

Medford Mail Tribune
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St., Ph. SP 2-4141

Subscription Rates
By Mail - In Advance, Copy 16c
Daily and Sunday - year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. 8.50
Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. 4.50

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

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
Oct. 5, 1950 (Thursday)
The new bridge at Rogue River will be dedicated tomorrow but a name for the bridge remains in doubt.

20 YEARS AGO
Oct. 5, 1940 (Saturday)
Thirty-nine Rogue River High school freshmen, the largest class in years, were initiated last night to the tune of resounding whacks from paddles.

30 YEARS AGO
Oct. 5, 1930 (Sunday)
Medford High school was defeated by Marshfield last night, 27 to 7.

40 YEARS AGO
Oct. 5, 1920 (Tuesday)
Bardwell Fruit company made the largest sale of valley pears in history on the New York market recently.

50 YEARS AGO
Oct. 5, 1910 (Wednesday)
City fathers are in a dilemma over how to dispose of the increasing stock of liquor in the city hall that has resulted from police confiscation of liquor from hoboes and drunks.

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

1. Three dots and a dash in the Morse code indicate what letter of the alphabet?
2. Jerry Cruncher is a character in which of Charles Dickens' novels?
3. When does the 24th hour of the day begin?
4. When two members of a legislative body "pair" their votes, do they have their votes recorded on the same side of the issue or on opposite sides?
5. Who wrote the "Blue Danube" waltz?
6. "Baldwin," "Jonathan" and "McIntosh" are commercial varieties of which fruit?
7. Mothers Day is celebrated the first, second, or third Sunday in May?
8. Is baseball a popular game in Japan?
9. What word means the opposite of "windward"?
10. Belmont Park race track is in N. York County?
Answers: 1. "V." 2. "A Tale of Two Cities." 3. 11 p.m. 4. Opposing sides. 5. Johann Strauss. 6. Apple. 7. Second. 8. Yes. 9. Leeward. 10. Nassau.

We're for Kennedy

Some newspapers are professing shock at the "line" being taken by Vice President Richard M. Nixon in his election campaign—to the effect that it is somehow unpatriotic for his opponent to point out any deficiencies in the America of today.

Is, in fact, Senator Kennedy "supplying grist for the Communist propaganda mill" as Mr. Nixon alleges?

Or can we agree with Senator Kennedy when he says: "I say it is wrong and dangerous for any American to keep silent about our future if he is not satisfied with what is being done to preserve the future."

AS MENTIONED, some papers are "shocked" that Nixon would, deliberately and over and over again, impute that Kennedy is disloyal for saying not enough has been done in defense, in economic growth, in conservation and development of natural resources, in care of the sick and aged, in providing a decent education for Americans.

Well, we're not shocked. We really rather expected it.

For it fits perfectly with the tactics of the "Old Nixon" (who was supposed to have been supplanted by the "New Nixon") of the campaigns of 1948, 1950, 1952 and 1956.

VICE President Richard Nixon has a disconcerting way of being on all sides of a variety of issues.

Take nuclear testing, and the banning thereof, for instance:

In 1956 he said Adlai Stevenson was "naive" about Communism for favoring a ban on nuclear testing. Then, when President Eisenhower agreed to the test ban some time later, himself came out for it.

Or take Indo-China: At the time the French were making their last stand at Dienbienphu, Nixon advocated armed U.S. intervention; then, when that crisis had blown over, boasted that the Administration kept us out of that war.

HE DOESN'T—not QUITE—call his opponents communists. (In the cases were they actually WERE called communists during his campaigns, someone else did the calling for him.)

But he comes close enough to it so no one can miss the point. Harry Truman was charged with "toleration and defense of Communists in high places." Truman and Stevenson were "traitors to the high principles" of the Democratic party.

And now he is employing the same tactic on Senator Kennedy, who, he alleges, is in effect giving aid and comfort to the enemy because he won't go along with the happy thesis that all's for the best in this best of all possible worlds.

WE DON'T think it will work. We think that Senator Kennedy's case is too good; that he is showing, day by day, and by concrete examples, that the time has long since passed when America should have awakened from its eight-year nap.

He declares, and we agree, that it has been a time during which American prestige has fallen to a new international low; during which demands of a growing population have been ignored or postponed; during which the number of elderly people has tremendously increased along with their needs for dignity and assistance; during which the problem of farm supports and surpluses has overwhelmed both Congress and Administration.

During a time, in short, when America crept when it should have run; when it dozed when it should have been vibrantly awake.

SENATOR Kennedy is challenging America; asking its people to live up to their proud destiny and their magnificent potential.

Mr. Nixon is soothing America, telling us we're doing "almost well enough" now, and that the little added effort won't strain anyone. And he's trying to shut off debate on the real and important issues of the campaign by declaring with a self-righteous smirk that it's aiding the communists for us to diagnose and prescribe for our own illnesses!

The Mail Tribune supports Kennedy, and will do so in the strongest possible terms, believing that Richard Milhous Nixon is not a fit person to sit in the White House of the United States of America.—E.A.

Memorandum From Lincoln

I am not a Know-Nothing; that is certain. How could I be? How can anyone who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people?

Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that "all men are created equal." We now practically read it "all men are created equal, except Negroes." When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read "all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics."

When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy.—(Abraham Lincoln, letter to Joshua F. Speed, Aug. 24, 1855.)

Dennis the Menace



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. The letters printed in this column do not necessarily represent the views of the paper; in fact the contrary is often the case.

Catholicism and The State
To the Editor: One of the writers in last Thursday's Mail Tribune gave the meaning of Catholic as universal, but she failed to define the difference in Catholic and Roman Catholic. There is a difference.

Catholic or Holy Catholic is universal, the Christian Church as a whole. Protestants accept the Bible and God's Holy Word as the authority of their faith. They believe in private interpretation. The Roman Catholic puts the authority of the Pope and the Church above the authority of the Word of God, with headquarters in Rome. They believe their church is the only true church.

Protestants believe in separation of Church and State. Roman Catholics believe the Pope has temporal as well as spiritual authority. Senator Kennedy is a Roman Catholic, and that is his privilege, for we are still living in a free America. He is bound by oath to be faithful to his church, but hasn't the right to force it on others. According to the Vatican, one cannot be faithful to his church, and hold a high government position where many decisions have to be made, without each being approved by the Roman power. Which will it be?

Our forefathers came to America for the purpose of the freedom of worship, and I believe we want to keep it that way. They do not believe their one church is the only true church but have the liberty and freedom to worship God in any church they choose to attend, be it Quaker, Baptist or Methodist, etc.

Vice President Nixon still has that privilege of worshiping God wherever he wishes. The writer said "You cannot serve God and Mammon." How true, You cannot serve God and someone who places himself equal to God, at the same time.

Senator Kennedy and his brother keep bringing the religious issue before the people, yet if anyone else even mentions it they call it bigotry. Let us think on these things.

Mrs. Ernest Santo, 204 Lozier Lane, Medford.

Editor's note: In this connection, we find the words of the Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, the internationally known and respected Baptist minister, of interest. In a recent letter to the New York Times, he had this to say:

I wish to comment particularly upon that part of Senator Kennedy's statement before the Greater Houston Ministerial Association on Sept. 12 in which he discussed the importance of religious liberty for all: Protestant, Catholic and Jew.

I quote him: "... while this year it may be a Catholic against whom the finger of suspicion is pointed, in other years it has been, and may some day be again, a Jew, or a Quaker, or a Unitarian, or a Baptist..." Today I may be the victim-but tomorrow it may be you—until the whole fabric of our national society is ripped at a time of great national peril."

It seems to me that these words cannot be too heavily underscored. The history of religious freedom and rights in our nation has been marred time and again by religious persecution such as Senator Kennedy has warned could happen tomorrow.

The Baptists were the first to petition for religious freedom before the Virginia House of Burgesses. Roger Williams fled Massachusetts Colony and established Providence Plantation because he could not endure the oppressive religious strictures of his brethren. A Presbyterian, Samuel Davies, influenced Jefferson, Madison and others to secure religious liberty.

Article VI of the Constitution explicitly rules out a religious test for public office, and this is as it should be. To require a religious test—even indirectly—is repugnant to the ideals of democracy, just as is any limitation on political rights on grounds of race, color or creed.

Talk of Russia-Red China Split Viewed As 'Just Talk'—At Present, Anyway

By PHIL NEWSOM
UPI Foreign Editor
The West should regard with considerable skepticism the talk of a deepening rift between the Soviet Union and Red China.

Disagreements, yes. But disagreements frequently occur within a family without any final break. So, with the USSR and Red China, the disagreements do not necessarily mean an impending split between the world's two greatest communist powers.

It is noteworthy that most of the "news" regarding the Chinese and Russian differences has come through Communist "leaks."

To this, then, has been added so-called evidence drawn from Red China's silence on Nikita Khrushchev's visit to the United Nations, and on its notable lack of support for his plan for world disarmament in four years.

There also was Russia's marked lack of enthusiasm for China's border quarrel with India.

Special emphasis has been placed on the ideological quarrel between Khrushchev and Red China party leader Mao Tse-Tung.

UPI correspondent Henry Shapiro, a close observer of the Moscow scene for 25 years, sees little of substance in the Khrushchev-Mao Tse-Tung quarrel.

Both, he points out, are dedicated communists who might disagree on methods but never on the final objective.

It might well be that there is a personal rivalry between the two for prestige within the party.

The USSR, relatively stable after a little more than 40 years, disagrees with Red China's haste because it believes that time is on its side.

Therefore, it could sympathize with Red China's designs on Indian territory but disagree with the rough-shod methods.

It could agree with Red China's demands on Formosa but heartily disagree with any precipitate action which might unleash a war.

But for the world to believe that deep differences separate the two, simply works to the advantage of both Red China and the USSR, carrying as it does the possibility that it will null the West into a false sense of security.

Future Problems
In the future not yet foreseeable, it may well be that important differences will arise. One cause might be China's explosive population problem. Another might arise from the proven fact that there can be no such thing as co-equal dictators.

The lands to the south of China are far richer than Russia's Siberian wastes to the north, and can support a far greater population than they now do.

But for the moment, Khrushchev needs a friendly China at his back. And China needs Russian industrial know-how. In addition, there are far greater worlds still to be conquered by Communism than either could gain by turning on each other.

Wilson Sees Dick Warming Up Campaign In Last 3 Weeks

By LYLE C. WILSON
Washington—UPI—If there is to be a "new Nixon" in this presidential campaign, the unveiling may be expected in about a fortnight.

Tuesday, Oct. 18 would be an appropriate date. That would be precisely three weeks before election day. Oct. 18 would be appropriate because Vice President Richard M. Nixon believes that the three weeks immediately preceding an election are the weeks that count the most.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was another politician who believed elections best could be won with a late start and a fast and furious finish. That is Nixon's campaign theory, emphatically so.

Therefore, it would be logical for the drama critics of the current political play to await the last act and the final curtain. Much of the special political coronation slugging for the Rockefeller party line. He could have his penthouse and slug too.

From the conservative cheering section there are, of course, cheers. Also, there are some yells of dismay. Conservatives, too, want the vice president to come out plugging. More, they want him to come out slugging with an issue which will tingle their spines and start them to marching in the aisles. Peace in our time has not done that. No farm program will. Maybe it could be accomplished with the issues of spending, taxes and inflation.

In the Day's News

President Eisenhower rejected a neutralist proposal put forth last week for an immediate summit conference between himself and Mr. Khrushchev on the subject of disarmament.

In turning down the proposal, he says in effect that however it appears that the Soviet Union is prepared to return to the path of peaceful negotiation with some prospect of fruitful results he will be prepared "to meet and negotiate with a representative of the Soviet government and with the heads of OTHER governments as their interests are involved."

He thus holds the door open for a return to summit diplomacy "if Premier Khrushchev will take steps to pave the way for USEFUL negotiations."

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in his kennel. He resents being down-rated by Kroosh. Nkrumah of Ghana (one of the new African nations) seems ambitious to join the ranks of Communist stooges.

We incline to lean courteously toward the neutrals because we probably have some hopes of Nehru, who inclines to lean more toward the West as the brutal despotism of Communism becomes more and more clearly apparent to him. Hence (probably) Ike's careful handling of the neutralist proposal for a Russian-American summit session on disarmament.

How important are SUMMITS to the future of the free world? One wonders. There is Yalta in the background of the comparatively recent past. Yalta was a summit meeting. Present at Yalta were President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States; Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; and Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union. The agreements reached there included policies and plans for the occupation of Germany, including the West Berlin situation, which is the root of so much trouble NOW. Yalta set the stage for the cold war that is plaguing us now.

Why risk another Yalta?

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in his kennel. He resents being down-rated by Kroosh. Nkrumah of Ghana (one of the new African nations) seems ambitious to join the ranks of Communist stooges.

We incline to lean courteously toward the neutrals because we probably have some hopes of Nehru, who inclines to lean more toward the West as the brutal despotism of Communism becomes more and more clearly apparent to him. Hence (probably) Ike's careful handling of the neutralist proposal for a Russian-American summit session on disarmament.

How important are SUMMITS to the future of the free world? One wonders. There is Yalta in the background of the comparatively recent past. Yalta was a summit meeting. Present at Yalta were President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States; Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; and Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union. The agreements reached there included policies and plans for the occupation of Germany, including the West Berlin situation, which is the root of so much trouble NOW. Yalta set the stage for the cold war that is plaguing us now.

Why risk another Yalta?

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in his kennel. He resents being down-rated by Kroosh. Nkrumah of Ghana (one of the new African nations) seems ambitious to join the ranks of Communist stooges.

We incline to lean courteously toward the neutrals because we probably have some hopes of Nehru, who inclines to lean more toward the West as the brutal despotism of Communism becomes more and more clearly apparent to him. Hence (probably) Ike's careful handling of the neutralist proposal for a Russian-American summit session on disarmament.

How important are SUMMITS to the future of the free world? One wonders. There is Yalta in the background of the comparatively recent past. Yalta was a summit meeting. Present at Yalta were President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States; Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; and Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union. The agreements reached there included policies and plans for the occupation of Germany, including the West Berlin situation, which is the root of so much trouble NOW. Yalta set the stage for the cold war that is plaguing us now.

Why risk another Yalta?

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in his kennel. He resents being down-rated by Kroosh. Nkrumah of Ghana (one of the new African nations) seems ambitious to join the ranks of Communist stooges.

We incline to lean courteously toward the neutrals because we probably have some hopes of Nehru, who inclines to lean more toward the West as the brutal despotism of Communism becomes more and more clearly apparent to him. Hence (probably) Ike's careful handling of the neutralist proposal for a Russian-American summit session on disarmament.

How important are SUMMITS to the future of the free world? One wonders. There is Yalta in the background of the comparatively recent past. Yalta was a summit meeting. Present at Yalta were President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States; Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; and Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union. The agreements reached there included policies and plans for the occupation of Germany, including the West Berlin situation, which is the root of so much trouble NOW. Yalta set the stage for the cold war that is plaguing us now.

Why risk another Yalta?

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in his kennel. He resents being down-rated by Kroosh. Nkrumah of Ghana (one of the new African nations) seems ambitious to join the ranks of Communist stooges.

We incline to lean courteously toward the neutrals because we probably have some hopes of Nehru, who inclines to lean more toward the West as the brutal despotism of Communism becomes more and more clearly apparent to him. Hence (probably) Ike's careful handling of the neutralist proposal for a Russian-American summit session on disarmament.

How important are SUMMITS to the future of the free world? One wonders. There is Yalta in the background of the comparatively recent past. Yalta was a summit meeting. Present at Yalta were President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States; Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; and Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union. The agreements reached there included policies and plans for the occupation of Germany, including the West Berlin situation, which is the root of so much trouble NOW. Yalta set the stage for the cold war that is plaguing us now.

Why risk another Yalta?

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in his kennel. He resents being down-rated by Kroosh. Nkrumah of Ghana (one of the new African nations) seems ambitious to join the ranks of Communist stooges.

We incline to lean courteously toward the neutrals because we probably have some hopes of Nehru, who inclines to lean more toward the West as the brutal despotism of Communism becomes more and more clearly apparent to him. Hence (probably) Ike's careful handling of the neutralist proposal for a Russian-American summit session on disarmament.

How important are SUMMITS to the future of the free world? One wonders. There is Yalta in the background of the comparatively recent past. Yalta was a summit meeting. Present at Yalta were President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States; Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; and Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union. The agreements reached there included policies and plans for the occupation of Germany, including the West Berlin situation, which is the root of so much trouble NOW. Yalta set the stage for the cold war that is plaguing us now.

Why risk another Yalta?

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in his kennel. He resents being down-rated by Kroosh. Nkrumah of Ghana (one of the new African nations) seems ambitious to join the ranks of Communist stooges.

We incline to lean courteously toward the neutrals because we probably have some hopes of Nehru, who inclines to lean more toward the West as the brutal despotism of Communism becomes more and more clearly apparent to him. Hence (probably) Ike's careful handling of the neutralist proposal for a Russian-American summit session on disarmament.

How important are SUMMITS to the future of the free world? One wonders. There is Yalta in the background of the comparatively recent past. Yalta was a summit meeting. Present at Yalta were President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States; Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; and Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union. The agreements reached there included policies and plans for the occupation of Germany, including the West Berlin situation, which is the root of so much trouble NOW. Yalta set the stage for the cold war that is plaguing us now.

Why risk another Yalta?

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in his kennel. He resents being down-rated by Kroosh. Nkrumah of Ghana (one of the new African nations) seems ambitious to join the ranks of Communist stooges.

We incline to lean courteously toward the neutrals because we probably have some hopes of Nehru, who inclines to lean more toward the West as the brutal despotism of Communism becomes more and more clearly apparent to him. Hence (probably) Ike's careful handling of the neutralist proposal for a Russian-American summit session on disarmament.

How important are SUMMITS to the future of the free world? One wonders. There is Yalta in the background of the comparatively recent past. Yalta was a summit meeting. Present at Yalta were President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States; Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; and Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union. The agreements reached there included policies and plans for the occupation of Germany, including the West Berlin situation, which is the root of so much trouble NOW. Yalta set the stage for the cold war that is plaguing us now.

Why risk another Yalta?

MR. Kroosh puts it more flatly. He says: "Some people say Khrushchev and Ike should be locked in a room and kept there until they come to an agreement on disarmament. But this is naive. We may sit there indefinitely. BUT IF NO DESIRE TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT IS EVINCED BY THE PRESIDENT, nothing will come of it."

So that's that.

A WORD on the five neutralists who put the request for the summit proposal. They are: Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nasser of the Arab Republic, Tito of Yugoslavia and Nkrumah of Ghana.

Nehru is a sincere neutralist. He wants to STAY OUT of the ruckus—as who doesn't! At first, he seemed to lean toward Communism, but he

got a rude shock when Communist China wiped out little Tibet and began to make rough gestures toward India. Sukarno is a Communist. Nasser is an opportunist who is looking for a break that might be good for Nasser. Tito is a Communist, but he wants to be top dog in