

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 21-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-6141

ROBERT W. RUIHL, Editor. HERB GREY, Advertising Manager. GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager. ERIC ALLEN JR., Managing Editor. EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor. HARRY CHAPMAN, Telegraph Editor. RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor. OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor. DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Entered as second class matter at Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1907.

Subscription Rates: By Mail—In Advance: Per Copy 15c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$18.00. Daily and Sunday—Six months \$9.00. Daily and Sunday—Three mos. 4.25. Sunday Only—One year \$4.25.

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 \$18.00. Daily and Sunday—One month 1.50. Carries in Deliveries—See our copy. All Terms Cash in Advance.

Official Paper of the City of Medford. Official Paper of Jackson County.

United Press—Full Leased Wire. MEMBER OF THE BUREAU OF CIRCULATION.

Advertising Representative: WEST-HOLIDAY 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

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

Flight o' Time

Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO

Sept. 23, 1946 (Monday). The matter of meat inspection in the state was the main topic of discussion at a meeting of the Jackson county board of health Friday.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: There is no shortage of ammunition this year. There is plenty for humans to shoot each other, and the so-called wild life.

20 YEARS AGO

Sept. 23, 1936 (Wednesday). The taxable valuation of Jackson county property for the year 1935 is \$24,063,820 as fixed by the county assessor.

Ira C. Moss withdraws today as a candidate for mayor of Medford.

30 YEARS AGO

Sept. 23, 1926 (Thursday). The opening luncheon of the Greater Medford club for the year will be held at St. Mark's Guild hall at 1 p.m. Monday.

The southbound plane of the air mail service was late today, but the northbound plane was on time.

40 YEARS AGO

Sept. 23, 1916 (Saturday). At the annual convention of the Drama League of America recently held at St. Louis, plans were discussed to widen the influence of that organization.

Jackson county WCTU will hold their convention in Medford at the Baptist church Sept. 29 and 30.

50 YEARS AGO

Sept. 23, 1906 (Sunday). A piano recital will be given by Miss Irene Brown at the Davis Opera house Tuesday.

The second annual gun tournament closed this afternoon at the shooting grounds.

What's the Answer?

Can You Get 4 of the 7? Cpt. 1955 Editorial Research Report

- 1. If Richard M. Nixon ever becomes President, he will be the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th or 5th Quaker President?
2. Most public school teachers are members of the Teachers Union, AFL-CIO; right or wrong?
3. Which of the authors of the four New Testament Gospels was of non-Jewish origin?
4. Less than one-fourth, about one-half or two-thirds, or more than three-fourths of U.S. adults use eyeglasses?
5. The island of Madeira in the east Atlantic belongs to Denmark, Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal or Morocco?
6. Which President of this century married a girl whose maiden name was Roosevelt?
7. An Amperand is a unit of electricity, kind of gravel, printing character, type of raincoat or Scotch fabric?
The answers: 1. Second (Hoover was first). 2. Wrong. 3. Luke. 4. About two-thirds. 5. Portugal. 6. F.D. Roosevelt. 7. Printing character (&).

ICEBERG NEARS AFRICA

Capetown, South Africa—(UP)—A 370-foot high iceberg from the Antarctic is drifting toward Capetown at a rate of more than 100 miles a day, it was reported today. Crewmen of the American tanker Ivy sighted the iceberg 1,200 miles southwest of Capetown.

How Dumb Are We?

Just how dumb are the people of Oregon? That the Republican-chief-of-staff, one Leonard Hall, thinks the voter "I. Q." in this state is far below sea-level, has been amply demonstrated the past few months by the upper-bracket strategy regarding this state.

It all dates from the pressure put on by chairman Hall which in 24 hours, completely reversed the then Secretary of the Interior McKay's mind, as to resigning his place in the cabinet and flying home to run against Senator Wayne Morse.

One day Secretary McKay publicly declared for the steenth time he would NOT resign and would not make the race against Oregon's senior Senator. He was through with politics. The next day, after a lengthy conference with Messrs. Hall and Adams, he said he would and the next evening he was no longer a member of the Eisenhower cabinet but back in Salem and full of fight for a six year term in the Upper House.

How come? When asked if this sudden switch was due to White House pressure Mr. McKay said "no," he had made up his own mind, aided somewhat, however, by overcoming the opposition of Mrs. McKay to six more years of politics and the insufferable Washington, D.C. climate.

It is hard to believe that White House pressure had NOTHING to do with this sudden change of front, but there is no doubt that the Republican G.H.Q. believed the voters of Oregon, as a whole, would never seriously question it.

How dumb can we get?

MR. Leonard Hall also had no question apparently that more people of this state would vote for ex-Governor McKay and against public power, if the eloquent and persuasive Vice President Nixon should tell them to do so. At least he would hardly have dispatched Nixon out to Oregon so promptly and with such a clear cut command, had he any suspicion that such action would lose votes for ex-Secretary McKay instead of making them.

But that, undoubtedly, is what happened. Such a judgment certainly could only be based upon a very low opinion of the intelligence and discrimination of the Oregon electorate.

Mr. Nixon not only declared he and his party were against all public-power development but that the federal government by itself can not do the job of a full development of our resources at all, but only the "triple-barreled" Eisenhower program can do it—whatever that is.

We suppose it means, the job should be handed over to the private power industry, with financial aid from the government, and either local contributions of advice or cash—or both.

If this is correct then it also means not only the end of all further public-power development in this state and the northwest, but a repudiation of such federal power projects as contemplated or now exist, such as Bonneville, Grand Coulee and Hells Canyon.

Can the people of Oregon be so dumb and so blind to their own self-interest as to swallow a bait like that?

Apparently the G.O.P. High command thinks so or neither Mr. Nixon nor anyone else with such a fantastic proposal would ever have been sent to Eugene to tell the people of this state, HOW to vote!—R.W.R.

Unconscious Irony

As a postscript to the above the Portland Oregonian should reprint and its Page 1 make-up man.

In its issue of September 20 the lead article on "column left" featured the reduction of power from Bonneville and the probable closing of several Oregon industries as a result.

Alcoa, one of the largest of them, might be forced to use steam power as a stop gap, the article declared, but could not afford to continue it long because of the increased expense. In other words while more hydroelectric power at lower rates is the crying need in the Portland area and throughout the state—Mr. Nixon says "Nix!"

ON COLUMN right Page 1, Vice President Nixon's attack on all federal power projects was featured under a three-column head and his claim that the only solution available is private power with presumably government aid and local controls, included. What an ironical juxtaposition!

For the only way cheap hydroelectric power in volume sufficient to keep step with Oregon's development, CAN be secured is to rush work on the federal projects that have been started and approved, and secure a congress and administration that will promote and defend public power, not do everything it can to prevent and destroy it.

The assumption of the GOP G.H.Q. must be the voters in wild and untailored Oregon are too dumb to see it.—R.W.R.

Why?

We are merely asking for information to wit: Why is it that calling Senator Richard Neuberger "Slick Dick" is an occasion for issuing a "medal of merit" while applying the same term to Richard Nixon calls for Republican censure and issuance of a badge of shame?

Ah partisan politics, what follies are committed in thy name!—R.W.R.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

NEW FACES

It is being said that we are seeing two new men, a new Stevenson and a new Nixon, and that somehow by an act of will the starry-eyed intellectual of 1952 has made himself over into a tough politician, the ruthless partisan of 1954 has made himself into a statesman moving at the higher levels. These two pictures make things simpler, it seems to me, than they really are.

No doubt men change with experience and as they grow older. But it would be a mistake to suppose that when the Governor of Illinois was nominated in 1952, he was not already a practical politician who knew his way around in politics. It is simply not so that he was an unworried man, his head in the clouds or perhaps in books of philosophy, unused to the precincts and the grassroots, and so innocent, so intellectual, and so high-minded that he did not know or would not look at the facts of life.

As for the transformation of the Vice President, it is difficult to tell in these days when most candidates read speeches written for them by someone else. It is true, however, that this year not only Stevenson and Nixon but Eisenhower too are showing a different face to the electorate. Stevenson and Eisenhower are both high-minded men, and at the same time each in his way, Stevenson by experience and tradition, Eisenhower by intuition, is a practical politician.

In 1952, Stevenson was running as Democratic candidate at the end of an unpopular Democratic administration. He had to separate himself in the voters' minds from the Truman administration and he had to persuade the voters who wanted a change that with Stevenson they would get a change. The party organization was Truman's, and Stevenson had to appeal to the country over the head of Truman. In 1956, his position is radically altered. He has become not merely the titular but actual head of the Democratic Party, and now his need is to identify himself with the party, not to separate himself from it.

Stevenson, in my view, has unusual political insight, and an unusual gift for seeing things as they are. His political judgment in 1952 was quite accurate, and the kind of campaign he conducted reflected correctly the difficult facts of his political situation: That the country

wanted a change from Trumanism, that Eisenhower was virtually certain to win the election, and that the Democratic Party would survive to fight another day if he could give it a new lead. In 1956, he has seen, again I think quite accurately, that the Democratic Party is the majority party, that there is a powerful undertow drawing the Eisenhower Democrats back to their party, and that he has a chance to win if he can rally the Democrats.

THE business of rallying a party which extends across a continent usually means, in the absence of fierce issues, that the national leader must involve himself in local politics in the various states. He must exploit the grievances which are important locally, he must support local hopes, and above all he must work with the local politicians. What is called practical politics is for the most part local politics, and it is bound to involve the national candidate in contradictions and embarrassments.

What this can lead to was demonstrated in 1952 when Gen. Eisenhower, against his better nature, sacrificed Gen. Marshall to appease McCarthy in Wisconsin, and allowed himself to be embraced by Jenner in Indiana. Stevenson himself, though he has nothing like that on his conscience, has been doing more denouncing and more promising than he would do if he were not bent on rallying his highly diversified party.

THE situation of the Republicans calls for a campaign to hold on to the Eisenhower Democrats. They have to take for granted the regular Republicans, the Eisenhower Republicans because they like Ike, the Old Guard Republicans because they feel confident with Nixon. The task of the President is to convince the Eisenhower Democrats that his health and his energy are so good that he can be and will be the effective head of a second Eisenhower administration. The task of Vice President Nixon is to reassure the Eisenhower Democrats that if he becomes President, he will not abandon Eisenhower Republicanism.

As compared with 1952 and 1954, the Republican situation in 1956 calls for a campaign at a high level. Since Stevenson, when he stoops to conquer, does not stoop very low, the prospect is that at least at the top the campaign on both sides will be decent, and that the dirty players, such as they are, will work in the shadows. (C) 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

In The Day's News

By Frank Jenkins

Nobody's shooting yet in the Suez area and the politicians are forking over the same old pile of straw. So let's turn to run-of-the-mill news: Two San Francisco women died in the crash of their automobile into an embankment 18 miles south of Ukiah on Highway 101. The California highway patrol says the car went out of control on a turn, hit the bank and rolled over. (Evidently the driver went into the turn too fast, which is an easy way to get into trouble.)

NEAR Sayre, Oklahoma, a Lakewood Village (California) woman was killed on big Highway 86 when the car, driven by her husband, collided head-on with another vehicle. (Responsibility in that case is hard to pin down. Not enough details. But SOMEBODY got out of his proper lane. When any car gets out so its own lane on a big modern highway bad trouble is apt to ensue.)

THERE is heartbreak in this one: In Palm Springs a mother stood speechless and paralyzed with fear for half a dozen tragic seconds as her 18-month-old baby crawled in front of a car that was just starting from the curb. The baby died under the car's wheels. The driver, until he heard the mother's screams, was unaware of what had happened. (I suppose the bitter, heart-rending moral of that one is that an 18-month-old baby must never be left out of sight for even half a dozen seconds.)

SO MUCH for modern transportation dangers. Let's turn now to one that harks back to earlier days.

A PROMINENT 76-year-old Hood (Sacramento county) rancher was killed in a RUN-AWAY. He was breaking a young horse to harness in the time-honored way—pairing it with an older well-broken horse. The team was hitched to a cart. His son was helping. The father drove around the barn. When he came in sight again the team was running away. The son tried to stop them, but the cart hit a bump and the driver was thrown out. He fell on his head and died.

THERE was a day when run-aways were as much a part of everyday life as car accidents are now. There was hardly a

wanted a change from Trumanism, that Eisenhower was virtually certain to win the election, and that the Democratic Party would survive to fight another day if he could give it a new lead. In 1956, he has seen, again I think quite accurately, that the Democratic Party is the majority party, that there is a powerful undertow drawing the Eisenhower Democrats back to their party, and that he has a chance to win if he can rally the Democrats.

THE business of rallying a party which extends across a continent usually means, in the absence of fierce issues, that the national leader must involve himself in local politics in the various states. He must exploit the grievances which are important locally, he must support local hopes, and above all he must work with the local politicians. What is called practical politics is for the most part local politics, and it is bound to involve the national candidate in contradictions and embarrassments.

What this can lead to was demonstrated in 1952 when Gen. Eisenhower, against his better nature, sacrificed Gen. Marshall to appease McCarthy in Wisconsin, and allowed himself to be embraced by Jenner in Indiana. Stevenson himself, though he has nothing like that on his conscience, has been doing more denouncing and more promising than he would do if he were not bent on rallying his highly diversified party.

THE situation of the Republicans calls for a campaign to hold on to the Eisenhower Democrats. They have to take for granted the regular Republicans, the Eisenhower Republicans because they like Ike, the Old Guard Republicans because they feel confident with Nixon. The task of the President is to convince the Eisenhower Democrats that his health and his energy are so good that he can be and will be the effective head of a second Eisenhower administration. The task of Vice President Nixon is to reassure the Eisenhower Democrats that if he becomes President, he will not abandon Eisenhower Republicanism.

As compared with 1952 and 1954, the Republican situation in 1956 calls for a campaign at a high level. Since Stevenson, when he stoops to conquer, does not stoop very low, the prospect is that at least at the top the campaign on both sides will be decent, and that the dirty players, such as they are, will work in the shadows. (C) 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Will Vote for Ike

To the Editor: It seems to me that your communication section has been pretty one-sided in favor of the Democrats and I am sure there has been a lot of people who feel as I do but failed to get their article printed when writing to you.

Now I have been hearing so much about how wonderful the Democrats are and how much better off we would be if we vote them in, but there's one question no one else has seemed to think about. If they are so wonderful why is the South so poor and backward in progress? As a native of the South I can say they are about the poorest and backward there than anywhere in the U.S., and yet they have voted Democrat for years in their local as well as government elections. I myself came out West and to the state of Oregon because of this as the employment is higher and much better wages under a Republican controlled state, and I'm sure most folk who are from the South will have to admit that. I'm for Eisenhower and his administration because it is a government for the people and has been run with honesty and sincerity. We have gone from war to peace and from unemployment and better wages for all and I'm sure most of the people have the good judgment to see this in spite of what a few might think or say and will again vote for Ike this election and also for a Republican state government. Mrs. C. Poole, Prospect, Ore.

Matter of Fact

By Joe and Stewart Alsop

Washington—The odds against a shooting war in the Middle East are now quoted rather high in official circles. But while the odds on shooting have been going down, the odds that Egyptian dictator Gamal Abdel Nasser will get away with his contemptuous challenge to the Western powers have been going sharply up.

The British, according to the official word, have all but promised not to fire the first shot. And if the British don't fire the first shot, so the reasoning runs, no one else will, least of all Colonel Nasser.

Actually, British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden has not given Secretary of State John Foster Dulles any flat and formal commitment not to use force against Egypt. But all their conversations, during the current London meeting,

have been based on the assumption that shooting must be avoided, which almost amounts to the same thing. By contrast, on his first trip to London after the Suez crisis started, Dulles found the British willing and even eager to use force against Nasser. The British reasoned that Nasser must at all costs be taught a lesson. Otherwise his open defiance of the Western powers would be followed by more of the same all over the Middle East, disastrously jeopardizing vital Western interests throughout the area.

DULLES' main accomplishment in all his comings and goings since Nasser seized the Suez Canal company, has been to persuade the reluctant and skeptical British that Nasser could be taught his lesson without a shot being fired. The Dulles' version of how this might be done may be authoritatively outlined about as follows: First, the shipping of the major maritime nations is to be diverted round the Cape, thus reducing the Suez Canal to a "dry ditch" and weakening Nasser's bargaining power. This was, of course, the real purpose of the Dulles-Eden proposal of a "users' association" to control canal operations—no one seriously ex-

Communications

Letters to the Editor must bear the name and address of the writer, although under certain circumstances the use of a pen name or initial for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with a view to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Reply to Reilly

To the Editor: I am writing this as an answer to Mr. Reilly's communication printed Sept. 19. Let us take it sentence by sentence.

1st. If the Al Sarena case is so much Democratic hogwash why don't McKay discuss it? 2nd. As Mr. Reilly stated they did have a patent on the mine and the right to sell the timber. No one, Democrat, Republican, Independent or Communist, ever said they didn't.

3rd. Mr. Reilly states, quote: "So what. That's the law." This must be corrected to read, that was the law, before Harris Ellsworth was forced to change it to stop his colleague's underhanded "give away" program in 1948.

4th. About twisting the law. What is he trying to do, put several thousand lawyers out of business?

5th. Mr. Reilly stated that McKay believes the people can develop their own states. Then why did he allow this person from Alabama do our job here in Oregon?

6th. In his last statement he spoke of pinkos throwing rocks. What does he call that statement if it is not throwing rock or mud on his part?

He signed his communication with "All America Constitutional Party." I know nothing of this party, but if they all stand back and throw mud at everyone who brings facts to the front, I am not interested in knowing about it. George E. Smith, 636 Palm St., Medford, Ore.

"The South Will Lose Again"

To the Editor: Southerners who oppose racial integration are showing their bad side, and unwittingly the bad side of this country. Russia and Red China are probably right when they accuse us of being fourflushing windbags when we speak of America as the free world. True, the Civil War stopped the sale of the Negro on the auction block, but that was about the extent of his co-called emancipation. I was born and brought up in the south where they said Negroes were beasts. I refused to believe it. I defy any surgeon, scientist, or anyone else to find any difference between the heart of a black man and that of a white man if they were laid out side by side for microscopic examination. The same goes for the brain and other vital organs. White or black, either can act like a beast and sometimes do.

I've seen Negroes lynched without trial and their ears cut off for souvenirs, a beastly crime if ever there was one. The present shameful behavior of our southern friends can be blamed on tradition, stupidity and false pride. They claim to "like the Negro in his place," which is generally as a poorly paid servant. If it were possible to remove all Negroes out of the south for 12 months so the whites would have to do their own work, I believe they would be welcomed back with open arms and given a better deal from there on out.

Southern people are fighting the Civil War all over again and are destined for defeat once more because their inhuman treatment of other human beings cannot be justified in the eyes of God nor man. Frank Strickland, Cave Junction, Ore.

Candidate Morse knows these facts. If he doesn't he isn't smart enough to be a Senator. Since he does, his advocacy of a lowered retirement age and higher benefits deserves to be branded what it is. It is a bald faced attempt to buy votes by a promise that he can't redeem. Dick House, "The House of Insurance" Medford, Ore.

pected Nasser to accept the proposal. Second, economic pressures are to be brought to bear on Egypt, and these measures will in turn increase both the internal and external pressure on Nasser to make a reasonable settlement of the canal dispute. When they begin to feel the pinch, it was argued, the small but internally powerful class of Egyptian merchants and businessmen will be eager for a settlement.

So will Nasser's oil producing Arab allies, whose oil revenues will be sharply cut. So will other countries on whose support Nasser counts. Eighty per cent of India's trade, for example, is normally routed through the canal, carried largely in British bottoms, and a settlement will then be very much in India's interest.

UNDER such internal and external pressures, Nasser is to be brought to a reasonable frame of mind, and he—or conceivably a successor—will ultimately accept the minimum Western terms. These terms boil down to some form of international participation in the operation of the canal. Thus Nasser, according to the Dulles, version, is to be taught his lesson without the direct application of force.

Maybe things will actually work out that way. The slow erosion of economic pressure, it is true, eventually brought old Mohammed Mossadegh down, and forced an acceptable settlement of the Iranian oil dispute. But there are certain important differences between the Iranian oil crisis and the Suez Canal crisis. Egypt is by no means as economically dependent on canal revenues as Iran was on its oil revenues. Unlike Mossadegh, moreover, Nasser can turn to the

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

Reporters are trained to write stories which are as unbiased and objective as possible. They don't always feel that way, though. Once in a while they write a story the way they'd like too—but not for publication.

One such follows. The names have been changed to protect the innocent:

"John Q. Doe spoke at great length to the Blank club at the regular meeting last night. "Doe's talk featured nothing spectacular, and consisted of a series of repetitious platitudes, while a bored audience roared with apathy. As he sat down at the end of his talk, the crowd cheered in gratitude."

And how many meetings THAT could have been written about!

The same reporter likes to cover those dinners where he doesn't have to pay for the meal. Assigned to one such meeting last week, he had a lapse of memory and had a big supper before leaving. It wasn't until he saw the linen, the silver and great heaping platters of fried chicken he remembered it was a dinner meeting. He choked down three big pieces, too.

From time to time we feel called upon to report in this column on a typographical error we have spotted in this or another paper.

What we want to know is why it's so darn easy to get typographical errors when you DON'T want them, and why it is so darn hard to get them into type when you DO want them.

A spirited discussion derogatory to jaywalkers was going on in the news room last week when the sports editor suddenly pointed out we might be slandering a member of the Medford High school football squad—Jay Walker, who plays right half.

There are two people on the news staff among whose chief duties are the writing of headlines—those things that tell you what to expect when you read the story.

One of them writes heads for "wire" stories — that is those which come to the paper via the United Press teletype; the other writes heads for stories which are gathered or processed locally.

Sometimes a story which arrives by mail will also arrive, in slightly different form, by wire. And once in a while it will happen that each of our two head writers will pick similar stories for use, without either knowing the other has done so.

That happened last week. The reason it caught our fancy, however, is not because of the obvious oversight in printing two stories on the same subject, but because both headline writers wrote heads which were identical in wording.

A five-month-old parmeter chicken, owned by Mr. and Mrs. Charles P. Sieck, route 2, box 674, Central Point, last Thursday laid an egg. It had three (not one, not two) yolks. Mrs. Sieck put the egg in the freezer, she said—presumably to keep it to prove her story when friends doubted it.

Did you ever see someone downtown whose face is vaguely familiar but whose name or connection you can't, for the life of you, possibly remember? That happened to a friend of ours a week or so ago. Both said "Hi" to each other, chatted in idle fashion about the weather, and fell into step. As they walked, their conversation got vaguer and vaguer, they walked faster and faster, and soon parted at a corner, both somewhat confused, embarrassed, and out of breath. Neither is yet sure who the "other guy" is.

Soviet bloc for help—he is already stepping up trade negotiations with the Communist countries, including China. Finally, the economic pressure is by no means all one way.

THE oil revenues the British lost in Iran were made up surprisingly quickly elsewhere. But even with the half-promised loans from this country, the economies of Britain and Western Europe will be badly hurt by a canal boycott. Thus economic bargaining power is certainly not a Western monopoly in the dispute with Egypt.

The hard fact is that the threat to use force was the central element in the West's bargaining power. No sensible man would argue that the prospect of an ugly little war in the Middle East was ever a pleasant prospect. But with the prospect fading, and the threat of force virtually ruled out by the Dulles' policy, the chance that Nasser will get away with his slip in the face for the West is immeasurably increased. If he does, the Western powers might as well resign themselves to more slaps in the face in the Middle East and elsewhere.

(Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune, Inc.)