

# Editorial Page

## Nagging Questions About Cuba

The Senate Preparedness Committee report that Soviet offensive missiles might be in Cuban caves nearby ready for use deserves a little exploration.

Actually, the committee's observation on this point does not differ in most respects from one made months ago by President Kennedy. There is no reason any difference should exist, since in both instances our intelligence experts are the source of this admission.

In the present state of things, we cannot prove such missiles are hidden in caves, nor can we demonstrate they are not.

The committee, led by Sen. John Stennis of Mississippi, does go beyond anything we have had from the President or other administration sources on one big point.

It says that "assuming maximum readiness at preselected sites, the Soviet mobile medium range (1100 miles) missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours."

This calls for frank comment from the President, Defense Secretary McNamara or a top military official.

Kennedy indicated months ago that while missiles might conceivably be stored in Cu-

ban caves, this nation's regular surveillance of the island was such that we would know quickly if they were brought to the surface and made ready for use.

He implied that the Russians and Cubans would have to repeat the process of erecting suitable bases, which we forced them to halt last October.

The Stennis group seems to suggest that Cuba under Soviet control could prepare sites and locate vital auxiliary equipment without our detection. Only thus, obviously, could missiles hauled out of caves be set to fire within hours.

Yet this conjecture leaves unanswered the question just how these extensive Soviet-Cuban preparations could be managed without giving us a clue.

We are entitled to know on what information and reasoning the committee bases this most crucial guesswork. And, as suggested we are also entitled to hear what the government says about this.

The security of free mankind is at stake in this matter of who has what missiles where. There is no place today for idle speculations that cannot be given some foundation in fact and good sense.

## The Six Per Cent Routine

(Register - Guard, Eugene)

For many Oregon voters, the first Monday in May is a day of understandable confusion. Some don't even try to take part in the annual budget elections held by most local school districts on that day. They don't because they really don't understand one of the principal reasons why such elections must be held. They don't understand why it is that, year after year, school districts must ask for approval of whopping property tax levies "in excess of the constitutional 6 per cent limitation."

Perhaps the following schematic explanation will help those who want to vote, and vote intelligently, in school elections. It is an overly simplified explanation, but it serves to convey the essential facts involved. It also dispels what might be mistakenly assumed even by the most conscientious voters if they had nothing but the ballot titles to judge by.

If voters of School District "A" are asked to approve a tax levy of \$300,000 outside the 6 per cent limitation, that does not automatically mean they are being asked to increase the district budget by that amount. If they want to know how the proposed budget for 1963-64 compares with that the district has had this year, they should check newspaper articles appearing in advance of the election or call their school district administrators.

In all probability, a good part of the re-

quested levy outside the limitation — perhaps all of it — was sanctioned by the district's voters last May to support the 1962-63 budget. And, 12 months prior to that, most of it was approved in connection with the district's 1961-62 budget plans.

The point is that for most Oregon school districts, tax increases allowable within the 6 per cent limitation and without special voter approval have been insufficient each year since World War II. But the districts have not been allowed to use levies outside the limitation except as they have been annually approved and annually re-approved and, in most instances, annually increased to match mounting school enrollment totals and the effects of continued inflation of instruction costs.

In brief, there is no appreciable "carryover" effect from one annual school budget election to the next. That's why proposed levies outside the 6 per cent limitation loom so large. In some cases these levies represent as much as 90 per cent of all local taxes needed by the school districts for purposes other than debt retirement and interest. Usually, of course, they are not quite so all-inclusive of districts' tax needs, but the fact remains that most of these levies outside the limitation have been building for 10 years and more. Yet they must be resubmitted to the voters, with whatever additions school budget committees have deemed necessary, year after year, after year.

## IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Soviet Fleet Overrated



By RALPH de TOLEDANO

For some time, viewers — with alarm have stridently warned of a Soviet submarine fleet numbering between 400 and 500 vessels. These cry-wolf accounts have painted our top Navy officials (and, indeed, all of our military) as shortsighted and complacent men unable to perceive the dangers and blinded by a dangerous disdain for Soviet undersea power.

The precise opposite is true. The U.S. Navy, which has never looked lightly on Communist threats, has carefully examined every scrap of evidence available to the viewers — with alarm (and much they have never seen) in order not to be caught unaware.

Our intelligence officials know that the Soviets have these 400 to 500 submarines. But they also know the capabilities of these German — model, World War II style U-boats. All but 12 of these underwater craft are useless in an age of atomic weapons. And those Soviet submarines that are armed with missiles — the 12 — have a maximum speed of 18 knots, which makes them easy prey for our modern hunter-killer submarines. The missiles they carry have a range of 200 to 300 nautical miles, but these could be launched against the United States coast only if our Navy had specific orders not to sink them before they were properly positioned.

There have, however, been stories in the newspapers about a "fleet" of Soviet atomic submarines. On the basis of my own experience with Communist propaganda claims, my brief look at the Soviet's visible naval pow-

er, and the detailed accounts of its "reviews" of Leningrad, it has been obvious to me that this scare talk was based on nothing but a few hints dropped to the right reporter at an impressionable moment. The Communists are adroit at this.

American Intelligence cannot rely on this kind of information. It derives its conclusions from a dull and painstaking process — the kind of brilliantly routine work which in World War II enabled us to break the Japanese code and clobber the Emperor's navy. In intelligence, the Mata Hari and the flamboyant spies are few and far between. The most successful kind of espionage consists of putting together hundreds of thousands of tiny scraps of information until the jigsaw has been completed.

On this basis, small contradictions assume great importance. So too does the even smaller giveaway — which is why all combat soldiers are told never to try to fool the enemy if captured — simply to give their name, rank, and serial number. A lie is frequently more revealing than the truth.

As a result of this kind of work, it can be stated that the Soviets do have an atomic submarine — just one atomic submarine. We know what it looks like, how it is constructed, and how it is operated. We know its speed and its performance. Compared to ours, it is a primitive model. We know it has made at least two trips under the Polar cap. We know without any doubt that it is incapable of any voyage around the world without surfacing. (The Soviets revealed this.) It is possible that other atomic

submarines are under construction, but this is the kind of assumption made about an enemy service for safety's sake.

Perhaps the most interesting piece of intelligence concerns the 400 to 500 conventional (and obsolete) submarines in the Soviet fleet. Why, when the rest of the world was looking ahead to more modern weapons, did the Kremlin choose a vast fleet of craft which would not compare with what was on Western drawing boards?

The answer, simply, is that the Kremlin has always operated this way. When jets were first coming in, the Soviet Union quickly developed one design and then mass-produced it. Today these two-engine TU-16s fill Russian airfields. The planes are lumbering and inadequate, but Comrade Khrushchev sure as blazes has a lot of them. The same has been true of other weapons. The Soviets always seem to have one aim — to achieve numerical superiority. They can then boast of so many of this and that — but while they boast, the United States and Great Britain are developing new and more effective models.

If the Soviets go true to form, their scientists and engineers will work on new plans — waiting for the flow of stolen U.S. and British blueprints. Then the Kremlin will decide on a new model for its submarine fleet. The West changes and adapts with each new effort. The Communists will mass-produce. Then they will announce that they have X number of atomic submarines. This will exceed the number under commission in the U.S. Navy, but in an era of fast-moving technology, there will be no comparison between ours and theirs.

## Wailing Wall



## Grand Strategy Of Freedom

By SAMUEL R. PETTINGILL  
Former Congressman, Indiana  
Socialism's secret weapon is money.

Governments formerly gained power by the sword and swelled their coffers by conquest and tribute. That method is still used, but chiefly against foreigners.

Modern governments obtain power over their own people in a more subtle fashion. They tax away the earnings of their people, and then dole some of it back to them in subsidies, gifts, grants-in-aid, and the award of huge government contracts.

By this process they become the masters of men, and cease to be their servants. The historic relationship is reversed. Instead of government coming to the people for its support, the people come to the government for their support.

Hitler put all groups in Germany in pawn to him via the money route. In the face of the granting or withholding of public money, opposition died away. People began to keep their mouths shut — business men first — but, finally, editors, educators and ministers. He thus united both conservatives and radicals behind him. This is a very important point.

In this country, governors of states, mayors of cities and members of business organizations — chambers of commerce — including those most opposed to Socialism in the abstract, become beggars at Washington for a return of some of the money collected from them in their own communities — less the political brokerage. As beggars, they fawn and smile.

Big government breeds little men. The great "power of the purse," with which the representa-

tives of the taxpayers once held the executive branch in check, is rapidly passing into the hands of a political Santa Claus.

Not one of the extensions of Socialism can be put into effect without money. Cut off the money supply — and the power to borrow — and you stop them in their tracks. As Jefferson said, "We must make our selection between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

Harry Hopkins gave the formula for Socialism — tax, spend and elect. Yet because they fail to grasp the grand strategy of freedom, various groups exhaust themselves on scattered tactical skirmishes — good in themselves, but largely futile in the face of this overpowering flood of money. Justice Holmes used to say, "We must strike for the jugular and let the rest go." I would urge no one to abandon the fight for his own program or group, but the number one plank in all platforms must be the exact reverse of the Hopkins formula — "Reduce taxes and spending, especially at the federal level. Keep government poor and remain free."

Make that the number one plank in all platforms for freedom. The doctors can then fight socialism: medicine, owners of real estate can fight public housing; others can fight federal control of education; business can fight government competition; others can fight to relieve privately created wealth of some of the tax burden.

With reduced Federal spending and sharply reduced taxes as the number one plank of all groups, they can then fight with some chance of success.

As it is, with each group fighting some single phase of Socialism

in which the others are not particularly interested, they are picked off like sitting ducks.

The Socialist planners tell the unthinking with the trick question, "What freedom have you lost?" That's easy to answer. It is my freedom to keep what I earn and spend it as I please. That's the vital distinction between European Socialism and American individualism. "To have and to hold," written into millions of title deeds, tells the story of the individual incentives and rewards that have produced America's magnificent achievement.

A grand strategy for freedom is imperative. We must unite on one point, easily understood, which touches the pocketbook nerve of millions of voters. Intellectual arguments are not enough. You must appeal to the legitimate self-interest of millions. We must find the common denominator of mass resistance to Socialism. The common denominator is the pocketbook. On that concept and that alone can you mobilize an army sufficient in numbers to wage successful war.

We must show millions of voters how they are being hurt — how their security for old age is melting away. The present "run" on our gold by foreign creditors is a storm flag which only fools will disregard.

There are millions of life insurance policyholders. As money becomes cheap, their security shrinks and in time vanishes. A policy paid up in 1940 has lost more than half its value in terms of what it will buy today. A life insurance president has just told us of the disastrous effect of the cheap money policies of the past 20 years on life insurance security. The insurance companies are forced to earn less on their investments. Therefore, they must charge higher premiums for the same protection. Then when the policy is paid, the money received is taxed more, and buys less. To cover all these losses, a typical life insurance holder needs to take out at least 90 per cent more insurance to provide the same purchasing power and protection as in 1920.

Most of the beneficiaries of life insurance are women. Tell them what taxes and debt and rotting money are doing to the security their husbands have worked so hard to provide. "Old age and want — thou ill-matched pair."

Then there are other millions who own government bonds. A bond bought ten years ago for \$75 can be cashed today for \$100. But the \$100 will buy you less than the \$75 did when you turned it over to the government. So you have lost all your interest and part of your principal. And you are ten years older.

Then you have 30 to 40 million people who have been compelled to buy what are called "social security" cards. Their hoped-for security melts away as dollars become cheap. To make up the loss, bills are in Congress to pay them more of these rotting dollars, adding to the tax burden to be carried by all industry, forcing prices still higher, and the music goes round and round.

The guarantees of government are writ on water and carved in sand. Something for nothing is the moral cancer of a free society. Once begun, there is no stopping its deadly course except to find the lowest common denominator of the mass resistance of millions of voters — the pocketbook and the fear of poverty in old age. This is the grand strategy of freedom.



## NOTHING SPECIAL

(W. B. S.)

No matter what side of the political fence one might be on, he or she can hardly feel that the community is anything less than highly honored with the appearance of Sen. Barry Goldwater from Arizona, in a couple of functions here this weekend.

Sen. Goldwater is also a Major General in the Air Force Reserve, and is one of the country's most able and qualified pilots. He is in the area to help Kingsley Field personnel wind up a most successful Armed Forces Week observance this evening. His appearance this afternoon at the dedication of the Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital site is a bonus for the community.

That Mr. Goldwater is a top-ranking candidate for presidential nomination cannot be ignored totally. However, I'm hopeful that all citizens will cast aside any thoughts of political connotations in his visits here today. The Kingsley Field people are most anxious that the General's appearance here be considered in the same light and with the same courtesy that would be extended to any other major staff officer of the Air Corps. The hospital board hopes that citizens will recognize that Sen. Goldwater is one of the nation's outstanding citizens, and a man who has contributed much to the welfare and progress of the nation.

Sen. Goldwater is as articulate as he is brilliant. He has served the country well in a number of capacities. He is also a very busy man. The community can take pride in that Mr. Goldwater has agreed to accept the invitation to participate in the hospital dedication ceremonies and to honor our Kingsley Field people Sunday night.

I hope that Klamath Falls folks realize the important contribution — not only to the nation's defense, but to our community — of the people at Kingsley. Not only are they the best pilots and backstop people in the Air Force, they contribute much to the welfare of the community. They take an active part in every project we ask help in. In addition, they jump in and take hold of projects that are helpful to the community on their own initiative.



## WASHINGTON REPORT . . .

## Congressman Shows Political Courage

By FULTON LEWIS JR.

It takes political guts for a freshman Congressman representing a marginal district to vote "No" on pork barrel legislation.

Particularly when that Congressman is the first Republican to represent his district in 42 years. Particularly when unemployment is high and passage of that bill would mean jobs — building sewers and pumping stations and roads, 15 projects in all.

But Bill Brock, a 32-year-old businessman from Chattanooga, Tenn., did just that. Rejecting the advice of colleagues older and presumably wiser, Brock opposed the President's \$450 million emergency public works bill earlier this session. He explains why:

"For every dollar sent to Washington, Chattanooga residents would receive less than 75 cents back in the form of short-term public works projects. I feel strongly that the same amount of money spent for new industry and more jobs could go a long way toward solving unemployment problems."

Dark-haired Bill Brock, in Washington only three months, is deeply distressed. "I have been tremendously disappointed," he told his associate, Bill Schulz, "in the number of Congressmen whose only question about any legislation is: 'How many votes will it get me?'"

"My criterion is different. Can we afford it? Do we need it? Will it promote individual freedom and responsibility?"

Of the several score freshman Congressmen now learning the Washington ropes, Brock has impressed leaders on both sides of the aisle as one of the most promising. He demonstrated why in a whirlwind campaign last year that frankly surprised GOP officials who had written off Tennessee's Third District as lost.

Republicans had not bothered to run a candidate in 1960, although Richard Nixon carried the district with something to spare. The evidence indicates a "deal" had been consummated by local politicians, leaders of both parties, to keep the seat Democratic.

Proceeding as if there were no deal, Brock began to work in No-

One fellow describes Utopia as the good old days — with all of the modern conveniences added.

There's considerable fussing and fuming over the proposed agricultural program. It would take a London lawyer to figure out just what the whole thing is about. The other day, a piece of literature brought to my attention contained some spoofing of the government farm program. Perhaps you've seen this (or one like it) in other publications. Here is an alleged letter to the Secretary of Agriculture:

"Dear Mr. Secretary: 'My friend over in Hickory county receive a thousand dollar check from the government this year for not raising hogs. So I am going into the not-raising-hog business next year.'

"What I want to know is, in yer opinion, what is the best kind of farm not to raise hogs on and the best kind of hogs not to raise? I would prefer not to raise razor-backs, but, if that is not a good breed not to raise, I will just as gladly not raise any Berkshires or Durocs, cause the hardes work in this is going to be in keeping a inventory of how many hogs I ain't raised."

"My friend Zeke is very joyful about the future of this business. He has been raising hogs for more than 20 years and the best he ever made wuz \$400 until this year, when he got that thousand dollars for not raising any. If I kin get \$1,000 for not raising 300 hogs, then I will get twice as much for not raising 100. Right? I plan to operate on a small scale at first, holding myself down to not raise in bout 4,000 hogs, which means I will have \$8,000 comin'."

"Now, another thing; these hogs I will not raise will not eat 100,000 bushels of corn. I understand that you also pay farmers for not raising corn, so, how much will you pay me for not raising 100,000 bushels of corn not to feed the hogs I am not raising?"

"I want to git started right soon as this seems to be a good time of year for not raising hogs. Now, one thing more, kin I raise me hoid, oh, say a dozen hogs or mebbe even 10 while I am in the not-raising-hog-business. Jest enuff to get a few slices of bacon for breakfast — yer friend."

November, 1960, starting with a campaign nucleus of 30 people, aiming toward November, 1962. There is no indication that he planned, at the time, to be the candidate.

By early 1962, Brock had decided to run. When a brash young liberal won the Democratic primary, defeating a middle-of-the-road incumbent, the scene was set for a bitter fight.

Well financed, Wilkes Trasher received ample Administration support in a campaign that served as a proving ground for the electoral popularity of Medicare. Trasher made medical care under Social Security his key issue. Brock opposed it.

The two were divided on almost every issue: deficit spending, aid to Communist nations, federal aid to education.

When the ballots were tallied Brock had won an amazing victory. In a district where only 15 per cent of the voters are thought to be Republicans, Brock won 51.1 per cent of the vote.

His volunteer organization, which at first numbered but 30 people, had grown by leaps and bounds. The Congressman — elect wrote 4,500 thank-you notes to workers who helped his campaign.

Representing a marginal district, Brock has kept his ear close to the grass roots. He sees his constituents as alarmed by "do-nothing foreign policies" of the Administration. "They want leadership," he says. "They want victory in the Cold War and they're not getting it."

Six months after his first race for public office, Brock is being urged to run for the U.S. Senate. Tennessee voters must decide the fate of Albert Gore in 1964 and of Estes Kefauver two years later. Both are liberal Democrats and would get quite a race from Representative Brock.

Young Republicans hope Brock runs for the post of Young Republican National Chairman at the federation's upcoming convention.

Active in VR affairs for many years, Brock favors Barry Goldwater for President. "The Republican Party," he says, "is the conservative party and Goldwater our leader."