

Medford Mail Tribune
 "Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
 Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO., 33 North Fir St., Ph. 772-6141
 ROBERT W. RUIHL, Editor
 HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
 GERALD T. LATHAM, Bus. Mgr.
 ERIC W. ALLEN, Jr., Mng. Editor
 EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
 HARRY CHAPMAN, Feels Editor
 RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
 OLIVE STARBUCK, Women's Editor
 DALE BRIDGEMAN, Circulation Mgr.
 An Independent Newspaper Entered as second class matter at Medford Oregon under Act of March 3, 1897.
 SUBSCRIPTION RATES
 By Mail - In Advance
 Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$18.00
 Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$9.00
 Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. \$5.00
 Sunday Only - 1 year \$3.00
 Single Copy (Mailed) 20c
 By Carrier - And Motor Route
 Daily and Sunday - 1 year \$21.00
 Daily and Sunday - 6 mos. \$11.00
 Daily and Sunday - 3 mos. \$7.00
 Carrier and Vendors - Copy 10c
 Official Paper of City of Medford
 Official Paper of Jackson County
 United Press International
 Full Leased Wire
 U. P. 1 Telephone Newspapers
 MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU OF CIRCULATIONS
 Advertising Representatives:
 NELSON ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES
 Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, Denver.

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
 NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
 Member California Newspaper Publishers Association

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

10 Years Ago
 Sept. 29, 1953 (Tuesday)
 The Griffith Creek bridge west of Central Point has been opened to traffic.
 Identity of one victim of the cabin fire on Sterling Creek Sunday morning remains a mystery today, although sheriff's deputies and state police are checking all possible sources.

20 Years Ago
 Sept. 29, 1943 (Wednesday)
 Clara Mae Bigham grand champion showman of 4-H fair.
 From Arthur Perry's "Jack Smudge Pot" column: "Ye rabbits were never so plentiful hereabouts. Due to curtailment of motoring, few if any of the present generation know what it is to outrun a Ford on the straight-away."

30 Years Ago
 Sept. 29, 1933 (Friday)
 Tax on liquor planned to provide funds for state relief.
 Good Government Congress president to go on trial Monday for horsewhipping.

40 Years Ago
 Sept. 29, 1923 (Saturday)
 Valley Newton apples shipped to England.
 Pre-dedication rally of Baptist church to be held Sunday.

50 Years Ago
 Sept. 29, 1913 (Monday)
 Medford initiative freight rate bill declared unconstitutional.
 Rain ends forest fire season; 275 acres burned over in national forest.

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

1. Is a truffle a short roll of drums, a decorative addition to a hat, or an edible fungi?
 2. The Panama Canal is approximately 25, 50, or 75 miles in length?
 3. Who was king of Israel when David slew Goliath with his sling?
 4. Every two years, the entire membership of the U. S. House of Representatives is elected; at the same interval, is 1/2, 1/3 or 1/3 of the Senate elected?
 5. Which noted Union general during the War between the States engaged in a famous march to the sea?
 6. "Hands" is a measurement for denoting the height of horses; what other human part is used to denote the number of horses?
 7. Which one of the New England states is nicknamed "Bay State"?
 8. What is the plural form of the word criterion?
 9. In Greek mythology, a centaur is half man and half - - - ?
 10. What type of "grease" denotes prolonged or hard exertion of the arms?
 Answers: 1. Fungi. 2. 50 miles. 3. Saul. 4. One-third. 5. William Tecumseh Sherman. 6. Head. 7. Massachusetts. 8. Criteria. 9. Horse. 10. Elbow grease.

Only One Way

The following paragraph, from an editorial column in the Ashland Daily Tidings, is herewith nominated for one of the most amusing of the current season:

"They" (they voters) "also know that the legislature can pass a sales and cigarette tax in a single day if they so choose and the present budget can then be met with money to spare."

They (the voters) don't know anything of the kind, and the editorial columnist knows it. Or if he doesn't he owes it to himself and his readers to find out.

FIRST, there always has been strong sentiment against a sales tax in Oregon, and there still is. If certain indications are valid, that sentiment is beginning to shift toward one, but the outcome is highly uncertain. The same is true of a cigarette tax.

The legislature (the same one that met earlier this year and resoundingly rejected a sales tax) is little more apt to adopt one in November than it was in May or June. It is much more apt to cut state appropriations to the bone.

Even if it does adopt a sales tax "in a single day" (hah!!) it could not go into effect until 90 days thereafter—in January at the earliest, and probably later — even if it isn't referred.

AND IT IS almost a certainty that a sales tax and/or cigarette tax would be referred. There are too many vested and organized interests opposed to this form of taxation for it to get by unscathed.

Then it could not be voted upon until May, at the earliest, and probably November, 1964. By that time the biennium would be almost over, and the state would be in the poor house.

And even assuming, as our naive editor friend does, that the legislature passed a sales and cigarette tax "in a single day" (hah) and it is not referred, it would become effective in January or February, with the biennium more than one-quarter gone, and the revenue which could have been derived in that period gone forever. (We've already lost 1 1/2 months' potential revenue simply because of the referral, to say nothing of the \$275,000 or \$300,000 the election will cost.)

WE SUGGEST that the Ashland editor, instead of dreaming wild and irresponsible dreams about cutting taxes and then having things go on as before, consider instead how many of his subscribers are Southern Oregon College faculty members, how many are school teachers, and how many of them support his advertisers and the economy of Ashland.

We suggest he read the Oregon Constitution, which requires the state to live within its income, and think what will happen when higher education, welfare and school district budgets are pared to below subsistence levels, as they will have to be if the tax measure fails.

Things might not be as bad as painted if the tax bill fails. But you can bet your bottom dollar that some old folk will go hungry, some faculty members will be fired (or leave), some school teachers will go on warrants (or leave), and that the state will sink into a slough of fiscal and educational despond from which it will not soon recover.

SOME OR ALL of these things will happen no matter what the Governor does, no matter what the Legislature does, if the tax measure is defeated.

There are, undoubtedly, some people who couldn't care less.

But it seems to us that those who have a care for the young people we are committed to educate, for the elderly poor, for the integrity of our state and our state's institutions, must, willy-nilly, vote to tax ourselves a bit more to prevent this from happening.

Only by doing so can we avoid a period—long or short—of fiscal chaos, governmental disarray, educational slippage, and human deprivation.—E. A.

Quintuplets' Problems

When the Dionne Quintuplets were borne, we were a bit young to contemplate the delights and difficulties of parenthood.

But the recent birth of the Fischer Quintuplets fills us with great sympathy for the parents. Imagine the problems of parenthood going up, not five times, but in a ratio magnified by notoriety, sudden wealth, and the life-long assurance of the loss of privacy and the possibility of living any reasonable semblance of a normal life.

We wish them well, and all the happiness possible. But the experience of the Dionnes would indicate that their chances are less than they might be. — E. A.

City of Medford Cemetery?

In Medford and its environs there are now Hillcrest Memorial Park, Memory Gardens Memorial Park, and Siskiyou Memorial Park. They are dead-people parks.

We need "City of Medford Memorial Park" as the name of an alive-people park like we need a hole in the head.

It may, perhaps, be regrettable that the words "memorial park" have come to be synonymous with cemeteries — but they have, and that's that. A city park should have connotations of health and happiness, not death and burial.—E. A.

"Would You Repeat That, Sir? The Afternoon Bomb Explosion Jarred The Microphone A Little"



Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann
 © 1963, The Washington Post

WHAT HAVE WE AGREED TO?
 So that we shall not expect too much or value too little the partial test ban treaty, we must, I believe, ask why this agreement, which has been suggested so often before, became at last feasible. What has been the primary reason? Not the pollution of the air by fallout.

The danger of that has been known for years. Not the Soviet quarrel with Red China. For while that could conceivably explain why Moscow became willing to agree with us, it does not explain why Washington became willing to agree with Moscow. Not a sudden realization after the confrontation on Cuba that war must be avoided, though it is true that what it was like to stand on the brink has not been forgotten in Moscow and in Washington.

These and many other reasons have, no doubt, played a contributing part in the decision on both sides to sign the partial test ban treaty.

BUT the primary reason has been, I submit, that a preponderant scientific opinion has developed on both sides that continued testing in the atmosphere could almost certainly NOT produce a decisive breakthrough in the nuclear race. There is a dissenting minority, led by Dr. Teller in this country and reflected in the negative votes in the Senate, which continues to believe that a breakthrough can be made if enough atmospheric tests are conducted. And there is reason to believe that in the Soviet military establishment there are Russian counterparts to Dr. Teller. But the two governments, having heard the Teller case argued by scientists, have rejected it, and that is the decisive reason why they negotiated this treaty.

To be sure, our responsible officials have been careful not to go on record publicly that a breakthrough to an anti-missile missile is virtually impossible. But they could not have supported the test ban had they not become convinced by the large majority of American experts and disinterested scientists that the absolute weapon cannot be produced by continued testing in the atmosphere. No doubt Dr. Teller is a formidable man to overrule. He would not have been overruled if the weight of opinion opposed to it were not overwhelmingly formidable. For it there were any real chance of achieving the absolute weapon, the risks of not testing would be absolutely enormous.

The government would not have taken such risks. What is more, we must not forget that Mr. Khrushchev would not have taken such risks.

WHAT has actually happened is that both governments have renounced what they have come to believe is an unproductive method of reaching what is very probably an unattainable goal. They have not renounced the cold war. They have not made peace. But they have cleared the physical and moral atmosphere without sacrificing any vital interest.

We should, it seems to me, think of the treaty as one in a series which began with the treaty to renounce the militarization of the Antarctic continent, and is, so the President now proposes, to go on to a number of cooperative enterprises, of which the most spectacular is the exploration of the moon. The whole series leaves aside the vital issues of the cold war and proceeds to deal with issues that, while not vital, are unnecessarily competitive and irritating.

A settlement of the cold war, which extends to all the continents, is not in sight. The cold war will smolder on for genera-

GREAT IDEAS...



From the Great Books
 By Mortimer J. Adler
 © 1963, Publishers Newspaper Syndicate

RACIAL SUPERIORITY
 Dear Dr. Adler: There are people in this world who believe that one race of man is superior to all other races. How have the great minds in history felt about the superiority of races?
 Judith M. Hersey
 Back Ridge road
 East Orland, Maine

Dear Miss Hersey: "Race" was originally a biological term. It referred to the varieties of an animal species; for instance, different kinds of dogs. As applied to man, it took account of the typical differences in physical characteristics—skin color, hair texture, skull shape, facial features, and bodily stature—which are to be found in various groups occupying different geographical regions.

Many thinkers, however, have doubted that the term "race" can be applied as properly to human beings as it is to dogs, pigeons, and other animals. They have questioned whether the races of mankind are sharply separated types, originating in different pure stocks, or are instead mixed groups which fade into one another, rather than are sharply delimited. Most anthropologists have held that man share a basic structure and set of characteristics, and a common origin in a primeval human couple.

Darwin expressed this view in his "Descent of Man" almost a century ago: "Although the existing races of man differ in many respects... yet if their whole structure be taken into consideration, they are found to resemble each other closely in a multitude of points... It is extremely improbable that they should have been independently acquired by oboriginally distinct species or races. The same remark holds good with equal or greater force with respect to the numerous points of mental similarity between the most distinct races of man."

Similarly, many great humanists of the 17th and 18th centuries stressed the unity of the human species and decried all invidious implications of superiority or inferiority among the various physical and geographical divisions of mankind. Herder, for instance, denied that there are various races of men with different origins—"exclusive varieties." And Leibnitz and the van Humboldt brothers insisted that all men belong to "THE human race."

However, many writers in the past century have espoused the view that there are inferior and superior races of men. They have contended that certain ra-

ces are naturally superior to others, and that the inferior races should be ruled by the superior. This view has been used to justify the most heinous crimes of the past century.

It is important to understand that the concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

The concept of race is a social construct, not a biological one. The differences between human groups are largely the result of environmental factors and cultural practices.

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop
 © New York Herald Tribune Syndicate

Down With Twaddle-Think
 Hong Kong—The needless political patch encountered in South Viet Nam and the excitable American reaction to it are both rendered extraneous by another highly important set of facts.

In brief, although less is known about North Viet Nam than any other country in the Communist bloc, it is now quite certain that the condition of North Viet Nam is downright desperate.

Prof. P. J. Honey, the Englishman who is literally the only serious authority on Viet Nam with no French or other axe to grind, compares the present situation in the north "to the worst moment in China after the disaster of the great leap forward." That was the moment, of course, when Communist China came periodically close to internal collapse, as was proven by the breakdown of discipline when the Hong-kong border was opened.

But this idealistic American demand for "Asian democracy" is doomed to be unfulfilled. Highly educated, highly industrialized Japan is a special case. But Asian countries which have not fully emerged into the modern world are even less well prepared for democracy than, let us say, Alabama.

THE persistent application of our standards to Asian leaders, the insistent demand that Asian leaders perform in a manner more ideally American than many an American state governor, is not merely silly in itself. In addition, the underlying self-righteousness is deeply pernicious. Its pressure warps and cripples Asian leaders who might otherwise perform quite respectably, as in the case of President Diem. Worse still, American policy itself is also warped and crippled by the same pressure.

About an Asian government, in short, it is a clear sign of twaddle-think to ask most of the questions that are usually asked at home. About such a government, only three questions need to be asked. Does it work? Does it serve American interests? And is it not better, with all its faults, than the probable alternative—which in present day Asia is quite often a Communist government like that in North Viet Nam.

Even today, the Diem government is at least far better than that in the north. But the problem goes beyond Diem. Look at the facts! Mouth no more clichés! Down with twaddle-think! These should be the new slogans.

THE position in North Viet Nam is anywhere nearly as desperate as it is thought to be, by the only persons who know anything about it, then

you can win a 54-volume set of the Great Books of the Western World by writing a letter, not to exceed 150 words, incorporating a question of general interest for Dr. Adler to consider for inclusion in this column. Each week he will select as first prize winners the writers of the three best letters. He will use ONE of these letters as a basis for a future column and will answer it in terms of the intellectual heritage of the Great Books—44 works by 71 authors, spanning 30 centuries of thought. Address the letters to Dr. Mortimer J. Adler, in care of this newspaper.

WARREN HONORED
 The State Bar of California through its Conference of Delegates took the same action as the Oregon State Bar on the three proposed amendments to the federal constitution, designed to establish "states' rights." The California lawyers rejected the proposals by heavy margins. They could hardly have done otherwise and kept a straight face, because the session at San Francisco was doing special honor to Chief Justice Earl Warren, recognizing his completion of 10 years on the U.S. Supreme Court.—Oregon Statesman, Salem.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THEY would shoot the bombs back at us.
 But it isn't bombs we're talking about.
 It's WHEAT.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

Editorial Comment

WARREN HONORED
 The State Bar of California through its Conference of Delegates took the same action as the Oregon State Bar on the three proposed amendments to the federal constitution, designed to establish "states' rights." The California lawyers rejected the proposals by heavy margins. They could hardly have done otherwise and kept a straight face, because the session at San Francisco was doing special honor to Chief Justice Earl Warren, recognizing his completion of 10 years on the U.S. Supreme Court.—Oregon Statesman, Salem.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

THE more wheat we can get rid of, the more room we will have for MORE WHEAT to be subsidized in the hope that the subsidies will bring more farm votes to the New Frontier. And—
 If we can get rid of the wheat FOR CASH, the more cash we will have with which to subsidize still further over-production of wheat.
 Any politician must agree that such a deal would be good business.

Vast Stakes in Viet Nam Settlement

warred over Saigon and its loot. We might be a little less horrified over Madame Nhu's callous references to the Buddhists' acts of self-immolation were we all aware that for a great many years that unhappy country has witnessed uncounted acts of savagery, including a couple of generations ago, the burning alive by Buddhists of 100 members of Diem's distinguished family in a Catholic church.

Not that such reflections do anything to help solve the miserably complicated problem of today. It is possible, indeed, that the first decision Washington must reach is whether any clear solution at all can be achieved, no matter what we do. There is a certain parallel with Cuba in this. We do not know what to do about Viet Nam save to encourage fighting; we do not know what to do about Cuba save to discourage fighting. There is an irony about this, since Cuba, where we remain paralyzed, is within our own area of absolute power, while Viet Nam, where we fight, is on the other side of the world in an area where the biggest application of American power could not guarantee a victory.

The truth is that great numbers of the Vietnamese people are unutterably weary with the war, and we will understand this more easily if we will remember what most of us have forgotten, that war in one form or another has been convulsing that country for nearly 20 years. This is why, when DeGaulle speaks of neutralizing Viet Nam, he is taping a well of feeling that has been deepening for a long time.

The Communist leader, Ho Chi Minh, and Peking, toward which Ho's regime leans more and more in the worldwide Communist doctrinal quarrel, would welcome neutralization and reunification moves, confident they would discourage the South Viet Nam military efforts in the process, and, if successful, ultimately lead to the communization of the whole peninsula by an easier and perhaps just as rapid a route.

The immediate question is whether the Diem regime can be reformed and revitalized, but the big question is whether even this could now rejuvenate the peasants' will to resist the Viet Cong. Under the very best of auspices and intentions that would require many, many months.

It is hard enough to see that far ahead, to begin to take this one small step, but American

leaders are obligated to consider the whole, vast area of Southeast Asia with its 250,000 million people, its enormous riches, its strategic geography, lying across the routes that connect the Pacific world with India and South Asia. At present there is a kind of rough balance between Chinese and Western and anti-Communist influence in Southeast Asia. But nowhere, from the new, shaky experiment in multi-racialism called Malaysia all the way to India itself is there an area of stability with an air of permanence about it.

The balance is not likely to continue as it is. It is bound to tip, in a manner obvious to everyone, to one side or the other. What Communist China is after is not necessarily physical possession of the immense region, but the elimination, for all time, of Western influence in the region. That accomplished, China would stand the undisputed, dominant force in all of Asia, able to work her will in her own way, in her own good time.

Her will surely includes the reduction of India to a passive, helpless dependency, to a life lived at the suzerainty of China. (Distributed 1963, by The Hall Syndicate, Inc.)

