous overemphasis on sports which sends 14 or 15 year old kids into a game that is rough enough for high school boys and college men?

I've asked several times about the practice of instituting football clear down to the fourth grade in some school systems. Generally, the answer is that "we have to do it, because such-and-such school is doing it, and it's the only way we can be competitive."

There is mighty little merit to the attitude, but it can't be completely disregarded. But, wouldn't it make more sense if the administrators got together in their thinking and banned football throughout the grade system? That way, it seems to me, kids wouldn't get too much rough stuff before they were old enough to absorb a few hard knocks, or dextrous enough to avoid serious injury (for the most part—I realize that we can never eliminate injury, and even death on the gridiron).

Now, before some rootin'-tootin' football fan bluffs off, keep this in mind: I support and enjoy athletics at every level of amateur and professional endeavor. I'd like to see them continued. But, certainly, we cannot expect that games that endanger the lives and well-being of children will be condoned by concerned parents. And, once violent reaction sets in, we often find it spills over into innocent, although related fields. And, another question occurs: Is it reasonable to expect taxpayers to support a football program that dives to the infant level in grade school? I think not.

And, along the same line: While I think it is the responsibility of a parent to look after the physical fitness of his children, there is a growing tendency to slough this responsibility off on the school (like we do on so many other things). So, generally, I favor the physical fitness programs that we have in the schools (although I do not think they should count as classroom activity). At the same time, I think that because football, basketball, track, baseball, etc. are too selective (many boys, for instance, are in several sports) to offer what I call "physical fitness" facilities for all of the students. So, I don't think that the argument that athletics offers a physical fitness opportunity stands by itself.

A teacher was explaining the wondrous things of science as discovered about the universe. "Just think," she exclaimed, "the light we need comes all the way from the sun at a speed of 186,000 miles per second. Isn't that almost unbelievable?"

"Aw, I dunno," retorted one unimpressed athlete, "after all, it's down hill all the way."



TIME OF YOUR LIFE

Home Away From Home?

By ARTHUR LORD

Dear Arthur: My wife and I have been thinking about inviting my mother and father to come and live with us. Our children are in college, the house is large, and if they would like to come, we would like to have them.

It's strange, but all of our friends advise against this. They say that it will only lead to trouble and real grief. I thought I'd write and ask you how we should behave if we do make this invitation to my parents.

My wife's mother and father died several years ago.

FRED

Dear Fred: You should be aware of several things.

First, don't discuss private family affairs like this one with the neighbors. Seldom do they know what would be best for you.

Second, be prepared for a refusal of your kind invitation. Your parents may be perfectly happy wherever they are.

Third, if you invite them and they do come, follow these ground rules:

Treat your parents as friends and equals, not as another gener-

ation with special rules pertaining to them. Insist that they become useful members of the household.

Nothing leads to unhappy family life faster than less-than-full participation in family life.

And respect your parents' desire for independence and privacy just as much as you expect them to respect yours.

Dear Arthur: Mother just became a widow. Most people would have said that their father died, but I don't know any other way to express how attached mother was to dad. He was the entire world for her. Whatever he wanted, she did.

As children, we had to learn from our father that mother really did love us. You see, she would sometimes give the impression that the only person she loved was father. Now that father is dead, mother can't seem to adjust to life.

What should we three sisters do? We are all in our late 30s.

NEE WEBSTERS

Dear Webster: Fortunately, real people are not like the princesses of the fairy tales who weep their lives away over the death of their loved ones. Real people ad-

just. Some, sooner. Others, later. The speed of adjustment depends on the love and interest you show a bereaved person.

Your mother needs someone to love. You can help by making yourself and your sisters available, allowing your mother to give you the great love she has within her, and permitting time to do the work that it alone can do.

Dear Arthur: I live in Tennessee. Can my Social Security check be sent to me at a lady friend's home in Missouri? My wife has taken all the money I've ever earned and I don't want her to get ahead of this. My little gal in Missouri understands my problem and will help me keep my money.

G.

Dear G.: Before you get yourself caught in a classical squeeze play, why not have the check sent to you in care of your own post office box?

Dear Reader: Please send your questions to me, Arthur Lord, in care of this newspaper. Look for an answer to those of general interest in future columns.

Seasonal

ACROSS

1. Trees have —
2. Fixed looker
3. Flower —
4. Maturest
5. Dispatched
6. Kind
7. Doctrine
8. Possessive pronoun
9. Feminine appellation
10. Grim beard
11. Trovostian
12. Indian
13. Age
14. Empty
15. Crested mountain
16. Mohammed's son-in-law
17. Leather thong
18. Vessel
19. Dropped
20. Permit
21. Congers
22. Poem
23. Measure of cloth
24. Stimulus
25. Bowing tools
26. — of grass
27. High regard
28. Most unusual
29. Sharper
30. Reluctant
31. Mistakes

DOWN

1. Cleopatra's snake
2. Shoshonians
3. Piece of wool (Sew.)
4. Muse of astronomy
5. Thaws

Answer to Previous Puzzle

JOHN SAM ANNE
ALICE TYE LEAD
GAIL LANE
SODDEN PATEN
LAD LAY
WILDER PARKSONS
ADES DAVE TEA
PEN RACE STOP
GATLATE LOONG
ERIE DO CODES
ROSA DON MANS
EVIL TOO ODOR
YESS ERR

32. Epistle (ab.)

33. More clamorous

34. Click beetle

35. Attire

36. Defeated one

37. European

38. Piece out

39. Written form of Mistress

40. Soothsayer

41. Feminine undergarment

42. Female saint (ab.)

43. Piece out

44. Written form of Mistress

45. City in Nevada