

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune" Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-6141

ROBERT W. RUIH, Editor; HERRL GREY, Advertising Manager; GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager; ERIC ALLEN, Jr., Managing Editor; EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor; RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor; OLIVE STARCHER, Circulation Editor; DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates: By Mail—In Advance Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One Year \$15.00. Daily and Sunday—Six months \$8.00. Daily and Sunday—Three mos. \$4.25. Sunday Only—One Year \$4.20.

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

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION, AFFILIATE MEMBER.

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: Oct. 10, 1947 (Friday). Edwin Dunn of Ashland elected president of Southern Oregon Pioneer society at 70th annual meeting in the old courthouse in Jacksonville.

30 YEARS AGO: Oct. 10, 1927 (Monday). Jury in federal court returns not guilty verdict in the trial of 12 Indian girls charged with burning a dormitory on the reservation.

40 YEARS AGO: Oct. 10, 1917 (Wednesday). Large turnout of local Elks expected to meet Grand Exalted Ruler Fred Harper of Lynchburg, Va.

What's Your I.Q.? Nine or ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.

1. Was Gen. MacArthur's landing at Lingayen gulf in January, 1945, virtually unopposed, or violently opposed? 2. What was George Washington's profession as a young man? 3. Bible: Who led the first group of exiles into Jerusalem after the fall of Belshazzar?

4. If a pen and ink cost fifty cents, and the pen costs fifty cents more than the ink, what did the ink cost? 5. Name the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet.

6. How often is a census of population taken in the U.S.? 7. What is the popular name for the American bison? 8. A medican man skilled in treatment of eye diseases is called an o- - - - ?

9. What is wrong with this sentence: "Outside of us there were four in the group?" 10. According to the constitution of mermaids, so much of a mermaid that is not a woman must be a—what?

Answers: 1. Virtually unopposed. 2. Surveyor. 3. Zerubbabel. 4. Five cents. 5. Alpha, Omega. 6. Every ten years. 7. Buffalo. 8. Oculist, or ophthalmologist. 9. "Beside" should replace "Outsideof". 10. "fish."—Dickens, in "Barnaby Rudge."

More Older Married Women Work

Few of them have school-age children now, everything costs so much more, jobs are to be had almost for the asking, friend husband has become used to the idea, the social tabu on working wives has vanished away. So it's not surprising that by far the greatest recent increase of any single group in the working force has been of that of married women 35 years of age and older.

The proportion of single women who work fell 10 per cent in the last nine years (1947 to 1956), says the U.S. Census Bureau. (Probable reason: earlier marriages.) The proportion of women under 35 living with their husbands and going to work regularly rose 20 per cent. But the increase was no less than 50 per cent for women 35 or older and living with their husbands.

The older working women "exhibit a good deal more regularity of employment," says the Bureau, than younger women. Many of the younger ones leave work to have a child or to go to school. And it's full-time jobs, too, that a majority of the women workers over 34 prefer.

The median wage for full-time women workers between 35 and 55 is about \$55 a week (1956). That is much the same as for their younger sisters, those between 20 and 35. It's about \$85 a week less than the typical full-time male worker pulls down, but \$55 a week added to the average family's income can spell the difference between having to scrimp all the time all along the line and living well.—E.R.R.

Red China and the U.N.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has again postponed for a year consideration of Red China's admission to the world organization. The vote was 48 to 27 (corrected tally) as compared with last year's 47-24 alignment on postponing the question to this year.

The defeat for the Soviet Union, India and other leaders in the fight to admit Red China was decisive, but it is to be noted that this year's 27 votes on their side marked a new high. And support for the United States position (in proportion to the total number of votes cast) was at a new low.

The United States has opposed representation of the Peiping regime in the General Assembly, or in any other U.N. body, since 1950—and with great vigor since Red China's intervention in Korea. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge told the General Assembly this was "not because of our disapproval of their interior social system"—"not because the present regime was not popularly elected"—"not because it came to power by violence." It was "simply because to admit the Chinese Communists would stultify the United Nations" and destroy its usefulness.

PREMIER CHOU EN-LAI, at a reception connected with Communist China's National Day celebration Oct. 1, thanked India and various Afro-Asian countries for their support of his nation's "legitimate place" in the U.N., while condemning the United States for its "persistently hostile attitude." He said no force could prevent China from ultimately "playing its due role in international affairs."

The latter view is shared by many friends of the United States in the U.N., who have watched the steady rise in strength of the Afro-Asian bloc with some concern. More and more Washington is being asked whether it might not be wise to reach an accommodation with the Chinese Communists under which they would be admitted to the General Assembly (but not to the Security Council) in exchange for a renunciation of force in seeking control of Formosa, withdrawal of their support from North Korea, and a pledge of non-intervention in Southeast Asia.—E.R.R.

The P.T.A.

If you're not already a member of a Parents and Teachers Association, don't be surprised if somebody rings your doorbell in a day or two and asks you to join. October has been designated as P.T.A. membership enrollment month.

The aim is to add 300,000 new members to the present 10.7 million so as to bring the total to 11 million. Last school year, over half a million new members joined. All states showed increases except Alabama, Indiana, West Virginia and Wyoming.

You don't have to be a teacher or the parent of a school child in order to get into a P.T.A. Any relative of a school child—indeed, anybody at all interested in children and schools—is eligible to help P.T.A. improve the nation's educational climate.

Founded in 1897 as the National Congress of Mothers, the organization took its present name in 1924. In addition to bringing the school and the home closer together, the P.T.A. works for child welfare legislation. It endorses federal funds to states for school construction on the basis of need, at the same time standing for minimum federal and maximum local control over education.—E.R.R.

Details of Fastest Missile Disclosed

Sunnyvale, Calif. — The Air Force today disclosed the first details of the nation's fastest target missile, now being developed by the Missiles Divisions System of Lockheed to test America's newest supersonic weapons. The Air Force described the Lockheed Q5 as a sleek ramjet vehicle that flashes through the stratosphere at more than twice the speed of sound. The target missile is nearly 39 feet long and has a wingspan of 10 feet. It weighs more than 7,600 pounds and is 20 inches in diameter. The speed of the missile makes it possible for the first time to test realistically the accuracy and destructive power of the nation's missile arsenal.



"I KNOW YOU'RE NOT ASLEEP THE TELEVISION IS STILL WARM!"

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

TOUGH ASSIGNMENT

The Indian government has recently been making soundings in Washington with a view to a formal request in the fairly near future for a substantial loan. The Minister of Finance puts India's overall needs at a credit in dollars, sterling and German marks of about \$1,000,000,000 of which India would actually need to draw about \$700,000,000 over a period of some eight years before beginning to repay the debt. The American share of this loan could hardly be less than \$500,000,000.



Walter Lippmann

Evidently, a transaction of that size would require specific authorization from Congress. This Congressional action would need to be taken fairly early in the next session of Congress—not later, it is said, than March when the Indian reserves of foreign exchange will have been run down to a critical point.

If this loan cannot be arranged, there will have to be a serious cut-back in both private and public economic development in India. THE task of persuading Congress to vote such a loan is, it might be said, one of those things which are impossible to do and yet have to be done. The prospects could hardly be more unfavorable. But, when the President has enabled the country to understand what is at stake, our people will, as they have done before, conclude that what is necessary, must be done.

Why must it be done? Because India is the supreme testing ground for all of Asia and of Africa of the question whether an undeveloped country can raise itself from extreme poverty by democratic, as against Communist, methods. If India succeeds in her present plans of development, it will have proved that backward countries do not have to follow the example of Russia and of Red China.

If India fails, if her economic development is strangled, it will be a fateful moment in the history of the world. For it will have been proved by a practical test that the free world is not willing to make any substantial sacrifice in order to have freedom prevail.

I HAVE no doubt myself that what looks so difficult to do can nevertheless be done if the President, and his Administration, take the trouble to explain thoroughly and patiently why it needs to be done. India has a population which is more than twice as big as ours. She has a national income which is only about one-twentieth as large as ours. Her standard of living is one of the lowest in the world, and at the present level of development her resources are barely capable of keeping up with her terrifying growth in population.

The Indian government is a free government, based on free election and the fundamental rights of a free society—freedom of religion, of thought and of speech—are carefully respected. The Indian government, which often differs with our own government in foreign policy, is nonetheless a free government, as free, it is fair to say, as any in the world of Asia.

It cannot, however, hope to survive on its adherence to ideals and principles alone. It must offer to the Indian people the hope that within the reasonably near future they will be emerging from their present poverty. If the Indian government cannot hold out that hope, there will surely be a reaction against liberty and towards a totalitarian system.

TO MEET the need of development, the Indian government has drawn up plans of investment, and it is now at the beginning of a second plan which calls for an investment of some ten to fifteen billion dollars in the course of a five year period. This looks big. There are some experts who think it is too big. But the Indian problem is enormously big, and even if the plan is carried out successfully, the best that can be hoped for is an increase of national income at the rate of 5 per cent a year.

This plan cannot, however, be carried out without capital assistance from abroad—capital assistance from private corporations, from the World Bank, from Britain, France, Germany and the United States. The question before this country, which will be critical by the time Congress convenes, is whether we can afford to let the Indian plan of development fail.

NO DOUBT the question will be most unwelcome in the coming session of Congress, what with our high taxes, our tight money, our signs of recession, the painful prospects of the integration problem, and the general feeling of not doing very well abroad.

Nevertheless, the country will listen to the President, and it will follow him if and when he shows that there is a vital interest of the country involved, when he shows where necessity drives us, and where duty calls. (c) 1957 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Everybody's talking today about the Russian earth satellite—"artificial moon" seems to be a favorite term for it. What is it like? How does it work? What are its potentialities in the way of danger to us?

WHAT is it like? Well, if you could see it, it would look something like an exaggerated basketball. It's about two feet in diameter. It weighs about 185 pounds—approximately the weight of a muscular halfback on a football team.

It's filled with complicated sensing and communications instruments that send out signals somewhat like radio messages. Its job is to tell what the world looks like from up there.

HOW does it work? That's a bit technical. When it reaches a point out in outer space where centrifugal force (the force that impels a thing outward from a center of rotation) balances the gravity pull of the earth, it stays put and rotates around the earth in an orbit. If it SLOWS DOWN too much, the pull of gravity will yank it back earthward. That will be the end of that particular satellite.

LET'S try to simplify it. It works just like the little ball in a roulette wheel. As long as the wheel spins fast enough the little ball stays on the outside. When the wheel slows down, the little ball drops into the slot that tells whether you win or lose.

WHAT are its potentialities of danger to us? That is quite simple. The danger is that this satellite (and its duplicates that are launched later (may teach the Russians how to make an accurate guided missile BEFORE WE LEARN HOW TO MAKE ONE. An accurate guided missile is a jigger that can be aimed at a target that thousands of miles away and will score a bull's-eye a reasonable number of times. The missile, of course, will carry an atom or hydrogen bomb. That would be BAD.

The nation that gets such a missile FIRST in adequate quantities can destroy the rest of the

Khrushchev Showing Frustration Over U.S. Coldness on Conclave

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent

Soviet Communist leader Nikita S. Khrushchev is showing signs of frustration over United States coldness to his bids for high-level talks.

Khrushchev and Soviet Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin have been hinting for months that they would welcome another "summit" conference in which President Eisenhower would represent the United States.

Now Khrushchev has disclosed that the Soviet government tried to get the United States to invite Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov, Soviet defense minister, to Washington and that his bid was turned down.

Khrushchev made this disclosure in an interview in Moscow with James Reston, chief of the New York Times Wash-

ington bureau. Khrushchev was pretty bitter about it. "That is a bad thing," he said to Reston. "We are a proud nation and we do not want to go down on our knees to arrange these things."

The Russian bid stemmed from a statement Eisenhower made at a press conference in Washington on July 17, when he was asked whether a meeting between Zhukov and retiring Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson might be useful.

"It might," the President said. "There is nothing I wouldn't try experimentally in order to bring about better relationships."

But the President added a warning that such meetings might raise high expectations and there would be a bad re-

action if the expectations were not realized. Reds Didn't Heed

It develops that the Russian leaders did not pay sufficient attention to this qualification. Zhukov was not invited.

It is evident that Khrushchev, like other Russian leaders, does not realize two important obstacles to any such invitation.

The first is that Russia shows no sign at all that it is ready to enter in good faith high-level talks on disarmament, the Middle East or any other big East-West issue.

The other thing is that Zhukov or any other high Soviet leader who visited the United States would be left in no doubt that he was unwelcome to many people. The danger of hostile demonstrations would be great.

Matter of Fact By Stewart Alsop

WASHINGTON—The Soviet satellite launching, coming on the heels of the Soviet intercontinental missile test, poses a simple question: Will the American government now tell the American people the blunt, unpleasant truth about the race for the decisive weapons of the future, the ballistic missiles?

In recent years, the American government has followed a conscious policy of concealing or muffling the facts about that race. The Government, moreover, has not had to guess about the facts. It has known the facts, without the slightest room for doubt.

How, the Government has known has at last been made obvious in the recent official acknowledgement of the existence of a radar tracing system with a range of 3000 miles. It is only necessary to look at a map to see how radar with such a range can detect missile firings anywhere in the Soviet Union. The tracking system makes it possible to detect, not only the firing of a Soviet missile, but the place of origin, the area of impact, the altitude, velocity, and general configuration.

THE recent Soviet announcement of the firing of an intercontinental missile (which was in fact far more strategically significant than the satellite launching) came as no surprise to the Government. For the radar system had already picked up the tracks of multi-staged, long-range ballistic missiles fired from the Soviet missile testing center in Semipalatensk, east of the Urals. The missiles, which had an "operational configuration," and ranges well over 4000 miles, were fired in the direction of the Bering Sea. (This explains, incidentally, why the Soviets closed their eastern approaches to foreign shipping.)

When the Soviets announced their history-making achievement on an ICBM, although they were quite aware that the Soviet announcement was accurate, high Administration officials competed with each other in down-grading and muffling its true meaning. This was a learned reaction, as the psychologists say, for the policy of concealing or muffling the facts actually began years ago.

In 1953, and more strongly in 1954, the intelligence reported that the Soviets had begun testing medium range ballistic missiles. As a result of these reports the radar tracking system was established in 1955. Almost on the day it opened for business, the radar system began to pick up numerous flight tests of Soviet missiles, thus confirming absolutely the previous intelligence reports. Thereafter,

strictly non-operative medium missiles have been test-fired—this in comparison with literally dozens of Soviet test firings, starting back in 1953-54. Two "Atlas" test vehicles have also been unsuccessfully test-fired. But these abortive firings were simply tests of the initial, or first-stage, rocket, designed to fly less than 3000 miles. Even when this first-stage rocket has been successfully fired, the problems of "marrying" the second stage to the first, of atmospheric re-entry, and of accurate guidance, remain to be resolved and flight-tested. In short, we are much further away from testing a prototype of a true intercontinental ballistic missile than the country has been led to believe.

All the evidence, in short, clearly indicates that the Soviets are frighteningly far ahead of this country in the race for the decisive weapons of the future. Given this country's immense industrial power, there is no reason on God's earth why they should stay ahead. But they will certainly stay ahead if the policy of the American government continues to be to bury the essential facts in great dollops of soothing syrup. It is time to tell the country the blunt truth, and the responsibility for so doing rests where it has always rested, with the President of the United States.

Copyright 1957 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

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 initials for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with an eye to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Eds Too Much for John To the Editor: I quit your paper for two reasons: the price of 10c was an overprice—also your editorials mundane and prosaic. You set yourself up as a paragon on controversial subjects, e.g. Little Rock, Arkansas.

You concern yourself with countless subjects when you should be vastly concerned regarding this dying Rogue valley. You could use your office to snap this valley out of its lethargy, bring in new industries—but no, you talk about something you know little or nothing about.

Wake up before you have no subscribers left. John R. Scott, P.O. Box 361, Jacksonville, Ore.

"On the Dean's List" To the Editor: I have read with interest your recent editorials on editorials. You make some very pertinent observations on this fascinating subject of readership and influence. In one particular especially do you reveal a major weakness in the highly inexact science of readership study when you say that readership depends much upon interest, and interest, in turn, depends upon what's going on. No readership study that I know of has given sufficient attention to this perfectly obvious situation.

Charles T. Duncan, Dean, School of Journalism, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.

world. ALL this brings up a rugged thought. MAYBE IN THE FLUSH YEARS OF THE RECENT PAST WE HAVE BEEN DEVOTING MORE ATTENTION TO ROULETTE WHEELS AND SUCH THAN TO PURE SCIENCE.

If so— Maybe we've let the Russians get ahead of us. This Russian satellite business brings home to us the shocking truth that life isn't all beer and skittles.

BUT— Let's not lose our nerve. Let's not lose faith in America. If we'll buckle down to business and cut out the waste and the fluff and the politics and the tummyrot, we can say with Annie Oakley in her song in Annie Get Your Gun: "Anything They Can Do We Can DO BETTER."

Chapel Mortuary. A haze on the far horizon, The infinite, tender sky, The ripe, rich tint of the cornfields, And the wild geese sailing high... Across from the Courthouse Frank Morgan - Harold Snodgrass FUNERAL DIRECTORS