

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North 1st St. Phone 2-6141

ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor; HERB GREY, Advertising Manager; GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager; ERIC ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor; EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor; HARVEY CHEPMAN, Telegraph Editor; RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor; OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor; DALE ERICSSON, Circulation Mgr.

Entered as second class matter at Medford Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1897

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail—In Advance: Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$12.00; Daily and Sunday—Six months \$6.50; Daily and Sunday—Three mos. \$3.50; Sunday Only—One year \$3.50.

By Carrier—In Advance—Medford, Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent, and on motor routes: Daily and Sunday—One year \$15.00; Daily and Sunday—Six months \$8.00; Daily and Sunday—Three mos. \$4.50; Sunday Only—One year \$4.50.

Official Paper of the City of Medford, Official Paper of Jackson County, United Press—Full Leased Wire, MEMBER OF ADVERTISING BUREAU OF CIRCULATION

Advertising Representatives: WEST-HOLLIDAY COMPANY INC. Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

OSGON 1956 NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

Flight o' Time: Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30 and 40 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO: June 24, 1946. (It was Monday). Dial telephone service to be installed in Grants Pass sometime in 1947, telephone spokesmen announced; total cost will be \$300,000.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: The harvesting and processing of the mighty pea crop of eastern Oregon is now underway, full blast. There will be enough peas to feed the world without mixing them with carrots and keep all the political and circus "3-pea games" operating on a 60-hour week.

20 YEARS AGO: June 24, 1936. (It was Wednesday). Talent considers re-allocation of Pacific highway through town; alternative route would be 3.2 miles in length, cost \$130,000, and eliminate ten curves.

Fifty members of Jackson County Food and Beverage Dispensers' association pledge determination to work in close cooperation with state liquor board in attaining and maintaining a high-class standard of service.

30 YEARS AGO: June 24, 1926. (It was Thursday). Bids for a bridge across the Rogue river at Gold Hill to be opened by state highway commission in August; cost about \$65,000, with Southern Pacific paying \$10,500 and state and county paying the rest.

40 YEARS AGO: June 24, 1916. The Rev. Alfred J. Hogg, pastor of the East Side Presbyterian church, Stockton, Calif., has accepted the call to the Medford Presbyterian church.

What's the Answer? Can You Get 4 of the 7? Copr. 1955, Editorial Research Report

1. Sen. Theodore F. Green (D-R.I.) is older than any other U.S. senator in history; right or wrong?

2. Fulton is a county in Georgia, a city in Missouri, a fish market in New York, an early American steamboat operator?

3. Which three of these states joined the Union after 1900: Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Wyoming?

4. It took (a) 50,000 gallons of paint, (b) 150,000, (c) 300,000, or (d) 1,000,000 gallons to paint the big new aircraft carrier Saratoga?

5. Huku is the name of a tropical disease, a towel fabric, or a guerrilla fighter?

6. The U.S. pays more than any other nation toward U.N. expenses; second largest payment comes from China, France, Britain, or Russia?

7. A man who dies in his 76th year is 76 years old; right or wrong?

The answers: 1. Right (Green broke the record June 17, at age of 88 years, 8 months, and 15 days). 2. All four. 3. Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma. 4. 300,000 gallons. 5. Philippine guerrillas (Hukbalahaps). 6. Russia. 7. Wrong (he's 75).

Opposition Is Explained

"Even right here in Southern Oregon, there is no incentive for electors to support—and help finance—a Federal Hell's Canyon dam which would benefit, primarily, the Columbia area valley area."—Grants Pass Courier.

Ever since the hey-day of Senator Joe McCarthy and "McCarthyism" the editorial policy of our esteemed neighbor to the north has been somewhat puzzling.

But perhaps in the above there is a partial explanation. The Courier doesn't deny that a Federal project at Hells Canyon would benefit the Columbia River valley and its people.

But that, it thinks, is no reason why the voters of Josephine County should support it.

THIS pronouncement of policy seems plain enough. Unless there is some tangible and direct benefit to Grants Pass and its environs, then there is no incentive to support ANY suggested public work or improvement.

Carrying this reasoning to its logical conclusion would mean the Grants Pass paper should oppose the Talent irrigation project, for it, too, is a federal and therefore socialistic development, which will benefit "primarily" Jackson County, and would offer therefore no reason for the Grants Pass "electors" to support it.

IT IS hard to believe the Grants Pass paper is serious in this contention which we supposed had gone out with the covered wagon, but we have often suspected a satirical touch and then discovered later that none existed—it was all in deadly earnest.

Our neighboring contemporary has perhaps renounced, among other of its pet aversions, the Chamber of Commerce axiom that what benefits one section of a state benefits all, just as what benefits one section of the county or country benefits all.

If this is correct that would explain a number of things.—R.W.R.

How About a Gov't Press?

We are surprised to see so many editors in Oregon swallowing the private power propaganda regarding newspapers. We don't mean many of them have but there should, as we see it, be none.

The "line" taken is a familiar one—namely: If it is desirable to have power plants owned and operated by the government then why not have government-owned and operated newspapers?

At this suggestion the editors are supposed, presumably, to scream with horror, promptly lay down their arms, and faint.

But as far as we have observed none has. And for this refusal to be intimidated by such a horrid suggestion, there are, we believe, a number of reasons.

NO. 1 IS there is no popular demand for such action, and in the foreseeable future will be none. The American people want a FREE PRESS, not a government owned press, whether one major party is in control at Washington or the other. Where the people don't want a thing, the possibility of having it forced on them is, in the U.S.A.,—thank the Lord—to say the least, remote.

On the other hand there IS a popular demand for public power, or the TVA's, Bonneville and Grand Coulees would never have been built. They were built—

Not to drive out private power (that can't be done and as far as we know, no one wants to) private power now controls 80 per cent of the nation's electric production, is exceedingly prosperous and steadily growing. Federal power projects are favored only to serve as a check and balance, prevent excessive rates, and threat of a monopoly, and where multiple projects are indicated, supply collateral public benefits which the private companies will not, or can not, provide.

AS SENATOR Morse pointed out when in Oregon last week, he has no quarrel with private power projects, where multiple power projects are not indicated, only where they are, and as on the Snake river where private power companies insist upon doing what the government could do better, from the standpoint of promoting the public welfare.

When one realizes what a limited area there is in this county where multiple projects ARE feasible, the cry of "save my child" proceeding from the private power interests, really sounds rather silly.

BUT the "line" continues:

"This is communism, or socialism, the terms are synonymous. It is an alien philosophy, it means the death of private enterprise and the American way of life. Now is the time for everyone to come to the aid of the party, etc. etc."

Interesting if true. But it just doesn't happen to be true.

Russia has communism which is the dictatorship of one man or a few, with the people having no more to say about how they should be governed or by whom than the unfortunates in the Soviet slave labor camps.

England is partially socialistic. The principle of public ownership and operation has been considerably extended over there, but the people have ultimate control and they can reduce this socialization or get rid of it entirely whenever they—or a majority of them—so desire.

THE latter is, of course, even more true in this country. The people have it in their power through the ballot box, to determine at any general election how they should be governed and by whom—and in a few months that will be determined for at least another four years. Such a situation no more resembles socialism, communism, or any other "ism" than it resembles paganism.

How silly can we get?—R.W.R.

Republicans Dominant in East But Face Democratic Challenge

Washington—(CQ)—Republicans still hold the upper hand in the industrial East, but they face a serious challenge from Democrats in the approaching campaign.

In 1952 President Eisenhower swept the six New England states, plus New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland. Only West Virginia, of the 12 eastern states, went to Stevenson. At the same time, Republican representatives were elected in 80 of the East's 129 Congressional districts.

But in 1953 the wind began to shift. Democrats proceeded to oust Republicans as governors first in New Jersey, then in 1954 in Maine, Connecticut, New York and Pennsylvania. Also in 1954, Democrats captured nine more House seats, making the current line up read: GOP 71; Democrats 58. Senate Seats Up

This year, the parties will be fighting not only for the East's 153 electoral votes and 129 House seats. Six Senate seats are at stake, five held by Republicans.

The GOP is concentrating on ousting the lone eastern Democrat whose term expires—Sen. Herbert H. Lehman of New York. But Democrats are believed to have a better-than-average chance of knocking off Sens. John Marshall Butler (Md.) and James H. Duff (Pa.).

Republicans are counting on President Eisenhower's wide popularity to bolster the party's position in the close Senate races, as well as in the contests for 23 House seats GOP candidates won in 1954 by less than 55 per cent of the vote. By contrast, only a dozen of the Democratic-held districts in the East are similarly classed as "marginal," and seven of these were won from Republicans in 1954.

Some Strength Shown. The extent of Democratic strength in the large cities of the East—New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, Pittsburgh—is underscored by Congressional Quarterly's study of the 129 eastern districts, part of CQ's continuing analysis based on the 1950 census.

President Eisenhower got 55 per cent or more of the vote in 71 of the districts, while Democrat Adlai E. Stevenson carried 29 districts by similar margins. The remaining 29 districts were carried by less than 55 per cent of the vote—21 by Eisenhower, eight by Stevenson.

On the average, the 29 pro-Stevenson districts gave Mr. Eisenhower only 38 per cent of the vote. All but four of the 29 were in cities—14 in New York, four in Philadelphia, two each in Boston and Pittsburgh. Negroes averaged 13.4 per cent of the population of these 29 districts, while the foreign-born white population averaged 17.3 per cent.

In Other Districts. By contrast, the 71 pro-Eisenhower districts gave the GOP candidate 63 per cent of their vote. These districts averaged 61 per cent urban, which is close to the national average. Negroes averaged only 2.8 per cent, and the foreign-born 10.3 per cent, of the population in these districts. Averages for the 29 marginal districts fell between these two groups.

The contrast in the proportion of foreign-born is even more marked in a breakdown of New York State's 43 districts. President Eisenhower carried eight of the 22 New York City districts and all 21 upstate districts, but averaged only 33 per cent of the vote in the 43 districts carried by Stevenson.

In the latter group of districts, the foreign-born averaged 24 per cent of the population, compared with 10 per cent in the 21 upstate districts. But in the eight city districts also carried Eisenhower, the foreign-born averaged only 2 per cent. Republicans are making strong

efforts to attract minority groups in the cities, but they have a long way to go. In 1954 GOP Congressional candidates averaged only 27 per cent of the vote in New York City's 14 strongly Democratic districts. In the six city districts which elected Republicans to the House, five of the winners got less than 52 per cent of the vote.

Democrats are hopeful of further gains in the East this year, especially in certain New England and Pennsylvania districts suffering from chronic unemployment. However, this expectation may boomerang if the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress adjourns before acting on President Eisenhower's request for \$50 million for giving a hand to the so-called "depressed area."

(Copyright 1956, Congressional Quarterly)

In the Day's News

Yugoslav President Tito signed agreements in Moscow pledging cooperation with the Soviet Union in party and government affairs "on a basis of equality." Following the signing, Tito pinned on Soviet Defense Minister Zhukov's bosom Yugoslavia's highest decoration. It was quite a love feast.

Zhukov struck an attitude and said Yugoslavia will fight shoulder to shoulder with Russia in any future war and Tito was quoted as predicting that his country will march arm in arm with Soviet Russia from now on.

Tito evidently thought that one over and counted up on his fingers the amount of money the United States has shelled out to him during the years when he was making faces and thumbing his nose at Moscow. At any rate, he later denied the "arm in arm with Russia" crack.

He said the reporters had misquoted him. WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

WHAT of Tito? Personally, I wouldn't trust him any farther than I can throw a Hereford bull by the tail. He's communist—and the communists STICK TOGETHER.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

Clipping Department—from the Eugene Register-Guard: "RAISED EYEBROW" Summer students at the University of Oregon may take an English course described as follows: "Studies in Romance; hours to be arranged; Friendly Hall."

Last week a feminine reader telephoned the Mail Tribune news room (as many people do when they want information) to inquire whether or not the style of dinner invitation she planned to use was correct according to Emily Post.

The office expert on such matters—the society editor—was busy on another telephone, so our friend discussed the matter with a male staff member. He assured her that, in this easy-going day and age, circumstances determine whether or not a dinner invitation is correct. He also assured her the type she had in mind was, in his opinion, the best under the circumstances.

This apparently comforted her, for her final remark was, "Well, if they say anything, I can say 'The man said so.'"

Looking over at the lumber company that lives kitty-corner across the street from the news room, we are struck with one of the more useless differences between a business firm and a woman: A woman would never have a sign saying "Established 1908."

More Clipping Department, this time from the Pendleton East Oregonian:

A friend said to us the other day, "My you must welcome the summer letdown in news." We asked, "what letdown?" and she explained, "oh, things just seem a lot slower in the summer."

People make the news, and they make it without regard for time. The newspapers report it and, much as they'd like to, they can't regulate the flow of it. This summer people will continue to get married, have babies, kill and maim themselves in auto accidents, steal, commit suicide and murder, play games,

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

What, we wonder, did the man have in mind who wrote the sign we noticed for the first time when walking down an alley after work and looked up to about the 18-foot level on the brick wall at the back of a tavern, and read: "No trespassing on This Roof?"

Possibly significant sociological note: One popular make of automobiles last year sold more light blue cars than any other single color. So far in 1956, however, the same firm has sold more solid-black cars than any other color. Second most popular this year is dark gray.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

More Federalese: To clarify—To fill in the background with so many details that the foreground goes underground. Referred for appropriate action—Maybe your office knows what to do with this.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE DOCTORS AND THE PRESIDENCY

The President, it appears, is taking it as a matter of course that the country is expecting him to decide

once more whether he will run again—It may be useful to remind ourselves that the situation in which he finds himself is peculiarly difficult for him, for the doctors who must advise him, and for the press which must keep the people informed.

The root of the difficulty is not so much medical as it is constitutional.

The President is the key figure in the American system; without his active guidance and control the system does not work. The President is elected for a fixed term of four years, and if he becomes in some measure incapacitated, there is no one to take his place. When, therefore, the President has had a serious illness, the crucial question is not his life expectancy. If he dies, the system provides the Vice President take over. The crucial question is whether he can count on his energy and personal powers over a period of four years.

FOR the system, as now established, makes no provision for invalidism or for failing powers. This is what is in the back of people's minds when they listen to the medical opinions of the doctors. They are waiting to be reassured about the President's health for the next four years.

It is here that a misunderstanding, such as it is, has arisen between the doctors and the public. The doctors have been talking about the President's recovery from his heart attack and from his operation. The politicians, who are playing for very high stakes, have been treating what the doctors say as an expert verdict on the President's fitness to carry the burden of the Presidency for a second term. These are not one and the same.

Owing to the fact that the President has a fixed term of office and that there is no one to substitute for him if he can not carry the burden, the doctors are being pressed to make a prognosis which must in the nature of things be highly speculative. They are expected to say not only whether he has recovered from his heart attack and is recovering from the lletitis, but really whether he will be in full vigor during a second term. If this were a parliamentary government on the British model, this question would not arise. The head of the government would not be committed to a

fixed term, and therefore it would not be necessary to do any medical guessing about what will happen in the future over a period of years.

THE question does arise here, and in the case of President Eisenhower, given his age and his medical history, it is a momentous question. The American system, as it works now in practice, cannot do with a sick or a failing President.

It can be said that the system is more defective than it needs to be, and that some of the worst features of it—as they were exhibited when Garfield and Wilmon were disabled—could be remedied. It should become the established practice that when the President is ill, the Vice President takes over until the President recovers. There is little doubt that this is what the authors of the Constitution intended. Any sick President—it might have been Eisenhower himself—can put this constitutional arrangement into effect.

He can invite the Vice President to sign official documents, let the action be challenged in the courts, and have its validity tested promptly in the Supreme Court. The Vice President would not, of course, be sworn in as President. He would remain the Vice President, temporarily discharging the powers and duties of the President.

THE alternative is the device of regency, as operated by Mr. Sherman Adams during the two illnesses of President Eisenhower. This device has worked well enough because the President has not been badly incapacitated for a long time. The device would not work at all well in case of prolonged disability, such as invalidism or the failing powers of age. For the country would not long like the office of President administered by men who have not been elected to any office.

But when all has been said and done about remedying the gross defects of the system, it will still be true that there is no substitute in a Presidential system of government for a strong President in full possession of his powers. This truth is the point of reference for the decision that must be made by the President, and, if he decides to run, then later on by the country.

From what the President said when he was making his first decision we know that after the doctors have said all that they are able to say, he has no choice but to reach his conclusions by applying his conscience to his common sense, informed by his experience of the office of President.

The country will have to make its judgment in the same way.

Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.



Walter Lippmann

Matter of Fact

By Stewart Alsop

WHAT WILL TWINING SEE? Washington — In defense and intelligence circles, the most hotly debated question currently is this: Will the Soviets show off their intermediate range ballistic missile to Gen. Nathan Twining and the other Western Air Chiefs now gathering in Moscow for the Soviet air show? The question is a meaningful one. As first reported in this space, the United States has "hard" intelligence that the Soviets have been regularly testing supersonic ballistic missiles in ranges well over a thousand miles. These ranges are four or five times those yet achieved here for comparable missiles.

Whether the Soviet missiles are operating weapons, equipped with hydrogen warheads, and capable of being guided accurately to target, or mere experimental prototypes. Moreover, there is a vast difference between intelligence reports, however "hard," and the actual display of such new weapons.

It is not surely known whether the Soviet missiles are operating weapons, equipped with hydrogen warheads, and capable of being guided accurately to target, or mere experimental prototypes. Moreover, there is a vast difference between intelligence reports, however "hard," and the actual display of such new weapons.

It is not surely known whether the Soviet missiles are operating weapons, equipped with hydrogen warheads, and capable of being guided accurately to target, or mere experimental prototypes. Moreover, there is a vast difference between intelligence reports, however "hard," and the actual display of such new weapons.

It is not surely known whether the Soviet missiles are operating weapons, equipped with hydrogen warheads, and capable of being guided accurately to target, or mere experimental prototypes. Moreover, there is a vast difference between intelligence reports, however "hard," and the actual display of such new weapons.

It is not surely known whether the Soviet missiles are operating weapons, equipped with hydrogen warheads, and capable of being guided accurately to target, or mere experimental prototypes. Moreover, there is a vast difference between intelligence reports, however "hard," and the actual display of such new weapons.