

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Everyone in Southern Oregon
Reads The Mail TribunePublished Daily Except Saturday by
MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
27-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-6141ROBERT W. RUHL, Editor
ERNEST R. GILSTRAP, ManagerHERB GREY, Advertising Manager
E. C. FERGUSON, Managing Editor
ERIC ALLEN JR., City Editor
HARRY CHAPMAN, Telegraph Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor
GERALD LATHAM, Circulation Mgr.

An Independent Newspaper

Entered as second class matter at
Medford, Oregon, under Act of
March 3, 1879SUBSCRIPTION RATES
By Mail—In Advance:
Daily and Sunday—one year \$12.00
Daily and Sunday—six months \$6.50
Daily and Sunday—three months \$3.50
Daily and Sunday—one month \$1.25
By Carrier—in A & V zone—Medford,
Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point,
Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix,
Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent
and on motor routes:
Daily and Sunday—one year \$15.00
Daily and Sunday—six months \$8.00
Daily and Sunday—one month \$2.50
All Terms Cash in AdvanceOfficial Paper of the City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County

United Press—Full Licensed Wire

MEMBER OF AUDIT BUREAU
OF CIRCULATIONAdvertising Representative:
WEST-HOLLIDAY COMPANY, INC.
Offices in New York, Chicago, De-
troit, San Francisco, Los Angeles,
Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta,
Vancouver, B.C.NATIONAL EDITORIAL
ASSOCIATIONNEWSPAPER
PUBLISHERS
ASSOCIATION

Flight o' Time

Medford and Jackson County History
from the files of the Mail
Tribune 10, 20, 30 and 40 years
ago.10 YEARS AGO
April 17, 1942

(It was Friday)

Grants Pass merchants peti-
tion city council to grant license
to group seeking bus service
between that city and Camp
White.From Arthur Perry's Ye
Smudge Pot column: The wind
blew all the leading directions
including up during the past
week.20 YEARS AGO
April 17, 1922

(It was Sunday)

Jackson county officials plan
extensive hunt for bodies of
couple lost in Dead Indian area
during severe January blizzard.Forty salmon taken by fisher-
men below Savage Rapids dam
in best single day's fishing in
area in several years.30 YEARS AGO
April 17, 1912

(It was Monday)

Jackson county court an-
nounces \$50,000 of county mar-
ket road fund will be used to
improve highway to Butte Falls.Medford motorist pays \$2 to
local Adventist church after his
car runs wild and knocks down
tree in church yard.40 YEARS AGO
April 17, 1912

(It was Wednesday)

Rogue valley orchardists ex-
pect high prices for fruit after
severe cold spell "wipes out"
crops on east coast.Medford women plan elab-
orate welcome for Mrs. Robert M.
LaFollette during his visit here
on a campaign tour of
western states with her husband.

Fools Creek

Fools Creek—Charles McLal-
len, accompanied by his son
Charles of Medford, left April 9
for Pueblo, Colo., to visit his
mother who is ill in a hospital
there. Mrs. Charles McLallen Jr.
and daughter Sharon are staying
with Mrs. McLallen while they
are away.A shower was given recently
at the community hall for Mrs.
Jim Cowie. Fifteen ladies were
present, and six who were un-
able to attend sent presents.Mr. and Mrs. Bud Brown of
Langley valley visited here last
week with Mr. and Mrs. Ace
Adams and daughter, Sylvia.
The Adams are driving a new
Chevrolet pickup.Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Dorman
of Klamath Falls spent April 13
here with Mrs. C. O. McLallen:
The party which was to have
been held at the Community hall
on Friday evening, April 18,
has been postponed.Mr. and Mrs. Ed Eaton had as
guests last week her mother and
two sisters, Mrs. Jennie Miller,
Mrs. W. Bigger and three chil-
dren of Seattle, and Mrs. Jack
King of Hood River, Ore. Mrs.
Bigger and children are leaving
soon for Alaska to join her hus-
band who is in the service.

The Grange

Sams Valley Grange will meet
April 19 when the travel lecture
from Gold Hill will visit. All
Grange ladies are asked to bring
a pie. All Grangers are invited
to attend the meeting.

'Read Before You Shoot', No. 2

To the Editor: For fourteen years I have been a constant reader of the Mail Tribune and your editorial column. Politically you are so fair that it is hard to figure your party affiliations. But now I have a beef.

In your Sunday editorial you advocate outlawing strikes. It would take Organized Labor's only weapon. Have you one to replace it? Or would you be in favor of outlawing Organized Labor?

Give us a break we only raise our wages to keep up with the cost of living. Do you know something? The Local Union to which I belong has never had to even discuss a strike.

Know why? Our employers have always agreed with us on wages, being honest and fair employers. Also we have never tried to force an unfair raise in wage-scale upon them. Now in regard to the steel strike, has not the company refused to accept the decision of the W.L.B. so something MUST be done? Perhaps H.S.T.'s action was unconstitutional so the whole limitation set-up may be.

If the wage limitation is to be set, however, it must apply to all peoples not just the ones that work with their hands but all who draw wages for services rendered. Such as doctors, lawyers, etc., etc.

This is my first letter to an editor and will probably be my last—print it or not, just as you like.

Joe Wales, Jacksonville, Ore.

This is an interesting—and a new—slant on the "outlaw-strike" editorial of last Sunday.

The first criticism received was based on the charge the editorial upheld the communist theory of tyranny and absolutism.

The next maintained that the same editorial, by implication, declared that in taking over the steel industry the President "took the ONLY means to which he could resort to prevent a walk-out," when he could have invoked the Taft-Hartley law. But because this law might have helped Senator Taft, a Republican, he refused to do so, which in the view of the writer quote:

"emphasized the charge widely made against him (Truman) that his act was the evidence of a corrupt political deal."

Which adds up to something like this:

The editorial was pro-Communist and un-American. The editorial was misleading and upheld corruption in high places.

The editorial was anti-labor, and implied a desire to outlaw labor.

THE situation will be appreciated by all newspaper men—especially editorial writers—as an illustration of how a single editorial—or single news-item—can mean so many different things to so many readers.

WE SHALL skip the No. 1 indictment as not worthy of a second treatment.

There is more substance to No. 2 in that President Truman MAY—we don't know—he may have refused to invoke the Taft-Hartley act chiefly because of a strong partisan prejudice against it—although we believe the record will show he invoked it in the past.

But how such action could in any way support the charge of a "corrupt political deal," is more than this department can comprehend.

ACCORDING to press reports, President Truman did not wish to have matters drag on for 80 more days, as invoking the Taft-Hartley law would have necessitated. He felt that things should be brought to a head, the strike threat removed at one clear-cut stroke, and not only his legal advisers but his military advisers and the Department of Defense supported him in this decision to take the industry over—and at once.

Now that report may or may not be correct.

But one thing SURE—it DOES make sense. Far more sense than charges of corruption and misfeasance in office—which in the judgment of this department adds up to 100 per cent partisan "foolishness."

AS TO indictment No. 3, there is even more substance to this namely: that to outlaw strikes would deprive organized labor of its only effective weapon. That is true but only under normal conditions.

We fear Mr. Wales overlooked the fact that this paper's suggestion would apply ONLY when the country is at war—and then ONLY when basic industries are involved. In other words, for only a brief period, in a few of the largest concerns, and—let us hope and pray—NOT often, because let us hope, WARS won't be waged—OFTEN.

When there is a war, however, large or small, what organized labor should have is not a "weapon" to fight its management, but a weapon in the direction of increased production to fight the enemy. If the people through their government have the right to make young men fight and die for their country, they should have the right, through the courts, to make labor OR capital accept what wage scales an impartial judicial body might determine at the time to be just and fair. There should no more be an inalienable right at such a time to strike and thus reduce or halt military production, than there should be an inalienable right in war to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

IN FACT there is nothing in this editorial proposal really very NEW, except the establishment of a permanent labor-court, where differences between labor and management would be settled, and the decisions—during war time—would be FINAL, and not subject to appeal by strikes or lock-outs—in short by adjudication and not by FORCE.

As has been previously pointed out, strikes were, in effect, "outlawed" during World War II by the Smith-Connally act, and its constitutional powers after the war were upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Only instead of a Supreme Court of Labor, suggested in this column as final authority, the power of seizure in case of a threatened strike was placed in the hands of the President.

So the only essential difference this paper really suggested, was:

Placing the FINAL authority in a permanent and highly qualified JUDICIAL body, instead of in the WHITE HOUSE.—R.W.R.

Crosstown

By Roland Coe



"The baker came while you were out, Mom. I stocked up on a few things we were out of."

Matter of Fact

By Joseph and Stewart Alsop

THE GREAT DIPLOMATIC CRISIS

Washington—Without attracting much serious attention, the foreign policies of this country, of Britain and France, have now entered a truly agonizing crisis. The cause is the so-called peace offensive now being carried on by the masters of the Kremlin. The gravity of the situation may be measured by the remark of one of the wisest American top officials that the "crises now confronting us are probably just as serious as the crises presented by the Berlin blockade and the Korean aggression."

The most urgent choice, of course, is that concerning Germany. In two critical notes which this election-absorbed country has hardly noticed, the Kremlin has offered the unification of East and West Germany, on the ostensible basis of free elections, with the sole proviso that the new, unified Germany shall not enter any such combination as the Atlantic Pact.

Acceptance of the Kremlin offer means sacrificing the West German divisions which are intended to be the custodians of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower's NATO edifice. But if America, Britain and France reject the Soviet proposal, the West Germans, enraged at being disappointed in their hope of national unity, are unhappily very likely to refuse the NATO divisions anyway.

Moreover, this is only one part of a much larger pattern. The recent Moscow trade meeting dangled tempting offers of much-needed business before the assembled British and European industrialists. But if these offers are accepted, the existing ban will be broken on strategic shipments to the Soviet empire.

ALMOST simultaneously Stalin's reply to the recent questioning by a group of American editors has indicated approval of a meeting of the Soviet, American, British and French heads of government, to try to bring the cold war to an end. Stalin himself has made the same point, in even stronger language, in his farewell interview with the retiring Indian Ambassador to Moscow. And the Communist negotiators in Korea have hinted a new willingness to compromise, thus vastly raising State Department and Pentagon hopes for the long-awaited Korean settlement.

In the face of these developments, a strong body of opinion in the American government still opposes negotiating with the Soviet at this time. And the thought is that the Kremlin, in the last analysis, understands no language except the language of superior power. It is argued that the current peace offensive (awful phrase) is solely intended to embarrass and impede the Western rearmament effort. And the conclusion is drawn that the only thing to do, for the time being, is to ignore the peace offensive and go forward with rearmament.

In the first place, however, this is probably not a practical course to adopt. There is no use saying, "We'd rather have German divisions than gamble on German free elections and German unity," if the Soviet offer of free elections and unity is likely to mean we cannot get the German divisions.

In the second place a minority of the American policy makers, which nonetheless includes several of the most judicious men in the government, holds that this Soviet peace offensive may mean a great deal more than its predecessors. The test, obviously, is Korea. If the Communists come through with the concessions needed to end the Korean fighting (which many people now predict may happen before May 1) this group of policy makers asserts that the Soviet peace offensive must be taken really seriously.

THEY argue that the Kremlin may already be genuinely alarmed by the new unity and strength of the West, and may even be prepared to talk seriously about a serious world settlement. They do not suggest slowing down the NATO effort or abandoning German rearmament at this time. Under any circumstances the rebuilding of the strength of the West must continue; and the bold decision to include Germany in NATO was precisely the final push needed to bring the Soviets to a new frame of mind. To change course now, they therefore say, would be to throw away our whole bargaining power.

At the same time, these men advocate taking the German gamble if the Kremlin proves to be truly sincere about free elections; and they further urge high-level Four Power talks about other East-West differences. To refuse to take these steps, they point out, will place us in the position of opposing peace, with appalling effects on world public opinion. The refusal, they point out further, will also invite a Soviet conclusion that the West is genuinely preparing an aggressive war, and will thus spur the Soviets to attack first. On the other hand, these men add, negotiating with the Soviets will risk nothing, if we avoid making improper compromises. That, of course, is not a great danger any longer.

There are two other dangers, however. The first is that the French, who have been perfectly horrified by the Soviet proposal for Germany, will prevent the right kind of reasonable, all-out exploration of the Kremlin's sincerity. And the second is that the ruck of policy makers, British and French as well as American, are already like trolley cars running down their rails, being too set on the pre-planned course to consider any departure from it. For the present, pending a clearer position in Korea, it is utterly uncertain what choices will finally be made. But it must be added that the auguries are not too good for the bold and creative choices which the changing world situation is probably going to demand.

(Copyright, 1952,
New York Herald Tribune Inc.)

Dog Law Controversy Continues in Ashland

Ashland—Controversy over Ashland's dog control ordinance continued here this week. Several letters from residents, protesting the strict enforcement of the ban on dogs running loose, were read at a city council meeting Tuesday by Councilman Walter Weller.

Weller proposed a new ordinance which would "temper justice with mercy," according to the Ashland Tidings. His proposal failed for lack of a second to his motion.

A letter to the editor, published in Wednesday's issue of the Tidings and signed "A Citizen," suggested that enforcement of the ordinance be extended to the full year, and not just the gardening months of April, May, June and July.

"Yours for a more beautiful, pleasant and 'dog-less' Ashland," the letter concluded.

Ashland Izak Waltons Will Clean Park Stream

Ashland—The recently organized Ashland chapter of the Izak Walton league will clean the debris from Ashland creek in Lithia park as its first project. It was announced this week. Members will meet in the park at 5 p.m. today to clear winter debris from fishing areas in the creek where youngsters alone are permitted to angle.

The most important commercial trees in New Mexico are the ponderosa pine and the Douglas fir.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Something to think about: "Revolt-blooded Bolivia, burying more than 300 dead and tending some 1500 wounded, appeared today to be under firm control of its new revolutionary government."

HOW did it happen? (We'll all recall, I think, that we've read of no campaigns and no elections down there.)

Somebody just seized power. Not by law. Not by constitutional permission.

By FORCE.

It was as simple as that.

THE fact that this happened in Bolivia lends peculiar interest to it.

Bolivia was named for Simon Bolivar (pronounced See-MONE Bo-LEE-yar). Bolivar was the South American George Washington. He delivered South America from the Spaniards as Washington delivered what is now the United States from the British. Like Washington, he came of a wealthy and prominent family. Like Washington, he was an ardent patriot. Like Washington, he was both soldier and statesman.

Like Washington's in our country, Bolivar's name is honored and his memory is loved throughout South America. You see statues and pictures of him everywhere. Our Revolution began in 1776. Bolivar's began in 1810.

Washington, you see, was the inspiration for Bolivar.

THE revolution headed by Washington WORKED. Upon the foundation provided by him and the other Founding Fathers, we have built the greatest democracy since the world began. Our people are not only the freest since the beginning of time but the BEST PROVIDED FOR. We are the envy of all the earth.

Bolivar's revolution failed. At best, throughout South America, it is only a hollow shell. At its worst (in Argentina) it is a modern demagogic despotism. The liberty Bolivar and his followers bought with blood has become only a hallowed memory.

WHY the difference?

This, I think, is it:

In the United States of America (which began with the 13 original colonies) the tradition of a UNITED PEOPLE endured for well over a century. It is true that among us, in that golden century or more, there were employers and there were workers. There were big capitalists and there were little capitalists. There were townpeople and there were farmers. There were property owners and there were non-property owners.

But IN THE MAIN we were all AMERICANS. It is true that in the in-between years we had our economic and to some extent our social differences. But we had the good, sound, basic common sense not to carry these differences into the ELECTION YEARS. When elections came around, we voted not as employer-Americans or labor-Americans or farmer-Americans or property-owning-Americans or non-property-owning-Americans but as STRAIGHT AMERICANS.

IN SOUTH AMERICA, it was different. The South Americans split early into classes—into PRESSURE GROUPS. They VOTED as such. Their pressure groups learned quickly the trick of using FORCE when they couldn't prevail by democratic methods.

SO Democracy FAILED in South America—in spite of Bolivar.

HERE in the United States of America, a startling change is creeping up on us. We, too, are splitting into pressure groups. We are beginning to VOTE AS SUCH.

In Washington the other day, our President seized private property without specific warrant of law and against the express provision of our constitution that private property SHALL NOT be seized without due process of law.

In South America, that has been going on for a long, LONG time.

Here we are just beginning to learn the trick of it.

THE pity of it is that too few of us condemn it as a dangerous principle. Too many of us DEFEND IT AS POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY.

UNLESS we change our ways, unless we can learn again the precious habit of voting as Americans and not members of cliques or classes or selfish pressure groups, I fear we shall in time go down the road that South America has traveled.

That is the lesson of Bolivia.

WATER EXPENSIVE

Knoxville, Tenn. — (U.P.) — A drink of water cost Miss Blanche Naughton, a bus ticket agent, \$49 plus her pocketbook. She stepped from the ticket office just long enough to get a drink. The purse was taken while she was gone.

WINDOW SHADES

MADE TO ORDER

BARNARD'S

317 E. Main Phone 2-3487

Franco Again Seeking To Become Power on World Political Scene

By PHIL NEWSOM

United Press Foreign Analyst

Spain is seeking again to become a power in world politics.

After more than a decade of

isolation, two

recent moves

by Generalissimo Francisco

Franco are of

special interest.

Both lead to the conclusion

that Franco hopes if not

to become the champion of

the Arab nations, at least

to become the arbiter between

the Arabs and the Western pow-

ers.

The first came early this

month when Spain demanded

the return of police control of

the Tangier international zone.

The second was the dispatch

of Franco's foreign minister, Al-

berto Martin Artajo, on a tour

of Middle East capitals.

Complement of Advisers

Proof that Artajo's trip was

no mere series of courtesy calls

was seen in the fact that his

party included a full comple-

ment of political and economic

advisers, thus assuring discus-

sion of a full range of subjects.

Two events undoubtedly have

given Franco encouragement.

One is that his government

finally has been recognized by

the United States and that he

soon is to be brought into the

Western defense setup. Thus it

may be argued that by exploit-

ing Spain's blood and cultural

ties with the Arab nations, he

increases both his value to the

West and his bargaining powers.

French Unfriendly

The other has been the spread-

ing wave of Nationalism from

North Africa to the Arabian pen-

insula, particularly as exempli-

fied by the outbreaks against

the French in Tunisia.

The French, particularly, do

not regard the Spanish moves

with a friendly eye.

The French and Spanish be-

tween them control the nom-

inally independent monarchy of

Morocco.

Any move by the Spanish to

grant increased autonomy in

their area is bound to have re-

percussions on the French.