

EVERYONE IN Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune. Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 33 North Fir St., Ph SP 2-6141

ROBERT W. RUHL, Editor. HERB GREY, Advertising Manager. GERALD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr. ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor. HARRY CHIPMAN, Teleg. Editor. RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor. OLIVE STARCHER, Women's Editor. DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.

Subscription Rates: By Mail - In Advance, Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$13.00. Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$8.00. Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. \$4.25. Sunday Only - One year \$4.25.

Official Paper of Jackson County. United Press International. Full Licensed Wire. U.P.I. Telephone News Pictures.

Advertising Representatives: WOLF HOLIDAY CO., INC. Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

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 Feb. 18, 1950 (Saturday) Sen. Robert A. Taft (R-O.) says he believes that President Truman's bid to "purge" him from the senate has "a deep red tinge of communism."

20 YEARS AGO Feb. 18, 1940 (Sunday) Pumps at two service stations were broken last night and gasoline stolen, city police report.

30 YEARS AGO Feb. 18, 1930 (Tuesday) Rumor being circulated that a railroad will be built from here to the coast next summer.

40 YEARS AGO Feb. 18, 1920 (Thursday) Flu situation in Klamath county now considered serious.

50 YEARS AGO Feb. 18, 1910 (Friday) Medford Commercial club pledges help in raising funds to construct a Crater Lake highway.

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

- 1. How many years ago was the first atom bomb exploded in New Mexico? 2. Is a major portion of the population of Australia of British, Canadian, American, or Oriental origin? 3. Who was President of the U.S. when the Armistice was signed that brought World War I combat to an end? 4. The compressibility of air determines the speed at which sound travels; true or false? 5. In astronomy, what are Virgo, Leo, and Taurus? 6. Which State rivals Virginia for the title "Mother of Presidents"? 7. Are American scenes, or foreign scenes, depicted in Carrier and Ives prints? 8. A headress worn by Spanish women is called a m-t-a. 9. Which Central American republic is smallest in area? 10. July 14, is what national holiday in France? Answers: 1. 15. 2. British. 3. Woodrow Wilson. 4. True. 5. Names of Constellations. 6. Ohio. 7. American scenes. 8. Mantilla. 9. El Salvador. 10. Bastille Day.

NO 'DOG HOUSE' London - (U.P.) - A woman has refused to rent a house here because it doesn't have an extra bedroom for her dog, the Daily Mail reported today.

Daring in Salem

Few people have accused Salem of being a daring town.

And yet — it has the most beautiful state capitol in the nation; a capitol mall which is striking and will become more so as the master plan is followed out; it built one of the first downtown motels on the west coast; it has the widest streets of any major Oregon city.

And now, as in answer to the people who say that daring and imagination are what is needed to save America's "downtowns," plans have been announced for a new downtown office building that, for a town Salem's size, is an eye-opener.

THE building, as announced by its planners, will be constructed on a full downtown block. Not a vacant block, mind you, but a block which now has some of the city's most prosperous firms. The existing buildings will be razed to make way for the six-story, \$8 million new one, which will have off-street automobile parking area built right inside it.

Many of the firms now in the block plan to retain space in the new building.

It isn't a pipe-dream, either. Options have been secured on all property in the block except one piece, and that is owned by Montgomery Ward & Co., which is cooperating in the project.

If all goes well, the existing buildings will be torn down and work started during 1960.

NOW a plan such as this takes more than just daring (although it takes plenty of that). It also takes vision and imagination.

We hope the promoters' supplies of these scarce commodities hold out, and that they create — as they well could — a building of beauty and drama; not just a commercial box, but a unique and style-setting building.

If they do this they will prove that money, enterprise and commercial know-how are not necessarily at odds with aesthetics. Equally important, this could well become the forerunner of other such imaginative plans for other small to medium sized towns throughout the nation, proving that "downtown" isn't on the way out at all — not when vision and courage are combined.—E.A.

And in Roseburg?

To read of a plan such as that proposed in Salem makes one wonder what, after all, Roseburg is going to do about the opportunity so tragically presented last August 7, when an explosion leveled a good portion of the downtown.

Perhaps this opportunity will be seized on; or, as it is beginning to appear, it will be haggled away by lack of cooperation and visionary imagination, backed by the hard work necessary to bring it to a reality.—E.A.

Meat Map

We are among those who are fascinated by maps.

Political maps, topographic maps, trade-route maps, historical maps, Mercator projects, polar projections — we can pore over them by the hour. And there are lots of varieties available. One variety we'd never heard of before, though. This is a "meat map" of the U.S.

It is a regular political map of the nation, but superimposed on it are the kinds of meat favored by people in different parts of the country.

It had never particularly occurred to us that likes in meat would vary according to geography, but according to an article in the New York Times they do, indeed.

FOR instance, housewives in New York City purchase more than half of ALL the lamb consumed in the United States, says the National Association of Retail Grocers.

The average New Orleans family eats five times as much veal as does the average family in dairy-farming Wisconsin. Sweetbreads are eaten with relish in New York and Los Angeles, but consumption is small throughout the rest of the country.

California, it appears, is a "beef bloc," where families eat 25 pounds more beef than families in any other state.

A "BOLGONA BELT" extends from Oklahoma City to Detroit, and a "cold cut" belt runs through the coal mines and steel mills from eastern Pennsylvania to Milwaukee.

The northern part of the nation favors fresh pork cuts; the southern portion likes it cured.

Whatever regional preferences may be, and whatever causes them (including family habit, national tradition, or whatever), there is no question but that this is a carnivorous nation.

Per capita meat consumption in 1959 was some 158.2 pounds, and it is expected to rise to 160.6 this year. More than half the nation's agricultural land is devoted to raising meat totaling 28,300,000,000 pounds this year.

Those living west of the Mississippi river will produce two-thirds of this meat, but those living east of the river will eat two-thirds of it.—E.A.

Under-Paar

The best of the many editorials we've seen commenting on the Jack Paar-NBC hassle was penned by a writer on the Oregon Statesman in Salem, and consisted of just one sentence. The matter, the editorialist declared wryly, "leaves NBC under-Paar."—E.A.

Dennis the Menace



"BOY, YOU GURE GOT A BIG STEERING WHEEL!"

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.

Cleanse Thyself

To the Editor: Since the Lord commands all of us to prove all things, and to make full proof of our ministry, what greater proof can any one have than God's word?

Eternal destruction is just as long as eternal life, so that subject is not trivial nor unimportant, and should be given serious consideration by all.

Since our flesh profits us nothing, and since our natural or carnal minds are not subject to God's law, and cannot be, we cannot depend on our own natural (carnal) minds.

God and His word tells us all to cleanse ourselves of all filthiness of the flesh and spirit — both.

By nature all are the children of wrath. God's people are commanded to not walk as others do in the vanity of their mind. Why? If we love the world and worldly things, God's love is not in us. If we live in earthly pleasures we are dead in sins while we live. Why?

The friendship with the world is enmity to God. Who whole world lies in wickedness, and its works are evil. Jesus was hated because he said this. And Christians are promised the same hatred.

Why do Christians warn the sinners and unconverted? If they see others sin and do not tell them, God will permit them to die in their sins. But will require the sinners blood at the Christians hands. So Christians have no choice but to warn others.

The Old Testament is for patterns and examples to show us to not walk as they did. The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth to a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all the things that are highly esteemed among men are an abomination to God.

Shorts and bobbed hair pertain to men, so the Lord has many abominable people and conditions to look upon. The abominable will not enter heaven.

One can and does commit sin just by looking upon others to lust after them. So if nudists and semi nudists look good to the opposite sex, they have already committed sin, God cursed Canaan for looking upon his father Noah's nakedness, so it is worse to look upon the opposite sex.

Mrs. G. C. Cunningham Box 381 Central Point, Ore.

Editor's note: See Matthew, Chapter 7, Verse 1; also Luke, Chapter 18, Verse 11.

Another Brave Soul To the Editor: Speaking of the letter that Jerry Anderson wrote to communications last Friday, evidently he is a teenager and not a very experienced driver, or else he wouldn't be judging all women by perhaps one or maybe a few.

How about those teenagers "gawking around" as he calls it? It's my opinion that if they were a little stricter in issuing drivers' licenses to teenagers the streets would be a lot safer. A 17 or 18-year-old should have the ability to think, but do they?

I can name three different times that if I hadn't had the ability to think I would have had some bad accidents. These other three drivers were men. No, they weren't gawking around; they just weren't looking at all. So I suggest that you observe drivers a

little more carefully. We women can take care of our selves—statistics prove it. Thelma M. Smith P.O. Box 725 Medford.

First Crocus To the Editor: Today a golden crocus Popped open with the dawn; I sent it three swift kisses For growing in our lawn.

An early thrush was singing, No bigger than a splinter, "Rejoice-rejoice-wake-up-It'snearyendofwinter!"

The pines began to tremble; The fir tree shook its head; The north wind gave a whistle. And I jumped back in bed! JAM (Name on File) Medford

"Living Foods" To the Editor: This is a further comment on "living foods," as advocated by those of us who believe they are far better and more healthful than those which were fertilized, and which contain additives of various sorts.

Wausau, Wis. - A local insurance company has long had the habit of telling the country "the W a u s a u" story in its advertising. They rightly say that this is the kind of pleasant little city where it is good to be a family. But for political buffs, the real Wausau story concerns the remarkable vigor of the Republican revival.

Such, at any rate, is the final conclusion reached by this reporter and his brother Stewart. We came out here for several days of rather bleak pavement-pounding and door-bell ringing, in order to get a line on Wisconsin's crucial Democratic primary contest between Senators John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts and Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. We were not looking, except incidentally, for pointers on the comparative standing of the two parties.

We have just completed our last round of wintry polling in Wausau city, on Edwards and Ruder and Fairmont and Emerson and other similar streets. Here industrial workers and insurance company personnel and other businessmen and salesmen live, cheek-by-jowl, in small comfortable houses so alike that you never know whether the door will be answered by a junior executive or a factory hand. Here are the streets of Mr. and Mrs. Average-Citizen-of-Wausau.

These streets that we traversed for many long, finger-nipping hours had good news for Senator Kennedy and bad news for Senator Humphrey. Among the country people we polled on an earlier day, Kennedy had a comfortable lead in the group that intended voting in the Democratic primary. In the same group in our Wausau sample, Kennedy led Humphrey even more widely, by means 2 to 1. But in these streets of Wausau, as in the

would like to express my point of view.

I can see that this person thinks that the advertisements on television are too long and there are too many. This is taking a narrow point of view.

Advertisements are the life of our television today, and truly without them we would have no television. Commercials may be relatively long and are propagandizing the American people, but to sell a product they must put it over in a big way, as they do in advertisements on television.

I don't quite see how the person that wrote the letter can see how commercials are a "half-nelson" affair. Advertisements in their substantial form are relatively fulfilling their ultimate purpose. Likewise we are able to watch television today.

If people are so disgusted with television advertisements, we will probably some day see "pay television" in Medford. This may be the only alternative for television commercials.

Richard Crowley 704 N. Oregon St. Jacksonville, Ore.

A Halo? To the Editor: I sure would like to see your Mr. Bulman. I'm sure from reading his letters he must have a halo, long flowing beard and long hair.

I can't even imagine how he must dress, as he doesn't believe in personal pride. Indeed he must be something to behold.

There are quotes in the Good Book that would take care of him nicely, but doubt if they would make a dent in his self-righteousness.

Helen Trucco 2595 Coruy rd. Medford.

No Commercials - No TV To the Editor: In respect to the letter entitled Commercials . . . Commercials, I

Quotes From the News

By United Press International Buenos Aires—Argentine Sen. Luis Racedo, discussing the Argentine navy's effort to track down the mystery submarine reported lurking in Nuevo Gulf:

"The weapons of our army, navy and air force are evidently out of date."

San Quentin, Calif.—Convict-author Caryl Chessman's attorney, George T. Davis, announcing he would seek a rehearing of Chessman's clemency plea in the California Supreme Court:

"Any time a man's life hangs in the balance by one vote in a case as important as this he deserves the benefit of the doubt."

Sacramento, Calif. — Vice President Richard M. Nixon, commenting on former President Truman's prediction that any Democrat nominated could beat Nixon for the presidency:

"Of course I would disagree."

Washington — An Air Force manual, quoted by Rep. Frank Kowalski (D-Conn.) as advising that "good eating certificates" and lollipops should be given officers' children if they eat all their food:

"This certificate usually makes a hit with parents who can use it to coax the little ones to clean up their plates."

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

REAL WAUSAU STORY Wausau, Wis. - A local insurance company has long had the habit of telling the country "the W a u s a u" story in its advertising.

They rightly say that this is the kind of pleasant little city where it is good to be a family. But for political buffs, the real Wausau story concerns the remarkable vigor of the Republican revival.

Such, at any rate, is the final conclusion reached by this reporter and his brother Stewart. We came out here for several days of rather bleak pavement-pounding and door-bell ringing, in order to get a line on Wisconsin's crucial Democratic primary contest between Senators John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts and Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota.

We were not looking, except incidentally, for pointers on the comparative standing of the two parties.

We have just completed our last round of wintry polling in Wausau city, on Edwards and Ruder and Fairmont and Emerson and other similar streets. Here industrial workers and insurance company personnel and other businessmen and salesmen live, cheek-by-jowl, in small comfortable houses so alike that you never know whether the door will be answered by a junior executive or a factory hand.

Here are the streets of Mr. and Mrs. Average-Citizen-of-Wausau.

These streets that we traversed for many long, finger-nipping hours had good news for Senator Kennedy and bad news for Senator Humphrey. Among the country people we polled on an earlier day, Kennedy had a comfortable lead in the group that intended voting in the Democratic primary. In the same group in our Wausau sample, Kennedy led Humphrey even more widely, by means 2 to 1. But in these streets of Wausau, as in the

would like to express my point of view.

I can see that this person thinks that the advertisements on television are too long and there are too many. This is taking a narrow point of view.

Advertisements are the life of our television today, and truly without them we would have no television. Commercials may be relatively long and are propagandizing the American people, but to sell a product they must put it over in a big way, as they do in advertisements on television.

I don't quite see how the person that wrote the letter can see how commercials are a "half-nelson" affair. Advertisements in their substantial form are relatively fulfilling their ultimate purpose. Likewise we are able to watch television today.

If people are so disgusted with television advertisements, we will probably some day see "pay television" in Medford. This may be the only alternative for television commercials.

Richard Crowley 704 N. Oregon St. Jacksonville, Ore.

A Halo? To the Editor: I sure would like to see your Mr. Bulman. I'm sure from reading his letters he must have a halo, long flowing beard and long hair.

I can't even imagine how he must dress, as he doesn't believe in personal pride. Indeed he must be something to behold.

There are quotes in the Good Book that would take care of him nicely, but doubt if they would make a dent in his self-righteousness.

Helen Trucco 2595 Coruy rd. Medford.

No Commercials - No TV To the Editor: In respect to the letter entitled Commercials . . . Commercials, I

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

NUCLEAR TESTING

The explosion in the Sahara Desert, which showed that French science and technology are as good as anyone else's, is notice to all of us that there is no monopoly and not much mystery about nuclear weapons. What France can do today, China will be able to do tomorrow, not to speak of Germany and Japan. This would not necessarily mean the end of the world. But it will certainly mean that as the test explosions are multiplied, the air will become polluted, and the consequences to future generations are horrible to contemplate.

For 14 months the U.S.S.R., the U.K., and the U.S.A. have been negotiating a treaty designed to put an end to test explosions. These negotiations have progressed marvelously, and they represent something quite new and unexpected in the relations between the Soviet Union and the West.

To be sure the three of us, who now have nuclear weapons, cannot impose our treaty, even if we reach final agreement, on the rest of the world. But if we are agreed on a treaty, we shall set an example, we shall create the machinery, around which world opinion will surely rally. There is little reason to doubt that France, for example, if her rights are respected, would join in and contribute valuable help in making the test ban workable.

YET for the time being the negotiations are stalled. The issue arises out of experiments conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission in a salt mine in Louisiana. These experiments showed our experts that relatively small underground explosions cannot be detected by the existing instruments. They cannot surely be distinguished from earthquakes.

Our difference with the Soviet Union is over the size of the underground explosions which can be detected. Our experts say that the underground explosion can be nine times as big, and still go undetected, as the Soviet experts say it can be.

The Administration has taken the position that we will not agree to abandon underground explosions if our experts say they are too small to be detected. We propose, therefore, to authorize such small nuclear testing. As it happens, these authorized explosions would be just the ones which the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon regard as desirable in order to perfect a number of weapons they are working on. The Soviet position, on the other hand, is that all tests must be banned, even those which cannot be detected.

Much more impressive, however, was the table of these same pollees' past voting records and present party preferences. In 1956, in brief, 28 had voted for Eisenhower; 12 had voted for Adlai Stevenson; and 11 had not voted. In 1958, in sharp contrast, 24 had voted for Senator Proxmire; only 12 had voted for Proxmire's Republican opponent, Judge Steinele; and 16 had not voted.

AS OF NOW, in still sharper contrast, 29 of our pollees would vote for Nixon for the Presidency against Senator Kennedy. Another 13 would vote for Kennedy, and 10 do not know how they would vote. Nixon would do even better against Senator Humphrey, with 32 voting for him, 13 choosing Humphrey decidedly, and only 7 in the "don't know" column. The Nixon-Humphrey trial heat was roughly typical, in turn, of the other trial heats we ran, between the Vice President and Adlai Stevenson, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, and Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri.

What gives significance and point to these figures is the large number of our pollees who sandwiched Democratic votes for Proxmire between their votes in 1956 for Eisenhower and their preference for the Vice President today. Without those intervening Proxmire votes you could dismiss the sample as unrepresentative. With those Proxmire votes, the sample means that here in Wausau, at any rate, the Republicans are in astonishingly good shape at the moment.

One more fact remains to be recorded. Our sample divided into 29 Protestants, 21 Catholics, and two persons without religious affiliation — which means that it was not weighted in Kennedy's favor. (c) 1960 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

WATER AREA New York — Surface area of the oceans is more than twice that of the lands.

iance of the concessions which have been made by the Soviet Union in agreeing to an elaborate worldwide inspection system, of which a large number of stations, manned by foreigners, would be on Soviet territory. In the perspective of Russian, not to speak of Communist, suspicion and dislike of foreigners, the Soviet concessions promise a political breakthrough of historic significance.

OUR policy-makers have not, it seems to me, taken into account the full consequences of the Soviet concessions.

The President and his advisors should bear this in mind when they talk about resuming our own testing. The President has said that "we consider ourselves free to resume nuclear testing" but that we shall not resume it without announcing our intention to do so.

What does the President think would happen if he did announce such an intention? There would be an uproar around the world. Quite complete and cool observers believe that the uproar would bring about a special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to protest against our action, and that if the question were put to a vote, we should be lucky to get ten votes out of eighty.

In any event the damage to our influence and our prestige would be enormous. Moreover, and this is the point that the Administration should not overlook, if the treaty fails because it is not totally perfect, the Soviet Union will have won a sweeping diplomatic victory. The Soviet Union will not have to admit foreigners to carry out inspection on her territory. At the same time the United States will not really be free to continue testing. For the more we test, the more we shall be denounced and opposed as having failed to show a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

When these negotiations started, the Russians wanted to ban testing without any inspection. If we hold inflexible to our present position, there is likely to be no treaty, and the Russians will get for nothing most of what they wanted in the first place. They will have no inspection and they will have made it almost impossible for us to do much testing.

I think this assumption is miscalculated. The miscalculation is a failure to realize the signif-

icance of the concessions which have been made by the Soviet Union in agreeing to an elaborate worldwide inspection system, of which a large number of stations, manned by foreigners, would be on Soviet territory. In the perspective of Russian, not to speak of Communist, suspicion and dislike of foreigners, the Soviet concessions promise a political breakthrough of historic significance.

OUR policy-makers have not, it seems to me, taken into account the full consequences of the Soviet concessions.

The President and his advisors should bear this in mind when they talk about resuming our own testing. The President has said that "we consider ourselves free to resume nuclear testing" but that we shall not resume it without announcing our intention to do so.

What does the President think would happen if he did announce such an intention? There would be an uproar around the world. Quite complete and cool observers believe that the uproar would bring about a special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to protest against our action, and that if the question were put to a vote, we should be lucky to get ten votes out of eighty.

In any event the damage to our influence and our prestige would be enormous. Moreover, and this is the point that the Administration should not overlook, if the treaty fails because it is not totally perfect, the Soviet Union will have won a sweeping diplomatic victory. The Soviet Union will not have to admit foreigners to carry out inspection on her territory. At the same time the United States will not really be free to continue testing. For the more we test, the more we shall be denounced and opposed as having failed to show a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

When these negotiations started, the Russians wanted to ban testing without any inspection. If we hold inflexible to our present position, there is likely to be no treaty, and the Russians will get for nothing most of what they wanted in the first place. They will have no inspection and they will have made it almost impossible for us to do much testing.

I think this assumption is miscalculated. The miscalculation is a failure to realize the signif-

icance of the concessions which have been made by the Soviet Union in agreeing to an elaborate worldwide inspection system, of which a large number of stations, manned by foreigners, would be on Soviet territory. In the perspective of Russian, not to speak of Communist, suspicion and dislike of foreigners, the Soviet concessions promise a political breakthrough of historic significance.

OUR policy-makers have not, it seems to me, taken into account the full consequences of the Soviet concessions.

The President and his advisors should bear this in mind when they talk about resuming our own testing. The President has said that "we consider ourselves free to resume nuclear testing" but that we shall not resume it without announcing our intention to do so.

What does the President think would happen if he did announce such an intention? There would be an uproar around the world. Quite complete and cool observers believe that the uproar would bring about a special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to protest against our action, and that if the question were put to a vote, we should be lucky to get ten votes out of eighty.

In any event the damage to our influence and our prestige would be enormous. Moreover, and this is the point that the Administration should not overlook, if the treaty fails because it is not totally perfect, the Soviet Union will have won a sweeping diplomatic victory. The Soviet Union will not have to admit foreigners to carry out inspection on her territory. At the same time the United States will not really be free to continue testing. For the more we test, the more we shall be denounced and opposed as having failed to show a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

When these negotiations started, the Russians wanted to ban testing without any inspection. If we hold inflexible to our present position, there is likely to be no treaty, and the Russians will get for nothing most of what they wanted in the first place. They will have no inspection and they will have made it almost impossible for us to do much testing.

I think this assumption is miscalculated. The miscalculation is a failure to realize the signif-

icance of the concessions which have been made by the Soviet Union in agreeing to an elaborate worldwide inspection system, of which a large number of stations, manned by foreigners, would be on Soviet territory. In the perspective of Russian, not to speak of Communist, suspicion and dislike of foreigners, the Soviet concessions promise a political breakthrough of historic significance.

OUR policy-makers have not, it seems to me, taken into account the full consequences of the Soviet concessions.

The President and his advisors should bear this in mind when they talk about resuming our own testing. The President has said that "we consider ourselves free to resume nuclear testing" but that we shall not resume it without announcing our intention to do so.

What does the President think would happen if he did announce such an intention? There would be an uproar around the world. Quite complete and cool observers believe that the uproar would bring about a special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to protest against our action, and that if the question were put to a vote, we should be lucky to get ten votes out of eighty.

In any event the damage to our influence and our prestige would be enormous. Moreover, and this is the point that the Administration should not overlook, if the treaty fails because it is not totally perfect, the Soviet Union will have won a sweeping diplomatic victory. The Soviet Union will not have to admit foreigners to carry out inspection on her territory. At the same time the United States will not really be free to continue testing. For the more we test, the more we shall be denounced and opposed as having failed to show a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

When these negotiations started, the Russians wanted to ban testing without any inspection. If we hold inflexible to our present position, there is likely to be no treaty, and the Russians will get for nothing most of what they wanted in the first place. They will have no inspection and they will have made it almost impossible for us to do much testing.

I think this assumption is miscalculated. The miscalculation is a failure to realize the signif-

icance of the concessions which have been made by the Soviet Union in agreeing to an elaborate worldwide inspection system, of which a large number of stations, manned by foreigners, would be on Soviet territory. In the perspective of Russian, not to speak of Communist, suspicion and dislike of foreigners, the Soviet concessions promise a political breakthrough of historic significance.

OUR policy-makers have not, it seems to me, taken into account the full consequences of the Soviet concessions.

<