

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"Everybody in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
27-29 North First St. Phone 2-5141

ROBERT W. RUTH, Editor
HERB GREY, Advertising Manager
E. C. FERGUSON, Managing Editor
ERIC ALLEN JR., City Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Telephone Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor
JACK JACKSON, Sunday 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: Per copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$12.00. Daily and Sunday—Six months \$6.50. Daily and Sunday—Three months \$3.50. Sunday Only—One year \$5.50.

By Carrier—In Advance: 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 \$8.25. Carrier and Dealers—5c per copy. All Terms Cash in Advance.

Official Paper of the City of Medford. Official Paper of Jackson County. United Press—Full Leased Wire. MEMBER OF AUDIT 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

1955 NEWSPAPER 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

August 4, 1945
(It was Saturday)
Paul Haglin, deputy U.S. marshal, opens and closes federal court on the same day.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: An auto showed up in traffic yesterday, with the driver tooting a horn, worth more than the auto.

20 YEARS AGO

August 4, 1925
(It was Sunday)
Farnum Motor Freight given right to operate between Ashland, Medford and Grants Pass.

Scouts to assemble tomorrow morning for pre-jamboree training camp at Jackson Hot Springs.

30 YEARS AGO

August 4, 1925
(It was Tuesday)
Local people win \$4,500 suit against Talent Irrigation district.

From the Local and Personal column: Two hundred and sixteen out-of-state cars were registered in this city on Sunday and up to 6 p.m. Monday at the local state traffic registration bureau in the Chamber of Commerce building.

40 YEARS AGO

August 4, 1915
(It was Wednesday)
Hit and run accident reported—two ladies driving a buggy struck by a Stanley Steamer auto.

City council bans fishing in Fish Lake as it is Medford's water supply.

What's the Answer?

Can You Get 4 of the 7?

Copr. 1955, Editorial Research Report

1. Most of the 21 (now 18) U.S. Korean war prisoners who struck with the Reds came from broken-up homes; right or wrong?

2. Are there any states in which the sale of alcoholic beverages is legal everywhere?

3. Total farm production is expected to be higher or lower this year than last year, or about the same?

4. The new French government of Italy is its 7th, 12th or 17th since Mussolini was overthrown?

5. A man named Pat McNamara represents a New England state in the U.S. Senate; right or wrong?

6. About 10, 25, 40, 55 or 70 no-hit games have been pitched in the major baseball leagues in the last 35 years?

7. An anemeter measures wind velocity, altitude of an airplane, blood pressure, humidity in air, or an electric current?

The answers: 1. Right. 2. Yes. 12 of the 48. 3. Higher. 4. 17th. 5. Wrong: Sen. McNamara is from Michigan. About 40. 7. Electric current.

up to eight weeks.

More than 8,000 Maine fishermen annually catch a quarter billion pounds of seafood. The State's lobstermen alone may take a yearly \$8,000,000 worth of Homarus americanus, clawed lobster out of the North Atlantic.

The automobile industry uses about 65 per cent of all rubber products turned out in the United States.

The Talbott Case etc., etc...

The ardor and unanimity of agreement among Republican leaders that the Talbott case can't hurt their party politically, strikes this department as rather amusing.

It reminds one of the brave little boy taking a short cut home to get there in time for dinner, whistling a lively tune as he scurries through the grave-yard.

FOR few of the Republican leaders CAN doubt for a moment that this case of "misfeasance" in the President's cabinet, WILL hurt their party in next year's election. It can hardly do otherwise.

Whether that hurt will be serious politically or not remains to be seen. Whether this case will become, along with similar examples of placing General Motors above the General Welfare, a major factor in the campaign, also can't be forecast with any certainty, so much depends upon what happens in the next year and how quickly and competently the Democratic party takes advantage of the situation.

BUT that here is an issue and an important one, which MIGHT put the Republican party out of power, we would regard as certain as anything in politics can be.

The alibis offered for the Talbott case, only strengthens this judgment.

Senator Barry M. Goldwater of Arizona expressed the GOP official point of view correctly, no doubt, when as chairman of the Republican campaign committee he said, quote:

"The Talbott resignation can hardly be made into a political issue because of the absence of criminal intent."

Columnist Frank Kent, stalwart GOP partisan, added in his column in the Oregonian, quote:

"The Dixon-Yates business has been so blown-up as to become a bore, and the Talbott affair while certainly unpleasant not to say malodorous . . . will in a years time, be forgotten."

THERE is no doubt that Columnist Kent HOPES it will be forgotten and also hopes that the Dixon-Yates contract has, to a majority of the voters at least, become a "bore"—but how can he be so sure?

In the past the American voters regardless of party, have refused to forget similar scandals in a year's time,—or for many years in fact,—that might prove to be the case in 1956.

HOWEVER in this case as in so many others, only time can tell.

But this much we believe is fairly certain. When the people of this country take enough interest in the Dixon-Yates deal, and the Talbott resignation to get ALL the facts concerning them, there will be a strong turn in the tide of popular feeling against the party responsible.

Not that in either case there was anything "CRIMINAL." But a party does not have to be "criminal" to lose favor with the people of this country.

"Misfeasance" in office in fact, is defined as "wrongful performance of a LAWFUL act."

And by his own admission Secretary Talbott was guilty of just that. We can't believe the American people approve of misfeasance in public office, or wish to see such a policy continued. But because no crime was committed Chairman Goldwater says no votes will be lost.

This cynical attitude may represent a majority of the Republican party. In other words—"keep within the law" and if you can as a member of the government, pull down \$100,000 a year for yourself because of that membership, whether it comes from General Motors, U.S. Steel, or the "Mulligan Engineers"—that's OK. Business is business, there is nothing criminal in making a cute profit while serving your country if your company doesn't get it some other company will, so why beat the drums about a little thing like that? That is the GOP doctrine . . . if the Arizona senator is right.

IT IS to President Eisenhower's credit that he repudiates this doctrine and instead of deploring the resignation of his Secretary of Air, approved it, although we believe his best and closest friends wish he had demanded it.

Well, why didn't he go all out and demand it?

The President alone knows, but our guess is because he wants peace and unity within his party, almost as earnestly as he wants peace and unity in the world.

And if he should have demanded this resignation, and the resignation of all party leaders in his cabinet and out, who believe not only business is business, but business comes FIRST, he would have found his job a very lonely and trying one. As the President recently remarked, he has had "enough of war," he wants to live out the rest of his years in harmony and peace.

HOWEVER that may be, we feel sure that if the general apathy now prevailing in this country should be dispelled—in another 12 months it may be—and the people as a whole become aroused to what is, and has been, going on in Washington, of late, these two examples of misfeasance in office represented by the Talbott and the Dixon-Yates cases, might well become vital factors in next year's campaign. This would be not so much in themselves as in demonstrating the fundamental difference in policy between our two major parties, their sharply conflicting conceptions of what a government of the people by the people and for the people should be.—R.W.R.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE OFFICIAL AND THE PARTNER

The mystery of the Talbott case is how he managed to act so foolishly, and the best explanation would seem to be that he has been two men, public official and private promoter, inhabiting the same body.



Walter Lippmann has lived and worked side by side in the Pentagon, each more or less uncontrolled by the other. The Secretary did not serve the partner corruptly. But neither did he rule the partner properly.

There is no evidence, I believe, that Mr. Talbott used his power as Secretary of the Air Force to induce or compel defense contractors to give profitable business to the Mulligan firm. There is no evidence, that is to say, that he meant to act corruptly. On the contrary, the evidence, including his own admission of his mistakes, shows that the Secretary was not really aware of what the Mulligan partner was doing. Had he realized it, had he been acting consciously and corruptly, he would have taken the trouble, as a competent villain would, to cover his tracks. The last thing he would have done was what Talbott actually did do, which was to promote his private business from his office in the Pentagon and with the help of Air Force personnel and on Air Force stationery.

THERE is no obvious explanation of such extraordinary foolishness. There is no doubt that he has been proud and happy to be Secretary of the Air Force, and that he was deeply attached to his high and honorable office. There is no doubt that he is a rich man to whom \$60,000 is not important money, and that it could buy him nothing remotely so precious as his public office. There is no doubt, on the other hand, that his Mulligan activities, once they were known, were obviously bound to ruin his public career. There is no doubt, moreover, that his activities will hurt badly the Mulligan firm itself.

The whole performance makes no sense except on the theory that Talbott was two men, and that when the Mulligan partner was in charge of his body, the Secretary of the Air Force was sleeping and unconscious. For no Secretary of the Air Force who was functioning at all could have supposed that it was right to promote from his office in the Pentagon a profitable private business on the fringes of the national defense. In this case the Secretary did not veto the partner's activities. Neither did he hide his activities. So I say that the public official must have been suppressed and asleep.

THE question, then, is why the Secretary of the Air Force did not govern the promoter, why he did not enforce the standards of public behavior upon the private business man. There is here a great and persistent ethical question which has been discussed since the days of the Greek moralists. Can a man who knows what is right do wrong—can he knowingly give in to his appetite, say for the Mulligan profits? Socrates held that no one acts against what he knows to be right—that men act wrongly from ignorance.

But Aristotle disagreed with Socrates, pointing out that a man may do what is wrong if his convictions about what is right are confused and weak, not clear and strong. In this deplorable case we must, I believe, side with Aristotle and say that as compared with the avarice of the Mulligan partner the moral convictions of the Secretary were confused and weak.

IT HAS been pointed out that the Talbott case poses the problem of the workability and the fairness of the old statute about "conflict of interests." There is, of course, such a problem, and it is a very difficult one. But the Talbott case bears only indirectly, in my view, on that problem. For no matter how much the statutes were liberalized, it could never be stretched to the point of tolerating the use of a public office to promote a private business that is closely related to the public business. The law might be revised, for example, to permit a man to keep his old securities, and to receive the dividends. But nobody would suggest that it could be made lawful for him to use the facilities of public office to enhance the value of his securities.

The essence of the problem of "conflict of interests" is that only the most elementary rules can be fixed in the law, that all the rest lies in what Lord Moulton once called "the domain of manners," which includes "all

the things that a man should impose upon himself from duty to good taste." It is possible to say in the law that an official must not make a private profit out of his public actions. But it is not possible to set down in the law just how he must decide the more complicated issues where his private interest, though it is involved, cannot be measured in dollars and cents. His moral duty is to decide every question on public grounds alone, regardless of whether this hurts or helps him, his family, his partners, his friends, or his political party. But here, not the law but only an instructed conscience can help him make the decision.

In the case of a high and conspicuous public official, who must not only do his job but cannot help setting an example, the sovereign rule is never to give his private interests the benefit of any doubt. Talbott seems not to have understood that rule.

THOUGH I think it has no bearing upon the Talbott case, which is quite simple and obvious, the wider problems of the conflict of interests need to be re-examined and reconsidered. They are a complicated cluster of problems. One of them, though only one, arises from the fact that for many business executives the holding of a public office is not a new career but an interlude in their normal careers. The question is whether a temporary public servant can be expected, or should be required, to reorganize his private affairs as if he were a Federal judge or a foreign security officer or a civil servant in a life time career. Many men refuse the temporary public assignment because they are unwilling to make the big personal sacrifice which the existing rules now demand. And, on the other hand, insofar as the temporary officials are intending to return to their old business, can it truly be said that there is not, in the intent of the statute, a conflict of interests.

We must, I think ask ourselves whether, except in the emergency of war, it is good public policy to rely so much on temporary officials. For myself I do not think it is. For no matter how able the business executive, it will take him a long time to learn the public business. The Pentagon has seen a continuing stream of civilian officials, coming in with no knowledge of the Pentagon and going out just about when they have acquired some knowledge. Does not the public business of national defense require civilian as well as military officers who make the national defense the work of their lives?

Sometimes I wonder whether the President is not mistaken in thinking that a trained private executive and a trained public official are interchangeable. For instead of building up a corps of high career officials, he seems to be trying to get along with men borrowed temporarily from the official hierarchy of the private corporations.

Copyright, 1955, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

Communications

Letters to the Editor must bear name and address of the writer although under certain circumstances the use of a pen name or initials for 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.

Thinks It Cruel and Inhuman

To the Editor: I have sent a letter to the Judge Advocate General, United States Army, Pentagon Bldg., Washington, D.C., which reads as follows:

"I read with interest an article a few days ago in my local newspaper of Pvt. Arthur Athans, who deserted from the Army Dec. 7, 1944 and has been sentenced to 25 years imprisonment."

"It strikes me as strange that a man in his circumstances should be made an example of. He has, according to the paper, become a successful business man and lived under honorable conditions. I think justice could be served much more readily by taking the judges who sentenced Pvt. Athans on a one way ride or sentence them to a similar term for cruel and inhuman punishment."

"I am a man who will always take the side of the under dog. If the whole army were made up of the sort of characters who sentenced Pvt. Athans, who probably was a better character than the courts martial judges. I sincerely hope that when the case comes before you for your consideration you will make an honest attempt to rectify this obvious error. "Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter." F.R.M. (Name on file).

A year-round crew of weathermen live on the highest point of the northeastern United States, New Hampshire's 6,288-foot Mount Washington.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Secretary Dulles tells reporters in Washington the United States hopes eventually to obtain from the Chinese Communists a declaration renouncing the use of force.

He says that would clear the way for extensive negotiations between the Chinese and other countries on major problems.

WHAT he means, I think, is that he hopes to convince the Chinese communists that talking is cheaper than shooting—and if he's to do that he'll have to convince them that if they start shooting we'll shoot back HARDER AND STRAIGHTER.

AT ANY rate, he said flatly that the status of Formosa and other islands held by the Chinese Nationalists is NOT subject to negotiation, and he added crisply that the United States will NOT abandon the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in return for Chinese Communist declaration denouncing force.

That is to say: We aren't going to throw any of our friends to the Communist wolves.

DULLES is a New Englander.

New Englanders have hereditary talent for horse-trading.

And—Every successful horse trader knows that if you show signs of WEAKENING you'll get badly skinned in the deal.

TODAY'S all-over Oregon note. Let's start it with Cabbage Hill, where the ox wagons of the Oregon Trail emigrants came out of the Blue Mountains and gazed down on what are now the rolling wheat (and pea) lands of the Pendleton-Walla Walla country.

It is an amazing view now, and then it must have been an inspiring view—for on the far western horizon they could discern dimly the peaks of the Last Mountain Range beyond which lay the Promised Land.

I SUPPOSE that when they prodded their oxen into motion again after the pause for the view they didn't realize that the road their wagon wheels were tracing would, long decades later, provide an interesting chapter in the history of Western highways—and the cost thereof.

THE ROAD their wheels were tracing cost them nothing but toil and sweat. The same might be said without too much exaggeration of the road that existed up and down Cabbage Hill for the next three-quarters of a century.

Then—In 1917—Came Oregon's awakening to the new era of good roads. Six years later, a MODERN HIGHWAY was completed up Cabbage Hill. It was located, by the way, by a young engineer named Sam Baldock. Its surface was gravel, and it cost \$6,000 a mile—which was then a staggering price.

A NEW road is now nearing completion there, after 30 years of relocation and improvement. It will cost \$160,000 per mile.

But—Whereas the old road wound and twisted like a snake the new highway that is now nearly ready for use will have only three curves that will require no material slackening of speed and they can be taken safely at 55 mph.

Such is modern progress.

AND—Whereas it took the ox wagon emigrants MONTHS to get from Cabbage Hill to the Willamette valley the highway inspection trip in the course of which these notes were scribbled covered the distance between Portland and the foot of Cabbage Hill between breakfast and lunch.

That, in terms of modern progress, offsets the fact that the new road up Cabbage Hill will cost 25 times as much per mile as the road that was built three decades ago.

INCIDENTALLY, the old road that was finished in 1923 was dedicated by President Warren Harding, who was making a "swing around the circle" and died in San Francisco a few days later.

Elderly Portlander Dies; Savings Found

Portland—(U.P.)—The coroner's office said today that \$1140 worth of postal savings stamps was found in the effects of an elderly man who died of natural causes.

It was the second such case in two days here.

The postal stamps were found in the effects of Edward Henry Byerley, 70, who died Tuesday. They were in an unlocked dresser drawer at the hotel where he had been staying.

The body of Patrick Keenan, 81, was found in the Willamette river Tuesday and \$2400 in bills was found on his person.

Dead line Sunday. Classified is at noon Saturday; 10 a.m. Monday for Monday; other days 5:30 previous day.



HE MADE IT! — Italian-born New York cobbler Gino Prato, 55, gets a welcome glass of water from his happy wife, Caroline (left), and daughter, Lorraine, after he successfully answered a four-part question on opera to reach the \$32,000 mark on the CBS-TV show, "The \$64,000 Question." He has a week to decide whether or not he will try for the \$64,000.

Tito May Be Seeking To Establish Self as Balkan Satellite Head

By CHARLES M. McCANN

United Press Foreign Analyst

President Tito of Yugoslavia may be trying to set himself up as the leader of the Communist-ruled countries of Southeastern Europe.

There never has been any doubt that Tito got the best of it when Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Russian Communist Party boss, and Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin visited him two months ago.

It was suggested then that, as the result of the humiliating pilgrimage of the Kremlin's top men, Russia's grip on its satellite countries would be weakened.

Now there are indications that Tito feels the same way.

Wolfson Files Suit Against Newspaper

Washington—(U.P.)—Louis E. Wolfson, board chairman of the strikebound Capital Transit Co., filed a \$30,000,000 libel suit against the Washington Post and Times Herald yesterday.

Wolfson, who lost a recent proxy fight to capture control of Montgomery Ward Co., accused the newspaper and two of its officials of libeling him in three editorials dealing with the 34-day-old public transportation strike.

Officials accused along with the newspaper were Eugene Meyer, board chairman, and Philip L. Graham, president and publisher.

Graham said the paper is "not going to be intimidated by nuisance law suits" by Wolfson "or by any other person who we feel is acting contrary to the public interest."

He said the Post and Times Herald's sole aim in criticizing Wolfson's Capital Transit Co. dealings has been to obtain better streetcar and bus service for the nation's capital.

French Cabinet OKs Faure's Moscow Trip

Paris—(U.P.)—The French Cabinet today approved the forthcoming visit to Moscow of Premier Edgar Faure and Foreign Minister Antoine Pinay.

Formal approval of the projected visit was given during a three-hour Cabinet meeting called to discuss Russia's invitation to the French leaders two days ago.

The probable date for the visit is early October.

That would put the French visit to the Soviet capital after the visit of West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and shortly before the Big Four foreign ministers resume the East-West talks at Geneva.

The idea is that he would like to make himself the No. 1 Communist in the Balkans. He could do this only at Russia's expense.

Bulgaria especially is mentioned as a possible target of the ambitious Yugoslav leader.

It was in 1947 that Tito signed a sweeping agreement with the late Premier Georgi Dimitrov of Bulgaria. It called for a customs union and coordination of foreign policy, among other things.

Josef Stalin at once recognized the danger of that accord. He compelled Dimitrov to cancel it.

Tito breaks with Joe. A year later, Tito broke with the Kremlin because he would not submit to Russian domination.

Dimitrov died in a sanitarium on July 2, 1949. As is usual in such instances there were hints that his death might have been officially arranged for him. But there seems no reason to doubt that, long ailing, he died a natural death.

Tito has been doing pretty well for himself this year.

It was a momentous occasion in the Communist world when Khrushchev and Bulganin visited him to patch up relations.

The Kremlin tried to blame its breach with Tito on executed Soviet secret police chief Lavrenti P. Beria.

In what seemed to be a deliberate slap at Khrushchev and Bulganin, Tito said in a statement made public Tuesday: Tito Blames Stalin.

"The Soviet leaders admitted that there had been certain men who had done an injustice to Yugoslavia, and that Beria was the main one. I think that he should be included, but that Stalin was the main man."

Of course, that was true. Stalin was a grim, vindictive man who never forgave an enemy, and never forgave insubordination.

The men in the Kremlin started trying to patch up relations with Tito as soon as Stalin died in March, 1953.

Yreka Voters Turn Down Swimming Pool Proposal

Yreka—A proposal to issue \$70,000 in bonds to construct a new city swimming pool here was defeated this week by a margin of 13 votes.

The vote was 467 yes, 253 no, just 13 votes short of the two-thirds majority needed for approval of the bonds.

Isachen weather station on Ellef Ringnes Island in the Canadian Arctic gets more snow in summer than in winter. Cold air doesn't hold as much moisture as warmer air.

Frank Morgan — Harold Snodgrass

FUNERAL DIRECTORS

"The Chapel of Cherished Memories"

CHAPEL MORTUARY

Across from the Courthouse