

## Safety Tips for Trees

More than 50 million American families in the next few days will be buying Christmas trees and decorating them for the holiday season.

Unless care is taken, this happy symbol of the holiday season can bring tragedy, warns the National Board of Fire Underwriters.

These suggestions are offered by the Board to keep your Christmas tree firesafe:

—When you buy a Christmas tree, choose one which appears fresh. Before you buy the tree, run your hand over the needles to make sure they are firmly attached. If needles fall when brushed, the tree is dry and you should select another one.

—When you get the tree home, keep it outdoors until you are ready to decorate it. You can keep it fresh by standing it in a pail of water.

—You should wait until just before Christmas before setting up the tree.

—You should place the tree in the coolest part of the room, away from radiators, heaters and the fireplace. This will keep the tree from drying, and reduce the chance of fire.

—Your Christmas tree stand should be of the type equipped with a water container in which the trunk can rest. Fresh trees will "drink" a sizeable amount of water, and you should fill the water container daily.

—Only flameproof decorations should be used on the tree—those made of glass, metal or fire-resistant material.

—Use only electric lights to illuminate the tree and be sure to check light strings before placing them on the branches. Those with frayed wires should be thrown away. If you buy a new set, select a type that bears the Underwriters' Laboratories label.

—The switch controlling the tree lights should be some distance from the tree.

—Electric trains—part of Christmas in many homes—should be set up away from the tree. Sparks from toy trains could be fire hazards.

—Lights on Christmas trees always should be turned off when everyone is away from home.

—Check the tree frequently for dryness. In particular, check tree needles near lights. If they have started to turn brittle, change the position of the lights.

—When needles become so dry they start falling, take the tree down at once and put it outdoors.

—When Christmas presents are opened, the gift wrappings you intend to keep should be folded and put away. Other paper, ribbon and boxes should be gathered up and thrown away promptly.

—Even if the tree still appears to be fresh, take it down the day after New Year's.

—Merry Christmas!

### James Dorais

## Anthony Eden Gives View On Appeasing Dictators

"The differences which divided us were about matters which are decisive to the successful conduct of foreign affairs at any time.

"They include the proposition that a leading democracy, in negotiating with a militant dictatorship, must not go cap in hand in the search of fresh negotiations to cover long-standing differences until there is evidence that the dictator is going to carry out the engagements."

In a new book, "Facing the Dictators," former British Prime Minister Anthony Eden

writes of his differences with the late Neville Chamberlain, the man who, umbrella in hand, returned from his visit with Hitler in Munich, confident, after giving sanction to the dictator's aggression in Czechoslovakia, that he had assured "peace in our time."

Eden, who resigned his post as Foreign Secretary in 1938 in protest against Chamberlain's readiness to recognize Italy's conquest of Ethiopia, clearly foresaw that appeasement led not to peace but to war.

Although they deal with events of the 1930s, and are concerned with the leading dictators of that bygone era, Hitler and Mussolini, his memoirs are utterly timely today.

"The more critical the negotiating position of the democracy," he writes, "the more important it is to hold to the tested forms of diplomacy, to proceed step by step, to make sure of agreement on the preliminaries before embarking on the detailed negotiations."

"To enter upon publicized discussion in order to cover broken engagements, without any evidence that a better fate will befall the new engagements than the old, is to run the most reckless of hazards."

In our time, we have witnessed the building of the Berlin wall without effective protest, the establishment of neutralist coalition governments in Asia which steadily become more Communist, and the willingness on the part of the democratic powers to allow the captive nations of eastern Europe to remain captive, just as Chamberlain saw no harm in the subjugation of Ethiopia and Czechoslovakia.

President Kennedy's action in the Cuban crisis, reversing the national policy of appeasement, won the enthusiastic support of the American people. Appeasement-minded advisors, however, remain in the highest councils of the Administration. Eden's new book is a melancholy reminder of the disaster that can engulf the free world if their policies prevail.



### Expert Reports

## Business 'Plateau' Due During Coming New Year

Los Angeles business should expect a "plateau" rather than a recession in 1963, according to USC's Dr. Preston Martin, professor of finance in the Graduate School of Business Administration.

National and local indicators analyzed by Dr. Martin lend support to his projection of the mildest "slowing down" of business in the post-World II period.

Earlier this year, Dr. Martin noted certain weaknesses in the national business picture. The close coincidence of national and local cyclical patterns was a product of his analysis.

The USC professor has developed nine local "predictors" or "leaders" of local business conditions. "The local indicators of business conditions shows weakness

similar to national indicators," Dr. Martin observed. "The data presage a leveling or slight decline in business in mid-1963, followed by a resumption of economic growth in this area."

The local economy is tied in so clearly with the national one that we are not immunized to the general business cycle, contrary to much popular opinion, according to Dr. Martin.

For example, a national peak was reached and turned in July of 1953; the Los Angeles peak came in the first quarter of that year. By the same token, July of 1957 was a national peak; again the Los Angeles peak preceded the national high point by one quarter. The Los Angeles situation again led a little in 1960. On the basis of this pattern, it would be safe to assume the Los Angeles area will feel the turn from expansion to recession ahead of the national impact," the USC finance expert reasons.

Dr. Martin's own research in the area of business forecasting has made use of data available on nine local "indicators": The dollar liabilities of business failures and the number of these failures in Southern California, the average workweek of production workers, the average hours of overtime, the dollar volume represented by new building permits, total layoffs in manufacturing, total accessions in manufacturing, unemployment claims, and

the number of help wanted ads, all as they are related in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area.

In addition, the USC professor says, he has analyzed three "coinciding" indicators: The index of non-agricultural employment, taxable retail sales and the Security First National Bank's Index of Business Activity for Southern California.

Four of the nine local "indicators" are declining, two are indecisive, and only three are currently rising. On balance, the local indicators suggest a local recession in 1963. The more extensive national indicators are negative, and indeed have been since April or May of 1962. Eight of the national indicators correspond to the local indicators. Four of these are declining and three are indecisive, leaving only one with a positive trend at last report.

Dr. Martin concludes that the slight "dip" indicated for the national economy is also indicated for Southern California, that this is in line with historical trends here, and that the timing suggested is for March, 1963 or later for its beginning.

A brighter note: Dr. Martin's figures suggest the possibility of an eight-month decline which may be the mildest such development in the postwar period, followed by a business expansion in 1964 of substantial magnitude.

### ROYCE BRIER

## Split in China-Russia Axis Coming Naturally

It may be profitable to speculate further on the deep schism separating Red China and the Soviet Union. It is possibly the most significant historical event of our century.

Its sharpest manifestation is the Cuban crisis, where Khrushchev backed a way from a showdown, to be called a "modern revisionist" by the Red Chinese. Revisionist of what? Why, of Lenin, and through Lenin, of Marx.

Lenin is the Communist saint due to three circumstances: he was a ruthless, efficient organizer of revolutionary action; he applied his genius at the right time; he died (1924) before he had to solve the inner contradictions of Marxism.

So he could apply Marx almost pure to his situation, though Marxian theory was designed for a European, particularly a German, situation, not a Russian.

Then came nuclear energy and the Russians became vul-

nerable to disaster. All they could do was build to parity to save the Motherland, an infinitely preferable sure thing to a world revolution gamble. So arose co-existence.

But the Chinese situation is far different. Japan was neutralized. The Russians faced the European west. The Americans were an ocean away. Who would, or could, overthrow the China Motherland? Nobody.

So let us return to pure Marx, a monolithic mankind ruled from a center. Moscow had defaulted as a center, as Berlin had had to default. Why not Peking? Besides, it is no more than was swishing around in Genghis Khan's head in 1215, when he captured Peking. Conquest of the world is in the Asiatic blood. Now all they need is The Bomb, with the non-yellow world remote or preoccupied.

No wonder Mao is bold, while Khrushchev must look to consequences.

PHILADELPHIA — American freedom has its roots in this historic American city.

You breathe it all over the place. Freedom permeates in the ivy covered walls of its patriotic antiquity.

This is the American patriot's home base. Here a patriot is a patriot . . . and a super-patriot has a monument erected to his memory.

The word "extreme" is only labeled to the radicals. An "extreme" patriot is a hero, not a rightist, or conservative, or reactionary, or fascist. But a hero, ready to spill muscle and blood to preserve his country's heritage.

It is near-slander, rubbing shoulders with near-treason in Philadelphia, for misguided men, fanatics, pseudo do-gooders, visionaries, crackpots, international master minds, egomaniacs . . . to advocate theories abhorrent to the American tradition.

What do we mean by the American tradition? It is simply . . . freedom. It is simply . . . free enterprise. It is simply . . . the freedom of an American to join Walter Reuther or John Birch, without insults, rumor mongering and hateful and deliberate falsehoods.

It means that the Christian be proud of his Christ and the Jew be proud of his Moses . . . but it also means that this be left to the Christian and the Jew.

It means that the "left" stand its ideological ground and not try to force socialism and radicalism on a trusting nation.

It means that the "right" uphold the traditions of its conscience without imposing indignities upon respected public officials because of ideological disagreement.

The yardstick is . . . the spirit of the controversy.

It is honest, sincere, loyal to the American tradition . . . the tradition secured with the Constitution and sealed with the blood of loyal Americans.

Not who is right . . . but what is right. Or is the yardstick a deliberate attempt, by deliberate connivance operating under respected rules of "free speech" to undermine the American way of life.

This is where the "right" fights the "left." Not on differences of opinion, but on methods and falsehoods . . . and the threat to regiment Americans into socialism.

Free enterprise is the secret of American success. It has produced . . . and is producing . . . the greatest productive society and the highest standard of living for more people than any other system the world has ever known.

Nothing has been created by man to match it with a 25,000-mile pole around the earth.

Basically the American tradition is the right of every American to make something

of himself . . . if he has the enterprise and the ability to do it by himself.

If he needs a lot of "group" help, then the system of individual initiative has left him behind. He does not fit as a leader in the system . . . he has to be satisfied as a follower . . . which means he will not live as well as the leader, creator, producer.

Too many people put too much emphasis on "free" and too little emphasis on "individual" enterprise.

Our free enterprise system is not a cure-all for all that confronts an American. Nothing is a cure-all for everyone except a deep breath of fresh air.

It is not "manna from heaven." It does not mean that all the rest of the Americans owe any one American a convertible or a TV set.

It doesn't mean living for free, on the sweat of your neighbors.

It doesn't mean that any public official should promise "something for nothing . . . or something from the toil of others." When they do, they are destroying America and its secret of success.

It doesn't mean license, either. It doesn't mean that a manufacturer can run a

sweatshop, or that a merchant can cheat or gouge his customers.

It does mean that an American is responsible for his own keep, unless misfortune has made him an indigent.

It means that government guarantees him . . . opportunity . . . nothing more. This is the whole philosophy of the American tradition.

The incentive to work . . . and save . . . and invest . . . and profit . . . so long as it is done honestly on the street of free competition . . . without unjust injury to any other American.

The future of every normal American is wholly dependent upon each American's individual ambition.

Any proposal or program that encourages dependence on government, instead of independence on individual effort, is a betrayal of the American heritage and total abandonment of the principles of free initiative under which we have become the most envied, the most happy nation on the face of the earth . . . bar none.

This is what the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia reminds the visitor. It's a thousand times better than Disneyland for our children to see.

### Our Man Hoppe

## Is A Hard Rock Just Defensive?

Art Hoppe

Have we invaded Cuba yet? It's bound to happen, all because of these darned missiles. Despite our best efforts to make Mr. Castro a pacifist, his followers keep lobbing these missiles over the fence at our Marines in Guantanamo.

Now these missiles happen to be rocks. And, true, their range and destructive power is limited. But the existence of these missiles in a Communist bastion only a stone's throw from our shores raises a grave question:

Is the rock an offensive or defensive weapon?

The answer is vital to peace in the Caribbean, the Monroe Doctrine, our national security, Russian-American relations, and the future of the U. N. If the rock is a defensive weapon, well and good. But if not . . .

So let us examine the facts coolly. First of all, even the most ardent pro-rock advocate must concede that rocks, when used as weapons, can cause nasty gashes. In this sense, rocks are definitely offensive. Particularly to the party who gets hit by one.

On the other hand, one must be skeptical of emotional statements by anti-rock fanatics that rocks can never be used defensively. For example, should Cuban troops invade Duluth and should the Duluthians greet them with a barrage of rocks, these would be, unquestionably, defensive rocks.

Thus heretofore, the rock, due to its limited range, has generally been considered a defensive weapon as it was believed an aggressor had to actually invade another's territory before he could get hit by one. What the incidents at Guantanamo have proved conclusively, however, is that rocks can be tossed across national boundaries, thereby injuring peaceful people of a different country.

There no longer exists any lingering doubt: Rocks, particularly Cuban rocks are offensive weapons.

Now then, what to do about it? Undoubtedly Mr. Khrushchev will deny there are any offensive Russian rocks in Cuba. All rocks in Cuba, he will claim, are Cuban rocks and are under control of the Cuban militia.

And even if Mr. Khrushchev agreed to removing all rocks from Cuba, how could we be sure he did so? Admittedly, our aerial reconnaissance could spot large boulders. But many small pebbles would escape detection. Particularly if camouflaged.

The only answer is on-site inspection. Perhaps by the International SPCA, which is nonpartisan but anti rock. Of course, Mr. Castro would never agree, claiming, as he does, that Cuban rocks are part of Cuban soil. Soon, then, our militant congressmen will be demanding an invasion to investigate and screen Cuban soil with a fine-toothed comb.

That will cause trouble. Maybe even a war waged between our defensive nuclear bombs and Russia's offensive nuclear bombs.

Well, it just shows what thickets our leaders get into these days trying to decide which weapons designated to kill human beings are defensive and which are offensive.

Meanwhile, don't knock the rock. I confidently predict it will be the most awesome offensive weapon in our arsenal. War after next.

### LIFE'S LIKE THAT

By FRED NEHER



"You'd make a sorry spectacle before a Senate Investigating Committee . . . when you can't even remember what you had for lunch!"