

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-6141

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER

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 May 24, 1946

Valley residents today found themselves with limited postal service, no Railway Express service and faced with dwindling supplies of food and petroleum products because of railway strike.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot column: The recent rain was worth \$1,000,000, and made most of the visiting Odd Fellows feel at home.

20 YEARS AGO May 24, 1936

Xavier Widmer and Frank L. Applegate of this city will be delegates to the 26th annual convention of the Knights of Columbus at Klamath Falls, May 24-25.

Mrs. J. D. Rickert was elected warder of the Rebekah assembly at its annual state convention in Roseburg Friday.

30 YEARS AGO May 24, 1926

Another summer round-up clinic, the third in the series, held at First Baptist church.

Next week the Craters will launch their campaign for new members of the Medford Chamber of Commerce, under the supervision of A. L. Hill and President Gaddis.

40 YEARS AGO May 24, 1916

Bishop C. W. Nibley of the Mormon church has resigned as president of the Utah-Oregon Sugar company.

Graduation exercises of the Sacred Heart hospital will take place Thursday.

What's the Answer?

Can You Get 4 of the 7?

Cop. 1955. Editorial Research Report

- 1. Which one of the following federal judges is not on the Supreme Court: Black, Burton, Clark, Douglas, Frankfurter, Harlan, Minton, Parker, Reed, Warren?
2. The United States is or isn't a party to the Baghdad pact?
3. Mendelssohn's "Wedding March" was composed as incidental music for a Rhine river festival, a play of Shakespeare, or a parade of German clowns?
4. The British parliament is in session longer each year than the U.S. congress; right or wrong?
5. Foreign-trained doctors taking exams in 1956 to practice in the U.S. will number one-third the year's total of American medical school graduates; right or wrong?
6. More people live in the metropolitan area of London, New York, or Tokyo?
7. A fifth of whiskey contains (a) 16, (b) 25.6, (c) 32, or (d) 128 fluid ounces?

The answers: 1. John J. Parker of North Carolina, chief judge of 4th circuit U. S. Court of Appeals. 2. Isn't. 3. For Shakespeare's "A Midsummer Night's Dream." 4. Wrong. 5. Right (estimate by chairman of N. Y. State licenses committee of Board of Regents). 6. New York (12.3 million against London's 8.3 and Tokyo's 7.7 million). 7. 25.6 fluid ounces.

How About Campaigning?

Just how valuable are campaign speeches? By "valuable" we mean how many votes do they change or make?

In the recent primary ex-Secretary of the Interior McKay conducted what is generally known as a "vigorous" campaign.

His primary opponent, Phil Hitchcock, did the same though not as vigorously.

But neither of them attacked the other. Both concentrated on Senator Wayne Morse, candidate in another primary and another party.

YET SENATOR MORSE received more votes than either of them and nearly as many as both combined.

It is difficult to believe had they left Senator Morse alone, his total would have been materially increased—though of course it might be.

On the other hand, had the two GOP aspirants attacked each other, particularly if Hitchcock had attacked the record of ex-Governor McKay as head of the Department of Interior, how would their race have come out?

As it was, McKay's majority was less than 25,000, in a contest where over 240,000 votes were cast, and it was an "Alphonse Gaston" affair from the very first.

Even more important perhaps, the sole victim of their campaigning, Oregon's senior senator, did not campaign at all! He put up no defense.

What does that add up to?

HAD WAYNE MORSE left his job in Washington and campaigned for himself and against McKay in the primary as McKay did against him, what would have been the result?

One can only guess. But if campaign speeches are half as important as most of the political experts maintain, Hitchcock might well have been the victor and Morse might have passed the 250,000 mark in his total vote. No one can be sure. But it is an interesting conjecture.

A NORTHERN contemporary—Republican of course!—shares our skepticism regarding the actual vote-making value of campaign oratory.

Noting that Lew Wallace defeated Bob Holmes in Jackson County and came close to nosing him out for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in the state this paper concludes somewhat facetiously as follows:

"The way to win an election in Oregon apparently is not to wage a campaign but to have a heart attack, withdraw from the conflict, and wage no campaign whatever. * * * Look what a heart-attack did for Ike."

THERE IS another side to this particular coin, however. Had Wallace's opponent Bob Holmes, done some active campaigning himself—gone out over the state instead of staying at home, not to ask for votes but to get acquainted with the people of the state—and explain that while he was unopposed in the May 18th election he would have acting Governor Elmo Smith to meet in November, and hoped they would keep him in mind—or something to the effect—the result, we feel certain, would have been very different.

IN OTHER WORDS, if a candidate for public office is not well known, persistent and prolonged campaigning is imperative, if he wishes to get anywhere. That does not mean he must necessarily rant and rave and call his opponent an "unadulterated liar" at every whistle-stop, but it DOES mean he must get acquainted, make his name and face familiar to the electorate instead of remaining a portion of the political "terra incognita."

FINALLY, the actual value of political campaigning should receive an excellent test here in Oregon in the final weeks of the present campaign.

We have in mind, of course, the contest for the US Senate between Senator Morse (incumbent) and ex-Secretary of the Interior McKay, aspirant.

Both men are well known, have been in the service of their state for over a decade, and both are fighters. Apparently Secretary McKay will not accept any challenge for open debate, it is rather doubtful, in fact, that he will call Oregon's senior Senator an "unadulterated liar"—at least as often as he did in the primary.

But one thing for sure—there will be no quarter asked or given on either side. There will be no punches pulled. And if we are not greatly mistaken the voters of the state will have a good idea of the records of both men, what they favor and what they oppose when they go to their respective polling places on the coming 6th of November.

AND that is as it should be. Let's have the FACTS. Let's have less name-calling, and more information—the TRUTH.

Just where do these two men stand regarding issues important to the people of this state and to the national welfare?

In this particular case the value of political campaigning—its necessity in fact—so the voters may know exactly what they are voting for and against, calls for no further argument. It is a MUST, both from the standpoint of the candidate and the public.

President of OSC Salutes Pear Industry

Portland — (U.P.) — Dr. A. L. Strand, president of Oregon State College, last night saluted the pear industry for recognizing the "five elements of survival."

Nehru's Role as Neutralist, Advisor to Nations, Growing

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India has added the Algerian situation to the long list of his diplomatic interests.



He has offered a detailed proposal to bring France and the Algerian Nationalists together to end the increasing danger of a revolt. Nehru made the proposal in his role of "neutralist" peace maker. In the same role, he is soon about the breakdown of Singapore independence talks in London.

Chief Minister David Marshall, who led the Singapore delegation in London, stopped off in New Delhi on his way home to ask Nehru's advice about the next step.

That he will get it, there can be no doubt. Nehru is an outspoken man with advice on world problems.

He is also a very influential man in parts of Asia and Africa, two continents which are emerging from "colonialism."

"Leader of Asian Democracy" Marshall, arriving in New Delhi from London, called Nehru "the leader of Asian democracy."

Nehru is unlikely to decline that title. He assumed the position of "neutralist," remaining aloof from the West-East cold war, as soon as India got its independence in 1950.

He took the leading part in trying to form the so-called neutralist bloc of Asian-African countries.

No one can doubt that Nehru is a man of good will, and that he earnestly seeks peace and world betterment.

One trouble, however, is that the military alliances which he opposes are those the western

allies have formed in defense against Communist aggression. Another is that he seems inclined to list Soviet Russia and Communist China as among the "anti-colonial" countries.

For instance, Nehru does not call Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Tibet colonies. When Russia and Red China wanted those countries, they just moved their armies in and took over.

However, Nehru's proposal on Algeria seems to be a reasonable one at first glance. He called for a cease-fire, and for French recognition of Algeria as "a national entity" and "personality."

He asked that Algerians and French settlers in Algeria be made equal. Finally he called for formal negotiations between France and the rebels.

It is possible that Nehru will advise Marshall to keep cool for the present in hope that the Singapore talks can be reopened.

But in any event, Nehru's interest in Algeria and Singapore will increase his influence in Asia and Africa, including the Arab nations which are supporting the Algerian rebels.

Nehru probably will have some thoughts to express on Singapore when he attends the British Commonwealth prime ministers conference in London late next month.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

He undoubtedly will have a lot of advice to give President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles too, when he visits Washington early in July.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

Sukarno and the Revolution

Dr. Sukarno, the President of the Indonesian Republic, who was in Washington last week, came at a time when the administration, and even some members of Congress, are reappraising American policy in Asia.

We know that we have been working up a blind alley. In fact, the invitation to Dr. Sukarno was meant to mark a new approach to the neutralism of the newly independent nation.

Yet it must be said that to listen carefully to what Dr. Sukarno said to Congress, and to what was implied in what he said, was a sobering experience.

For though he had come as head of the Indonesian republic, he spoke with a great zeal and fervor as an apostle of the revolution which is rising against Western power and influence all the way across Asia and Africa.

We are, it was quite evident as he spoke, only in the first phase of the re-appraisal which the tides of history are compelling us to make.

More specifically, what is going on in Washington today is an effort to correct errors in our policy which are quite recent, which were the consequences of the Korean war. Before 1950,

we did not take the view that all nations ought to join a military coalition of which we are the leaders, that neutralism or not joining our alliances was morally wrong and unfriendly to American vital interests, that with grudging exceptions joining our military alliances was the passport to economic aid.

In the Marshall Plan, which was launched before the Korean war, economic aid was given ahead of military aid. The NATO military alliance had not yet been conceived when the Marshall Plan went into effect. It was the Korean war that compelled us to rearm ourselves in Western Europe and led to the militarization of our foreign policy in Asia.

We are now engaged in trying to persuade Congress to agree to some demilitarization of our policy.

Dr. Sukarno made it quite plain how necessary is the demilitarization of our relations with newly independent countries like Indonesia. But there was a lot more to his address than that, and all of it dispelled any notion that with a few changes of emphasis in our foreign aid policy, all be well. In the welcoming addresses and in his responses much was said about George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. But the analogy cannot be carried very far. For the revolution of which Dr. Sukarno is so brilliant a leader and spokesman has a depth and scope and energy which are without precedent.

The revolution is not only anti-colonial in the sense that it is a rebellion against foreign rulers. Dr. Sukarno went beyond that to raise the question—whether the revolutionary movement means to stop short of the explosion of all Western power an influence from Africa, South Asia and the South Pacific.

What gives this revolution its fierce and enormous energy is the determination at long last to undo the human consequences of three centuries of the white man's domination, and at the same time overcome the economic and technological backwardness of the former colonial lands.

Dr. Sukarno made it plain that if this four dimensional revolution can be carried out by democratic means he would prefer it, but that the revolution will have to be carried out, if necessary by totalitarian means.

The revolution which Dr. Sukarno was proclaiming is running from Morocco to Tunis through the Middle East, to Aden, to Ceylon, to Singapore, to Indonesia, probably to Formosa and Japan. The Western nations, among whom we belong, are on the defensive throughout his vast area, and all the key positions remaining to them are under attack. One has the feeling that the Western nations are fighting rear guard actions, the French in North Africa, the British in the Middle East, we in Formosa and beyond.

We must begin to ask ourselves questions to which we cannot expect to find quick and certain answers. A new relationship between the emancipated East and the democratic West will have to be found. Where shall we look for the end of the thread by which we can find our way through the labyrinth?

In 1950 the answer to that question was plainer than it is today. We should have looked to India to be the mediator.

Is it now too late for this? Is the damage done by our crudely militaristic policies irreparable in the sense that opportunities which once existed are now foreclosed?

Let us hope that nothing is irreparable.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

1956, The New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Matter of Fact

By Stewart Alsop

DAMASCUS — The "Troika," as someone has called it after the three horse team that draws a Russian sleigh, operates all over the Middle East. But here in Damascus, the lovely city of the seven rivers, the "Troika" not only operates but rules.

Syria's President, Shukri Kuwaty, does not govern his country. Except for a tendency to oratory, very little is left of the fiery Arab independence leader who once defied Turkish torture. Nowadays Kuwaty seeks only peace and comfort, perhaps comfort above all; so he obeys the "Troika."

Syria's amiable, astute, decidedly temporary premier Said Kahazi does not govern his country either. Even the Chief of Army Intelligence, Abdul Hamid Saraj, the young, dynamic, leftwing captain who has the most important influence on the Syrian army and is constantly being tipped as Syria's next military dictator, does not exercise any final authority. For both Ghazi and Saraj also obey the "Troika."

WHAT then is this "Troika," which has acquired predominant power in this country where the slightest hint of foreign influence used to stimulate paroxysms of anti-colonial rage? It is simply the strangely assorted but highly effective combination of Egyptian political leadership, Saudi Arabian bribe money, and Communist organizational talent.

Of these it is necessary to say at once that the Communist party is measurably the least important as yet. In the last year, the crafty chief of all Middle Eastern Communists, Khalid Baqdash, has managed to make Communism almost respectable in Syria. He can turn out a street crowd of several thousand whenever he chooses. His organizers have partly penetrated the other leftwing groups.

But although Baqdash has the usual organizational advantage of Communists everywhere, he has much less real appeal as yet than the other leftwing leaders like the fiery Socialist, Akram Hurani, and the military politician, Capt. Saraj.

Furthermore, men like Hurani and Saraj are much more nationalist than they are leftist. And their angry, suspicious and violent brand of nationalism does not lend itself to final domination by the Communists.

AS FOR Saudi Arabian bribe money, this is one of the most extraordinary phenomena in the whole Middle East. In Syria and Lebanon, the main centers of expenditure, the Saudi Arabian government is rather reliably reported to be investing something like half a million a month of its American oil dollars in politicians and the press.

You hear well-authenticated tales of organized press visits to Saudi Arabia, in the course of which the Syrian and Lebanese editors were each sweetened by a tactful little envelope containing the equivalent of \$1,200—which is a lot of money hereabouts. Anyone who wants to

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

most West European countries. Exclusion of economic aid for these countries was specifically noted by the President in his March 19 message to Congress.

Communications

Letters to the Editor must bear the name and address of the writer, although under certain circumstances the use of a pen name or initial for publication is permissible. The Mail Tribune reserves the right to edit all letters with a view to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Freeway Considerations To the Editor: Thanks for your democratic and humanitarian views expressed in the Mail Tribune on May 16 regarding the proposed freeway cutting through the residential section of Medford. It is my opinion that any individual or civic group should consider very seriously the possible results of this proposal, not only from the sentimental standpoint of wiping out one of the older and well kept residential areas and displacing many families, but also from the practical side.

This highway will quite naturally create an east-west traffic obstruction in addition to the prevailing ones, namely, Bear Creek and the railroad right-of-way. While a railway is essential to any community, and was more so in the past, it has never been a particular asset to a downtown area. The history of any commercial right-of-way is one of municipal deterioration, and to place the Medford business district between two of them just isn't using foresight.

Another practical point to consider is that of tax revenue. Fifty-eight taxpaying residences will be eliminated in deference to the state highway. Furthermore, property devaluation in the right-of-way area is inevitable, and we already have the problem of adjacent areas' reluctance to come into the city limits. Unquestionably, we must work harmoniously with the county and state, but the city is our first consideration.

In regard to the businesses located on the highway's present route, it might as well be in another state for the benefit they receive, since it is to be (we understand) a non-stop freeway, unapproachable from within the city limits.

Since federal funds will assist in the construction of the highway, it will of necessity be made available to military use in the event of an emergency involving that factor.

So far definite information is unavailable. Mayor Miller is to be commended for his sensible and fair-minded attitude in requesting more specific information, and a further study of the possible effects upon the city.

No southern colonel (or Texan) could take more pride in his surroundings than do the residents of Medford. While we might point with pride to a beautifully constructed, modern freeway, where are we going to point from it? Certainly not to what will be visible of Medford.

Mrs. J. W. Barnard, 19 Geneva st., Medford, Ore.

Praise for Morse To the Editor: I am a resident of Brooklyn, N.Y. For many years it has been my privilege to travel throughout the country on business. The city of Washington, D.C., our great capital, has always been close to my heart, because there one may visit the varied buildings and secure a close-up view of our law-makers in action, in both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

During my many visits to the Senate balcony, I watched and listened to the statements of our Senators. The presentation of bills, the pro and con, the interest displayed, particularly that display of human interest for the common good of all, is heart-w