

MAIL TRIBUNE, MEDFORD, ORE.

Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North First St. Ph. SP-2-6141

ROBERT W. RUDL, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
GERALD LATHAM, Business Mgr.
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Teleg. Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates
By Mail—In Advance: Copy 10c
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday—6 mos. 8.00
Daily and Sunday—3 mos. 4.25
Sunday Only—1 year \$4.25

By Carrier—In Advance—Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
Central Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill,
Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River,
Talent and on motor routes
Daily and Sunday—1 year \$18.00
Daily and Sunday—1 mo. 1.50
Carrier and Dealer—copy 10c

All Terms Cash in Advance
Official Paper of City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press—Full Leased Wire
MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATION

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

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

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

10 YEARS AGO
July 17, 1948 (Saturday)
Southern Oregon Kennel club will hold a meeting and picnic next week in Lithia park, Ashland.

20 YEARS AGO
July 17, 1938 (Sunday)
A black bear en route to berry patches was seen crossing the road near the South Fork CCC camp.

30 YEARS AGO
July 17, 1928 (Tuesday)
Hulce, the Hindoo crystal gazer, opened an engagement at the Rialto theater last night with an act described as "one of the finest and cleanest crystal gazing acts in a long time."

40 YEARS AGO
July 17, 1918 (Wednesday)
City council grants salary raises to city employees, then to increase revenue passed an ordinance which anyone found with liquor in his possession could be fined \$100.

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

1. If someone threatened to "pin back your aricular appendages," to what would he be referring?
2. The opening words of which American classic are: "Four score and seven years ago"?

3. The s-o-h is an animal that sleeps upside down.
4. All states have the same voting requirements: true or false?
5. During which season do we experience "Squaw winter"?

6. The U. S. Post Office Department does, or does not, employ women mail carriers?
7. Formerly, "plus fours" were widely worn by players engaged in which sport?
8. Kaiser Wilhelm II fled to which country, where he was interned for the remainder of his life?
9. Name the manager who piloted the New York Yankees to the 1947 world championship.
10. Who was U. S. President when the W. W. I armistice was signed?

Answers: 1. Ears. 2. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. 3. Sloth. 4. False. 5. Autumn. 6. Does. 7. Golf. 8. The Netherlands. 9. Bucky Harris. 10. Woodrow Wilson.

POLICE SEEK WALLET
Alhambra, Calif.—(UPI)—Police today sought two men who stole a wallet of a fatally injured woman in a car following a traffic accident. Witnesses said the pair looted the car of Mrs. Clifford Reese Peterson, 38, after she had slumped into a parked car. She died Wednesday in General hospital.

Data on Sputnik

A lot of valley folk saw the rocket of Sputnik III whirling overhead Monday night. We missed it, darn it. It must have been quite a sight — spectacular, and a bit eerie, knowing that something made in Soviet Russia was scooting through the sky. On Tuesday and Wednesday the sky was too overcast to permit a view of the rocket.

SPUTNIK III, if memory serves, is the only one of the three Russian celestial satellites still in orbit. Two others, the American Vanguard and Explorer, still are up.

Sputnik III is by far the largest of the satellites launched since the first one last October. It weighs 2,925.53 pounds, and is more than double the size of Sputnik II, which carried the live dog. It carries a considerable amount of scientific equipment, 2,134 pounds of it, designed to give data on a wide range of subjects, including atmospheric pressure, the earth's magnetic field, the electric charges on the satellite itself, the intensity of radiation from the sun, and the temperatures inside and outside the vehicle.

Other instruments measure the impacts of micrometeorites, weigh the particles in the ionosphere to determine its chemical composition, and detect various aspects of radiation at differing heights above earth.

THE satellite circles the earth with a perigee (low point in its orbit) of 150 miles and an apogee (high point) of 1,168 miles.

However, what has been visible to the naked eye is not the satellite itself, despite its 11 feet 9 inches in length and base diameter of 5 feet 8 inches. What is visible is the larger fourth-stage rocket which went into orbit with the satellite, and which over the past two months (it was launched May 15) has gradually separated from the Sputnik itself.

The burned-out rocket, last of the four which boosted the satellite into near-space, is about 79 feet long, and circles the earth each 103 minutes. It is not visible in the daytime, and can be seen at night only as it reflects sunlight shining on it — in the same manner the moon is visible. For this reason conditions must be just right for it to be seen. It must be dark, but not so late that the object is obscured by the earth's shadow.

AND what keeps the satellite and its rocket circling in orbit around the earth?

The same combination of forces which hold the moon in orbit — gravity, on one hand, preventing it from flying off into space, and centrifugal force, on the other, which prevents it from plunging toward the earth. (Centrifugal force is what holds the water in a bucket when you swing it around and around.)

The speed with which the satellite and its rocket swing around the earth varies, depending on whether it is outward bound to its perigee (sort of "uphill"), when it slows down, or inward bound (or "downhill") toward its apogee, when it speeds up. The average is about 18,000 mph.

THE orbit of Sputnik is not a circle, but an ellipse, and it also moves as the earth turns below it. That is why it can sometimes be seen in Oregon skies, but most times cannot be.

Some day, as the sky travellers gradually slow down, they will meet increased resistance from thickening air at lower altitudes, and eventually will plunge toward the earth. Several of the satellites have already done so.

As they do, the friction with the air causes them to heat and burn, and the last plunge is a fiery one.—E.A.

Murder Will Out

Southwest Oregon's congressman, Charles O. Porter, is up against the full resources of Latin America's nastiest dictatorship and one of America's top lawyers. But Porter's leading.

We're referring to one of the trickiest, most involved international crimes in recent times.

It started in early 1956 when a man named Galindez, outspoken and influential foe of Dominican's dictator Trujillo, disappeared from his exile home in New York.

SHORTLY thereafter, a free-lance pilot named Murphy, known to haul cargoes into the Caribbean area, also vanished and is assumed murdered in Dominica. Before he left on his last flight, New York to Dominica, he mentioned something about Galindez to his parents.

Porter became involved because the pilot is a Eugene boy and his parents asked for help in finding him.

And Porter, following up the matter, has become known as the Congressman from Latin America while bird-dogging evidence in person.

THE story he pieces together is that the pilot was hired by Trujillo to spirit Galindez to Dominica and death, and that Murphy later was rubbed out gangland style because he talked too much.

Trujillo, a foxy one, hired Morris Ernst, big shot New York lawyer, to debunk Porter, which Ernst has been doing vociferously.

But Porter's also a lawyer, and he has the advantage of not being retained to prove a point. His "client" is a constituent, and Porter's findings so far have been pretty hard for the parents to take. Our credence goes with Porter and we wish people would stop trying to louse him up. The Trujillos, ruthless father and playboy son, need all the exposing possible.

—Salem Capital Journal.

Dennis the Menace



"THIS IS CHARLIE, HIS MOTHER SAYS SWIMMIN' TRUNKS FOR KIDS OUR AGE IS SILLY!"

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

OUR NEIGHBOR CANADA

Not long ago a highly qualified spokesman on Canadian and American affairs, Mr. Jacob Viner, wrote in the quarterly magazine published by Queens University that "Americans are capable of forgetting their common concerns with Canada while Canadians cannot forget their involvements with their giant neighbor." This is the essential point in the general sense of grievance which has been mounting in Canada. It led to the President's visit of a peace and of friendship.

The Canadianians have a fair number of specific grievances about wheat, oil, lead and zinc, about the control of Canadian subsidiaries of American companies. They are themselves negotiable and adjustable provided that we in this country pay enough attention to them. But the general grievance is more important than the sum of the specific grievances of which the President discussed several in his Ottawa address. The crux of the problem is that the Canadian economy is highly vulnerable to what is done in the United States while the American government and American public opinion are inattentive and absent-minded about what happens in Canada.

AS a measure of our inattention, we can take a fact which was reported recently to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by Reps. Brooks, Hays and Frank M. Coffin. There is only one American newspaper, "The New York Times," which has a news bureau in Canada; "The Chicago Tribune," and we might add "The New York Herald Tribune," have reporters; for the rest there are the Associated Press and the United Press International which take their Canadian news from the Canadian Press Association and the British United Press. There is, that is to say, little popular interest in Canadian affairs.

In part, no doubt, this lack of interest is due to the fact that Canadian-American relations have for so long a time been so very good. Nations tend to think about what troubles them rather than about what goes well. But there is more to it than that. Canadian concern and American inattention reflects the enormous disparity in the economic size of the two countries. The Canadian population is less than 10 per cent of the American. Their gross national product is about 6 per cent of ours. Yet, as Prime Minister Diefenbaker said recently, the Canadian "trading world has become increasingly confined to the United States, which takes 60 per cent of our exports and provides 73 per cent of our imports."

Moreover, in a variety of key industries, an impressive percentage of the capital employed is controlled in the United States. In oil it is 68 per cent, in mining 54 per cent, in pulp and paper 45 per cent, in agricultural machinery 56 per cent, in automobiles 95 per cent, in rubber 84 per cent. Thus while the Canadian economy is much smaller than the American, it is at the same time vitally related to the American.

AMERICAN inattention — crossed with Canadian vulnerability pose a problem which in any long view is of very great importance. It is

that Canadian-American relations, which have been the pride of North America and an example to the world, can no longer be taken for granted — as predestined to be good because the two peoples have so much in common. Our relations will have to be cared for and nurtured, will have to be guided and promoted, by the conscious action of the two nations.

The President's speech to the Canadian Parliament, though it was ably written, failed, it seemed to me, to recognize that the times have changed and that the old relationship which has worked well for so long will not be good enough for the future. Indeed, much of the emphasis of the President's speech was on the ideological notion, which does not happen to be true in this case, that as lovers of a free economy there is nothing much for statesmen to do. What, for example, was the point of his saying that "the United States and Canada are not state traders" when one of the specific Canadian grievances is over the United States' state trading operations for the disposal of our surplus wheat?

THE real long term problem, of disparity in size combined with American inattention, is not going to be solved by occasional meetings at or near the summit, and for the rest by conventional diplomatic intercourse. We have to open our minds, I am inclined to think, to the task of creating some kind of new organ, a joint political institution which has enough authority to make both governments listen.

The chief reason for thinking that the existing diplomatic machinery is not adequate lies in the radical difference between the Canadian and the American form of representative government. At last week's meeting in Ottawa, for example, Mr. Eisenhower had nothing like the power to negotiate which Mr. Diefenbaker possesses. The Prime Minister could commit his government. The President, who outranks him, does not control Congress and could not commit the American government.

For in most of the economic issues which affect Canadian and American relations, the real power in the American government is not the President but the Congress.

OBVIOUSLY, neither country is going to change its form of government. Obviously also, it is not possible for the Congress of the United States to negotiate with the Canadian government. This leads me to think that it might prove to be relevant and useful to establish a permanent joint institution, in the nature of two delegations from the two governments, and with a joint secretariat.

I do not think of the institution as having supra-national powers, like the European Coal and Steel community, but as having the right by treaty and by law to report on the complaints, to give advice and to make proposals which, it would be agreed, were to be taken seriously by both governments.

(C) 1958 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

STAMP DEALER DIES

New York—(UPI)—George B. Sloane, 60, one of the nation's top stamp dealers and appraisers, died Tuesday. Sloane appraised many famous stamp collections, including those of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the late Wall Street financier, Alfred H. Caspary.

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 an eye to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words. The letters printed in this column do not necessarily represent the views of the paper, in fact the contrary is often the case.

Strange People

To the Editor: We Americans are a strange people. We contradict ourselves time and time again. We love a man one day and hate him the next.

For example — the Korean War. We sent our men into one of the bloodiest battles ever fought — and for what purpose? To save the Koreans from Communist slavery.

Yes, we loved the Koreans enough then to let our sons die by the thousands to save them — yet now — when a few Christian people would desire to love those same Koreans (the Korean orphans fathered by the Americans), we argue and quarrel about the need of it. We think not so much of what's the right thing to do but rather what's the popular thing to do?

We hear such things as "they're part Korean—they'll be persecuted"—or "we have orphans of our own"—or "they're diseased," etc., etc.

Suppose a rich man's son should take advantage of a poor uneducated girl and she should give birth to his son. Suppose she had no way to care for this child but the rich man's son had every means by which to provide for that child. Whose responsibility should it be to care for that child? And if the child is sick—how much more he needs the proper care that the rich father could provide.

Yes—what a strange people we are. We profess to be Christians, yet we deny the Christian faith again and again by the hardness of our hearts.

Barbara Miller
728 Newtown St.
Medford.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

U. S. Marines have landed in tiny Lebanon.

The U. S. Sixth fleet—the most powerful single unit of military force in the world today—is assembling in the Eastern Mediterranean, directly off the shores of the explosive Middle East.

The landing of the Marines and the assembling of the fleet was ordered by President Eisenhower, who under our constitution is the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the United States.

WHAT does it mean? Here is the official explanation:

President Eisenhower says the action is in response to an urgent appeal from President Camille Chamoun of Lebanon. He says the step was taken to "protect American lives and . . . to encourage the Lebanese government in defense of Lebanese sovereignty." He adds: "These forces have not been sent as any act of war."

In a special statement, President Eisenhower pledges that the United States will support the United Nations in taking measures adequate to meet the Middle East situation—measures WHICH WILL ENABLE THE U. S. FORCES PROMPTLY TO BE WITHDRAWN.

SO MUCH for the OFFICIAL explanation. Let's now probe beneath the surface.

WHAT does it REALLY mean?

THIS, I think, is the best guess: We're handing RUSSIA a challenge.

We're presenting her with what the diplomats call a "fait accompli" — (an accomplished fact) and are saying to her: WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

WHY do we go that far? Here's another guess: We need to know what Russia has in mind. Is she READY for war now? The chances are somewhat against it — at least enough against it to justify us in calling for what amounts to a showdown.

Competent authorities tell us we are NOW superior to Russia in military might — that our capacity for instant

Today's Best Buy for—
Body Lice—Fleas
on Dogs, Cats or Birds
Simply sprinkle BUHACH lightly through fur, feathers—then watch the vermin fall off.
Be Sure You Get BUHACH
—Safe—Easy To Use—Economical—

U.S. Intervention May Provide Favorable Results in Mid-East

By CHARLES M. McCANN
UPI Foreign News Analyst

United States intervention in Lebanon may show some favorable results soon — unless Soviet Russia is ready to back up angry words with warlike deeds.

With its threat to "take the necessary measures" unless the United States gets out of Lebanon at once, the Soviet government has grabbed the ball away from President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic in leading opposition to President Eisenhower's action.

The implication which the Kremlin obviously intended to convey is that Russia will take direct action of some sort unless the United States withdraws voluntarily or the United Nations gets it to do so.

That is Russia's way of conducting its diplomatic affairs.

President Eisenhower said in announcing the explaining his action that he knew it might involve serious consequences, and he mentioned the risks involved. He could have been thinking only of Russia. Plainly, he was prepared for Russia's threat.

Jordan Helped
But if all goes well, it may prove President Eisenhower's forceful action came just in time.

There are strong indications the intervention in Lebanon may have saved Jordan from a revolt like those in Lebanon and Iraq.

There are indications also there may be a move soon in Lebanon itself to end the revolt there by a compromise between the government and the rebels.

It seems possible the United States action may save the Baghdad Pact — the Middle Eastern treaty organization alliance against Communist aggression — from the sudden death that threatened it because of the revolt in Iraq, one of its five members.

What Nasser can do in addition to stirring up Arab resentment against the United States, it is hard to figure out. The military record of Egypt under Nasser is a sorry one.

During the Suez Canal crisis in 1956, Israel administered a humiliating defeat to Nasser. Its advance was stopped only by the attack of Great Britain and France on the canal zone and by the consequent action of the United Nations in forcing a cease-fire.

Nasser's weapons, like those of Russia in the cold war, are propaganda and subversion.

It is true these weapons have been potent ones both for Nasser and for Soviet Russia.

But in Nasser's case, the United States has moved, directly and indirectly, and massive retaliation if she starts anything is unquestioned.

Maybe it will be different LATER. Russia's modern (meaning nuclear) might is rising rapidly, the experts say.

AND— We know from past experience that the Russians respect NOTHING BUT FORCE.

So— In menacing situations involving them, it's better to be firm than fuzzy.

rectly in Lebanon and indirectly in Jordan, to invoke an even more effective weapon.

Nasser is sure to fill the Middle Eastern air waves with allegations that the United States, in the interest of "imperialism" and "colonialism," is trying to stop the surge of Arab nationalism. May See Nasser Threat

This propaganda is pretty sure to have some effect. But it is possible also some Arab governments, in addition to that of Lebanon, may

realize that to Nasser nationalism means his own acceptance as the dictator of the Arab world.

These governments may realize Nasserism threatens them with subjection. There could be revolts like those in Lebanon and Iraq in other Arab countries, including Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan and Libya, Egypt's Western neighbor.

Some of these governments, even while they criticize Eisenhower's action, may realize it could benefit them.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

THEY LOOK LIKE VULTURES
Washington—The chickens are coming home to roost at last; and as might have been foreseen, they look like blood-stained vultures.

That is the obvious thing to say about the events in Iraq. This tragedy is a quite direct result of the Eisenhower administration's policy—or lack of policy—in the Middle East. It is the grim proof of the rule that governs all Middle Eastern politics: "If you won't stand by your friends, you must expect to lose them."

The foundations were laid by the Administration's disastrous handling of the Suez crisis. The superstructure was built by the having and wavering of the period after Suez. The roof was put on the catastrophe by the slow motion in Lebanon, where we have been parodying Neville Chamberlain, but of course with "due deliberate speed," for the last two months.

NO DOUBT the Administration's waning band of propagandists will say the British were also fooled in their management of the Suez crisis. They were. Of course, the State Department's fulemen will talk at great length about powerful tides at work among the Arab masses. They will be right.

The point is, however, that the American government might have nullified the follies of others; it might even have controlled or channeled the tides running in the Middle East, by wise, foresighted and courageous action. It was at least the American government's duty to try to solve the situation. Instead, the American government added its own follies—the moral prating and hectoring, for instance, that played such a part in transforming the badly prepared Suez operation into a terrible defeat that might still have been avoided.

No doubt the State Department's fulemen will also plaintively inquire, "But what could we have done to stop a plot in the Iraqi Army?" The answer is quite simple, and it comes out of their own mouths. Middle Eastern army plots are no doubt inevitable, but successful Middle Eastern plots are most emphatically not inevitable. The State Department has quite openly taken credit for its share in frustrating the military Nasserite conspiracies to destroy King Hussein of Jordan in March a year ago. This was not empty boasting, either.

AT THE time, the absence of real content in the Eisenhower Doctrine had not yet been widely perceived. Everyone in the Middle East watches to see which way the

GOD knows, the American government had ample warning that these results must be expected. Tough old Nuri Pasha himself, the Shah of Iran, the Turkish leaders, the leaders in Lebanon, the more courageous experts in both the British Foreign Office and in our own Intelligence—all these persons ingeminated warning after warning of trouble in Iraq if we did not respond boldly to the challenge in Lebanon. To descend to a much, much lower level, this reported did the same thing.

If the Iraqi tragedy produces the really catastrophic sequels that now seem likely, it will be no consolation to say, "I told you so." But do you remember those richly ringing promises of a dynamic new foreign policy which would "recapture the initiative," based on American military power capable of "massive retaliation"? Those phrases had better not be used again either.

(c) 1958 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

THE DANMOORE HOTEL

1217 SW Morrison St.
PORTLAND, OREGON

All transient guests. All those who come, return. Rates not high, not low. Free garage, TV's and radios. Reputation for cleanliness. Reservations by long distance phone refunded on request upon arrival.

"All the powerful things in the world are invisible—honor, character, love, your power to visualize and make dreams come true. They are lights within, casting their rays around you so that you can find your way. Open your eyes with faith so that you can see them."
Celia Caroline Cole

Chapel Mortuary

Across from the Courthouse
Frank Morgan — Harold Snodgrass, FUNERAL DIRECTORS

DAY OR NIGHT PHONE SP 2-8030