

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
 "Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
 Published Daily Except Saturday
 MEDFORD PRINTING CO. Phone 2-4141
 27-29 North Main Street
 ROBERT W. RUMEL, Editor
 ERNEST R. GILBERT, Manager
 HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
 E. C. FERGUSON, Managing Editor
 ERIC ALLEN, City Editor
 HARRY CHIPMAN, 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, 1879.
SUBSCRIPTION 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 Advance:
 Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, Phoenix, Shady Cove, Rogue River, Talent and on motor routes:
 Daily and Sunday—one year \$12.00
 Daily and Sunday—six months \$6.50
 Daily and Sunday—one month \$1.25
 All Terms Cash in Advance
 Official Paper of the City of Medford
 Official Paper of Jackson County
 United Press—Full Local Wire
 MEMBER OF THE BUREAU OF CIRCULATION
 Advertising Representatives:
 WEST-HOLLIDAY COMPANY, INC.
 Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B. C.

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION
 1953
NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

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

10 YEARS AGO
 Aug. 30, 1943
 Mexican brothers fined \$10 each for knife brawl in local beer parlor.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: A Gallup poll of local juveniles shows them about as enthusiastic over the opening of school as Italy favors peace, except on her own terms and when ready.

20 YEARS AGO
 Aug. 30, 1933
 John Cupp purchases MF&H furniture stock.

County to restrict relief to those unable to perform labor.

30 YEARS AGO
 Aug. 30, 1923
 Check shows daily average of 7,611 autos use Main st. crossing.

Lightning starts fires in Siskiyou range.

40 YEARS AGO
 Aug. 30, 1913
 L. G. Bishop forced to walk from Crater Lake to Fort Klamath when horse dies.

Don "Pinkie" Rader, Medford boy, farmed to Lincoln of Western baseball league by Chicago White Sox.

Potluck
 By M-T Staff and Contributors

Staff member back from coast vacation reports hotel, motel and restaurant men screaming because so many vacationers sleeping in cars or sleeping bags along roadsides and buying most of meals at grocery stores — crackers, cheese, etc. More cars on road than ever, they say, but many occupants on economy budget.

It Pays To Be Tall. according to a Reader's Digest writer who backs up his assertion with figures gleaned in his survey of 1037 professional men. The guy may have something there at that for the local six-footers we can think of just off-hand—Ed Kelly, John Ousterhout, Bob Root, Jim Ambler, Joe Hosick, John Day, Fred Morland, Ernest Leavitt, Bob Dickey, Ken Beebe, Mel Hogan and the Hoovers, Charlie and Claude—all seem to be doing all right.

Local housewives have had their canning troubles this season. One lady (name on file) labored mightily putting up cherries only to discover, after getting well along with the task, that her cherries were decidedly on the wormy side. Another lady (also name on file) narrowly escaped possible injury when one of the jars blew up spattering beans and glass all over her newly painted kitchen. Though the explosion was of such force that glass fragments were imbedded in the walls and ceiling, the housewife suffered only minor injury to one hand.

Airport scuffle has it that when an Air Force jet fighter dropped a defective wing-tank over the Agate desert last week, one resident of the area saw the jets, saw the object hurtling to the ground, and gave mad chase. "Thought it was a flying saucer the jets had shot down," he is alleged to have reported. "Wanted to be the first on the scene when it crashed."

Now They're After "Ike"

With the landslide victory of General Eisenhower and the wholesale defeat of the Democratic party there were many who believed the Red witch-hunting mania would soon be over.

And for three main reasons.

No. 1: The Republican party under Eisenhower would soon kick the Red rascals out—assuming there were any dangerous ones left.

No. 2: There were evidences the voters were getting a bit fed up on the technique of the "Big Lie" for political profit only.

No. 3: With all the adverse publicity, the conviction and imprisonment of so many of the ring-leaders of the American Communist party, it was felt that the real danger of any attempt to overthrow this government or cause serious injury to same, was so remote as to be safely disregarded.

In short the Red play, they thought, was played out!

BUT THOSE who reasoned in this fashion, did not reckon with either the gullibility of many voters, or the strange perverse vitality of the anti-Red crusade, as still a profitable political racket.

In fact now instead of one McCarthy-crusade functioning, we have two, and the latter recently came out with a most sensational report which one might say even out-McCarthy's McCarthy.

THE CHAIRMAN of this sub-committee is not Joe McCarthy, but he might as well be. He is one of McCarthy's bosom pals and demagogical alter-egos—none other than that close contender for the No. 1 "worst Senator," Senator Bill Jenner of Indiana. The other members of the committee are not exactly outstanding either, to-wit: — Messers Pat McCarran, James Eastland and Olin D. Johnson, Democrats; Senators Welker, Butler, Hendrickson and Watkins, Republicans.

And what do these gentlemen find?

A charge similar to that made against ex-President Truman, is now made against President Eisenhower, quote:

"The successful and important penetration of the US government by Soviet Communist sympathizers has still not been fully exposed, despite anything the President has done about it. . . the policies and programs laid down by members of this Soviet conspiracy are still in effect in our government and constitute a continuing hazard to our national security."

NOR IS THAT all. The committee also maintains there were three rings of Red conspirators and only one has been checked. If this is true then there are twice as many "Russian rats" working underground to overthrow the government today than were liquidated by the Truman administration — which would indicate there is twice as big a job to do.

IN THE judgment of this department anyone who would believe the above would believe the moon is made of green cheese.

But that is the formal charge made by this committee against the present administration, and their final demand is that this sub-committee continue to spend the taxpayer's money for their wild-eyed investigations, and the President (called the executive branch) should proceed to get busy and reevaluate and review all employees in the government "where subversion yet has not been fully exposed."

"HOW LONG, oh Lord, how long! is this sordid racket going to continue before the people of the country get wise to the hocus-pocus and put a stop to it? The truth is—

THERE IS NO real Red issue—no divided opinion in this country regarding the dangers of subversion where it exists and the necessity of checking it. But as President Eisenhower has pointed out many times, this is not the function of the legislative branch of the government, but of the executive. It is not the duty of the politicians, but of the FBI, AND the executive branch.

And President Eisenhower can be depended upon to clean out any dangerous characters in his government wherever they are, and whatever their nationality or their ideologies.

That is his job, with the detective and police assistance legally provided.

And he needs no help from self-seeking demagogues like the McCarthys and the Jenners to do it.—R.W.R.

Wanted—More Light

It is a pleasure to note that at least one editor in Oregon not only understands the administration's "new power policy" but apparently approves of it.

Editor Robert Sawyer of the Bend Bulletin, a bitter critic of public power policies, comes to this conclusion concerning this "new deal" in power, as follows, quote:

"The new administration's power policy recognizes the part the Federal authority must play where there is need. At the same time it recognizes the part that private enterprise should play—be given the opportunity to play—where it can."

NOW THAT is just dandy.

But would Editor Sawyer please elucidate?

Just when and where would there, in his good judgment, be "NEED" of Federal powers? And where and when should private enterprise be ALLOWED to take over?

And by the same token what supreme authority should be given the power to decide these very vital questions?

IT SEEMS to the Mail Tribune that until these questions have been answered the "new federal power policy" is no clearer than the old one.

Incidentally, the Bulletin speaks scathingly of the

attempted destruction of private power by public power, in the past.

And Secretary McKay in his speech before the Commonwealth club in San Francisco last week viewed with alarm a government "monopoly" of power—or a monopoly of any kind for that matter.

So say we all!

A man from Mars, however, might conclude from these remarks that private power companies in this country of ours, were being driven to the wall by a ruthless government and were, as of today, only a few steps this side of bankruptcy.

BUT WHAT are the facts?

Private power companies have increased in size, power and financial strength more in the last year or two than ever before in post-depression history. They control approximately all the power in operation except around 15 per cent. In other words they control 85 per cent of power which in Wall Street circles would be considered practically absolute.

So why all the alarm?

Well probably in this area the answer to this question as well as the others will be more apparent as time goes on and the real intentions of the powers-that-be in Washington become increasingly evident.

—R.W.R.

The Taft Argument Continues

We have had several communications from a member of the editorial staff of "Time" trying to sustain Publisher Luce's claim that the late Senator Taft was not a Conservative, but in the proper definition of the term, a Liberal.

The latest evidence provided is an editorial from "The Anniston Star" of Anniston, Alabama, the Luce contention being supported for the following three reasons:

I: A liberal stands for political liberty, that is "a government of the people, for the people and by the people."

II: A true liberal is reasonable and must respect the "candid opinion of another."

III: A true liberal emphasizes the application of the moral conscience to the affairs of this world.

Senator Taft stood firmly for these three articles of faith, ergo: He was a Liberal.

WELL, OK—we see no point in laboring the issue nor in denying that in general the late Ohio Senator did uphold the three principles above cited.

BUT as we see it, that did not entitle him to the title of Liberal as contrasted with Conservative, in the general accepted definitions of the terms.

In fact it seems perfectly evident that any objective analysis of the man, his character and his record, would place him in history as a through going Conservative—perhaps even a GREAT one—but not by any stretch of the imagination or Mr. Webster's dictionary, a true Liberal.

ON every issue—except when he campaigned to get the presidential nomination and was only after votes—Robert Alphonso Taft was strongly against the liberal, progressive viewpoint, and for what might be termed the solid, substantial conservative one.

This was especially true in foreign affairs, but also was true on questions of finance, the tariff, social security, unemployment and health insurance—practically all the new political items generally known as advanced or liberal.

In short we would say Senator Robert Alphonso Taft of Ohio was a "fine gentleman of the old school" politically able, trustworthy, scholarly, conscientious—but NOT a Liberal.—R.W.R.

In The Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS
 I SOMETIMES wonder if we aren't being a bit silly about the hydrogen bomb.

One commentator (AP's Hilliard Schendorf) says: "Announcement of a Russian H-bomb has renewed speculation like that which for a long time revolved around the A-bomb. Speculation is fostered largely by the fact that we don't know much about the H-bomb, just as we didn't know much about the A-bomb. The speculation has led inevitably to predictions of disaster ranging from the destruction of America to the devastation of the world."

DO YOU suppose the hydrogen bomb and the atom bomb are any more terrifying in these days than the bow and arrow was when it first entered warfare?

Remember that until the bow and arrow came you had to get close enough to your enemy to hit him with a sword or a club or to pierce him with a thrown spear. The bow and arrow changed all that. With it, your enemy could STRIKE YOU DEAD FROM A DISTANCE. Until you mastered the new weapon yourself, you had no way to get back at him. All you could do was RUN or stand and be struck down.

That was pretty terrifying in its day. It must have looked like the possessor of the bow and arrow could conquer the world before anyone could stop him.

EVEN TULLY, gun powder came on the scene. That was something. Not only did it enable your enemy to strike you from a distance greater than your arrow could reach. The bullet or the cannonball propelled by gunpowder MAILED AND TORE AND SMASHED human flesh and human bone. The wounds inflicted by swords and spears and arrows had been comparatively clean and comparatively mild. The wounds inflicted by bullets and

cannonballs were grisly and awful.

BUT gunpowder didn't end the world. It didn't end war.

It even did some good. It put an end to the FEUDAL CASTLE. Whereas in the past strong feudal castles could be taken (if taken at all) only by storm with heavy loss of human life, gunpowder made it possible to stand off at a distance and BATTER DOWN these hitherto impregnable strongholds that had enabled the vain and proud and heartless and intolerant nobility to dominate all human life below their level.

It was only with the utter destruction of the feudal castle that the era of the common man really began to dawn.

HERE is what the hydrogen bomb and the atom bomb will probably do to the modern world:

THEY WILL PUT AN END TO THE VAST CITIES AROUND WHICH OUR MODERN INDUSTRIAL LIFE HAS BECOME CENTERED.

It is said (perhaps with considerable exaggeration) that ONE hydrogen bomb can destroy EVERYTHING within a radius of 10 miles of its epicenter. A dozen or so atom bombs (presumably) could do the same thing.

THAT will compel DISPERSION.

I'm not too sure but dispersion is the answer to most of the SOCIAL problems that harass us. Most of our modern evils seem to start in the big cities. I'm reasonably certain that a nation made up of clean countryside and small towns and moderate-sized cities (say a maximum of 50,000 or possibly 100,000) would be cleaner and better and far more livable than a nation dominated by huge metropolitan centers. At any rate, it would be easier to find parking places in such a country.

The point is that no enemy could assemble enough hydrogen

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 initials in publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with an eye to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

MT Policy is Praised

To the Editor—Having read your editorial entitled, "How About the Kinsey Report," I take this opportunity to commend you for the stand that you take on this matter, in that giving publicity to it would do definite harm. I am confident that the church people are right behind you on this. Furthermore, I was happy for your statement of the policy of the Mail Tribune, "when convinced publication of any item would do more harm than good, to withhold it." The community is fortunate, it seems to me, to have a paper with such a policy.

J. R. Jennings, Pastor
 Medford Church of the Brethren.

Fluoridation Cost Cited

To the Editor: Cost of fluoridation to the city of Medford, population 17,305. Fluoridation equipment \$23,073. Annual maintenance \$6,500, which includes \$1,600 worth of fluorides, total cost \$29,573.

One per cent of city water is used for drinking and cooking, only children under 10 years of age could receive any possible benefit from fluoridated water.

Since it is estimated that less than 0.3 of 1 per cent of the water containing \$1,600 worth of fluorides, the children would obtain \$4.80 worth of the fluorides added to the water supply.

Thus it can be readily seen that aside from the initial cost of \$23,073 for equipment it would cost \$1,600 to deliver \$4.80 worth of fluorides. This will leave 99.7% of the fluoridated city water to be used by adults for drinking, bathing, washing, gardens, lawns, commercial, and other purposes.

The fluoridation of our city water would be an expensive public venture. Who would be responsible for any injurious effect resulting from the fluoridation of our water supply? A safer procedure would be for those in need of fluorides to take in the form of fluoride salts, tablets, or bottled fluoride water.

If in a community of 300 people, one should receive a broken leg, in order to give this one proper care would it be necessary for every one in the community to have one of their legs placed in a cast. Does this sound reasonable or ridiculous?

Taken from April 1953 issue of Journal of The American Naturopathic Physicians and Surgeons Association.

C. J. Haas,
 802 West 11th St.,
 Medford, Ore.

About The Kinsey Report

To the Editor: Please permit me to commend you most highly for your straightforward and intelligent editorial "How About the Kinsey Report?"

It is refreshing to find a responsible newspaper such as the Mail Tribune reiterating the seemingly forgotten code and responsibility of the press.

It is hard to be patient with a man who sums up his findings expressing the sentiments that man is a mere animal living under a system of outmoded "moral codes." The sooner these are abolished the better. When man's proper dignity is reduced solely to his "sex life" you can quite logically expect nothing more. The unusual interest and publicity of the Kinsey Report is, as you so aptly expressed, an unwholesome and unhealthy sign of our times.

It is encouraging to find a few people "defying popular opinion" to express sound principles.

Phyllis Corliss,
 938 South Holly St.,
 Medford, Ore.

More Call Fluorine a Poison

To the Editor: May I share some articles with you from the nation's leading dental journals? In April '53 "Dental Items of Interest" Robert Mich, D.D.S. writes:

"Assuming that iodine or penicillin is the drug to be used to combat infection, should I have to drink it every day because my neighbor expects to cut his finger some day? According to the U. S. Department of Agriculture . . . Fluorine is a cumulative poison and long continued consumption of relatively small quantities produces chronic fluorosis in all farm animals and poultry. The general symptoms are abnormal teeth and bones . . . damage to kidneys and injury to such other organs as liver and heart . . ."

Dental Items June '53: "Fluorine is one of the most powerful enzyme poisons known and the margin of safe dosage is extremely narrow."

In Modern Nutrition, Jan. '53, four of the minerals listed as essential parts of tooth structure bombs and atom bombs to destroy a nation built upon such a pattern.

LET'S quit worrying. Maybe, by dispersing our modern life, nuclear weapons will change our world for the better as gunpowder did when it put an end to the institution of the feudal castle.

Crosstown

By Roland Coe



Matter of Fact

Stewart Alsop

SUMMING UP: I

Washington — Somebody in Europe recently suggested an idea for a political cartoon. The cartoon was to show President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles



was to be nudging Eisenhower, and saying nervously, "Don't look now, but nobody's following us."

The idea may be a bit premature. But it is perfectly easy to foresee a situation, starting perhaps with a French failure to ratify the European Army pact, in which the United States will be going one way and all its allies going the other. There is no one in Europe who does not agree that the American-led Western coalition is in a frighteningly shaky condition. And there is no one, including the Administration's major representatives abroad, who does not agree that this is largely because American prestige, and thus the American capacity to lead, has fallen off disastrously in recent months.

This has, in fact, been the subject of a series of warning messages to Washington from the most successful Eisenhower appointees abroad, Ambassador to Great Britain Winthrop Aldrich and Ambassador to France Douglas Dillon. These Aldrich-Dillon cables have dealt particularly with the impact of McCarthyism on American prestige.

THESE cables have been taken so seriously in Washington that the effect of McCarthyism on American foreign policy is reliably reported to have become a subject for official review by the highest American policy-making body, the National Security Council. The subject is one which certainly deserves to be taken seriously in Washington.

Such episodes as the Cohn-Schine junket and the book-burning nonsense have made the United States look ridiculous,

are calcium, phosphorus, silicon and fluorine, not just fluorine. When Dr. Heard of Hereford, Texas, first drew attention to their fantastic low rate of dental decay he stated that fluorine alone was not the answer. In another Texas town men found that with the same concentration of fluorides the decay rate, though low, was twice the rate of Hereford. Field men gathered samples of meat, wheat and vegetables for analysis and reported that one fact stood out clearly: the foods were very astonishingly high in phosphorus, probably the most vital of all soil minerals.

From the study on "The Effect on Rats of Artificial Addition of Fluorine to Water," July '53 Dental Item: "It appears that the gross signs of degeneration as influenced by the addition of artificial fluorination of water became more apparent in the second generation . . . The permanent body injuries as were produced in our laboratory animals do not seem to warrant the use of fluorides in the drinking water of animals or humans."

The April '53 Dental Items quotes from Journal of the A.M.A. (Feb. '53): "The committee that held these hearings (on use of fluorine in public water supplies) was not, in its final report, willing to endorse the fluoridation of water."

(Miss) Gladys Bond
 923 East Main St.
 Medford, Ore.

No well-born Arab in Zanzibar feels dressed without a big J-shaped dagger thrust in his belt. Such daggers are also common accessories for the men of southern Arabia.

which is something no great power can afford to look. McCarthyism, and its twin, McLeodism, are reducing all but the bravest American foreign representatives to timid automata, which is also something no great power can afford. But there is no use laboring the obvious.

What is not so obvious is why the Europeans themselves should take so serious, and indeed such a wide exaggerated view of the McCarthy phenomenon. After all, every democracy has its demagogues, as the Europeans have good reason to know.

The fact is that McCarthyism is a convenient symbol of all Europe fears about America. Their fear of McCarthy has been, first, a fear of America dominated by the Congressional extremists, Asia-Firsters, and isolationists, with President Eisenhower rendered powerless. The better informed Europeans, at least, have been somewhat reassured by President Eisenhower's now evident determination to be master in his own house. But McCarthy remains a symbol of an American foreign policy so rigid and inflexible, so hag-ridden by dogma, as to render war inevitable.

"Suppose," one high British official remarked recently, "that the Russians came to your people with a blank sheet of paper signed by Malenkov or Molotov, and asked you to fill in your own terms for a settlement. You'd be so scared of dealing with the Russians that you'd indignantly refuse."

AFTER the American elections Europeans braced themselves for the great change in American foreign policy which had been promised in the campaign. They had nightmares about warlike American adventures in Eastern Europe and Asia. Now they fear American policy, not because it might change, but because it seems incapable of change.

American representatives abroad, for example, have been ordered not even to discuss an alternative to EDC, EDC, if it is ever ratified, obviously rules out an agreed European settlement. An agreed European settlement is no doubt impossible. But the great failure of American policy in the last few months has been the failure to demonstrate, once and for all, that this is so.

The amazing European response to Churchill's famous May 11 speech, calling for an attempt to reach a peaceful settlement with the Russians, is a phenomenon which should be carefully pondered in Washington. No European leader, from left to right, can dare to criticize this proposal, which Washington denounced as "irresponsible."

The fact is that ever since 1950 American policy in Europe has been squarely based on the assumption that the division of Europe into two parts, with the Red Army on the Elbe, is a permanent condition of life. For the Europeans, this is a well nigh intolerable condition. To the Germans, it means that Germany is forever divided. To the French and British, it means that the physical survival of their countries in case of war is rendered doubtful.

YET the present Administration has clung more rigidly to this assumption than its predecessor. This is clearly suggested by Washington's angry reaction to Churchill's speech, and Washington's obvious, anguished reluctance to discuss seriously proposals for German unification. The hubbub about McCarthy is only a symptom of the wide gulf which is opening up between America and Europe. If we continue to appear the eternal nay-sayers, the apostles of rigidity, the gulf is likely to become so wide that the whole structure of our foreign policy will come crashing about our ears.

(Copyright, 1953,

New York Herald Tribune, Inc.)