

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
71-29 North Fir St. Phone 2 6541
ROBERT W. RUHL, Editor
HEERB GREY, Advertising Manager
GERALD LATHAM, Business Manager
ERIC ALLEN JR., Managing Editor
EARL H. ADAMS, City Editor
HARRY CHIPMAN, Telegraph Editor
RICHARD JEWETT, Sports Editor
OLIVE STARCHER, Society Editor
DALE ERICKSON, Circulation Mgr.
An Independent Newspaper
Entered as second class matter at Medford, Oregon, under Act of March 3, 1937.
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 \$3.50
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—One month 1.25
Carrier and Dealers—See per copy
All Terms Cash in Advance
Official Paper of the City of Medford
Official Paper of Jackson County
United Press—Full Licensed Wire
MEMBER OF AVIATE BUREAU OF CIRCULATION
Advertising Representative:
WEST-HOLIDAY COMPANY INC.
Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

There Should Be A Law

We are somewhat weary of the Al Sarena case, but there seems to be so much misunderstanding concerning it, and the attitude of the Mail-Tribune, that a few more words appear necessary in an effort to clarify the situation.

We have a communication from Mrs. Ernest T. Ross of Gold Hill for example, asking if we believe in lynching—the implication being that opposition to the policy of "mining for timber" on the federal forest reserve at several thousand per cent profit, adds up to a policy of lawlessness.

WE THOUGHT we had made it plain in the editorial referred to, that what we wanted was a change in the present mining laws, so far as mines in the national forests are concerned, so that this racket could be stopped. We can see in this contention no suggestion that we favor calling in Judge Lynch—in fact exactly the reverse. We don't want any law broken, we want a new law and want it enforced.

It is true, as Mrs. Ross states, that the mining laws since the Al Sarena case broke have not been changed somewhat. But the changes do not have any effect on the Al Sarena "give away" whatever. That is "water over the dam." The only hope of redress lies in voiding the mining patents, as the Minority report advised—but as we stated, to accomplish this during the present administration appears extremely remote to say the least.

THE Ellsworth law does make any repetition of the Al Sarena case less likely but it does not render it impossible.

It will give US Forest service the right to do as it wishes with the timber on the mining claims until the patents have been granted. This might be a period of 5 years, ample time to avoid any "give away." But as we understand it there is nothing in the law to prevent the mining claimants from doing the required \$500 improvement work in one year instead of five and then follow the Al Sarena pattern—drop mine operations and concentrate upon cutting off the timber, secured at approximately \$5 an acre and worth anywhere from \$500 to \$1000 an acre depending on the quality and stand.

IT IS this sort of profiteering the Mail Tribune thinks should be stopped. We grant the Ellsworth law takes a step in that direction, but only a short one, and one that can too easily be blocked.

As so often stated we are not considering the mining laws in general but only within the federal forest reserve where the paramount concern is—or should be—not mining or well-drilling but the conservation and properly regulated sale of timber.

Mining, of course, should be allowed where the Forest Service engineers find mineral values that justify operation. But a mining permit at \$5 an acre should not include FOR FREE a timber cutting permit where the acre value may be more than one-hundred times as much.

IN OTHER words on government land the two operations should be kept separate, the miners should operate on one side of the fence and the timber men on the other, they shouldn't be mixed up, and both should be under strict federal control, for the land does not belong to them but to the people of the United States.

As to why former Secretary of the Interior Chapman did not deny the Al Sarena patents, we have never heard his explanation but we do know he did not GRANT them. Our guess is he hated to sanction a deal whereby, in his judgment, US Forest land that was worth five or six hundred dollars should be sold for five.

That at least would be a natural reaction for a Secretary of the Interior we should think!—R.W.R.

As to Communications

IT IS ABOUT time to issue our usual pre-election warning regarding communications.

The Mail Tribune, as a matter of policy through the years, has probably given more space to communications, particularly of a critical nature, than any other paper in the state.

But we have not and will not print communications which are anonymous, are of an abusive, personal nature or exceed 400 words in length.

The writer of each offering must be identified, and the more the writer sticks to facts and objective discussion of issues, and the less to partisan cliches, propaganda and glittering generalities the better the chances of publication.

If there is some good reason offered why the writer's name and address should not be printed—but the reason in the realm of political controversy must be GOOD—the name will be withheld and placed on file to be divulged only on personal request.

Finally communications which question the integrity of this paper or that any members of its staff will promptly be consigned to oblivion where gratuitous and unwarranted insults of such a nature belong.

Finally—after the two conventions have been held and the campaign really gets into "high" the Mail Tribune will offer as heretofore equal space to both parties—to the party organizations, not individuals—where they may express their opinions freely, subject only to the same rules and regulations that apply—and have applied for so many years—to communications, regarding length and subject matter. These departments will be run 3 days a week, Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday. — R. W. R.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

WESTERN COMMUNISTS IN TROUBLE

We are now hearing from the Western Communist leaders on the subject of Khrushchev's campaign to degrade Stalin. They are profoundly embarrassed, having for many years been Stalin's obedient servants, now denying that his rule was a reign of terror and then justifying the purges and executions. They cannot plead, as Khrushchev has, that he served the tyrant because he was afraid of him. Togliatti and Nenni in Italy, Thorez in France, not to mention the little Communist politicians in Britain and the United States, did not have to embrace Stalinism. Now that Stalin is being demolished in Moscow, they have lost face, and they look very foolish indeed.

To make matters worse, Khrushchev has shown how little thought he gives to them by taking the trouble to send them a copy of his famous diatribe. The leaders of Western communism have been reduced, as they bitterly complain, to finding out what Moscow now thinks of Stalin by reading a text furnished to the Western newspapers by the Department of State.

PIETRO Nenni, the leader of those Italian Socialists who are in partnership with the Communists, is so upset that he is now calling Stalinism "the most vast propaganda hoax in the memory of the world." This raises the interesting question of why he was taken in by this hoax. There were plenty of Italians who were not taken in by it, and the main charges now made by Khrushchev have been published long since. The only thing about them that is essentially new is that they are now officially confirmed by Stalin's successor at the head of the Communist party.

Men like Togliatti, Thorez, Nenni have been the victims of the hoax, not because they have been intimidated and not, I would think, because they have been bribed, but because they were in the grips of their own will to believe.

To believe what? That the revolution in Russia was showing the way, and must therefore be followed, to the construction of that society which they, and European Socialists, had learned to believe in. They became the dupes not only of Stalinism but of Leninism as well, because they misjudged the essential character of the Soviet experience.

As disciples of Karl Marx they should have been on their guard. For Marx taught that Socialism would develop out of the most highly developed capitalism. Yet here was Russia, the first Socialist state, a society which had only a primitive capitalism. Evidently, not only was the Marxist prophecy wrong as to where Socialism would begin but it was wrong also as to what Socialism, when it did begin, would be like. In Russia it has turned out to be quite different from what Marx had led his disciples to expect.

What Stalinist Russia was con-

cerned with was the forced and rapid industrialization of a backward country. What Stalin did, at the sacrifice of the happiness of a whole generation, was to organize an economy which would enable Russia to compete in productivity with Western capitalism. In the Stalin era the objective was not to lead the West to Socialism, but to make Russia catch up with the West's industrialism.

IT WAS an extreme form of self-deception for a Socialist like Nenni to look for leadership to a country which had never developed a modern industrial system and had never known the civil liberties and the democratic institutions of the West. The most intelligent way to conceive the Soviet system, is, it seems to me, as a successful demonstration of how, by ignoring the human costs, a country that is primitive in its economy and unused to constitutional government, can be industrialized rapidly and developed into a powerful state.

If we can conceive Soviet communism in this way—as a gospel for the primitive—we have, I think, the key to a number of puzzling questions. Why, for example, has communism made such progress in Asia and the Middle East while it has made no progress at all in Europe on this side of the iron curtain? Because what has been done in Russia in the past 30 years is something that might be done in other underdeveloped and pre-democratic societies. In the Western countries, on the contrary, the Soviet system would be not only reactionary but irrelevant. That is why Western communism has been so alienated from the interests and sensibilities of the Western peoples.

IN A speech he made the other day in San Francisco Mr. Dulles remarked that while the Russian Communists now "disassociate themselves from Stalin, not even this much gain is registered by the Chinese Communist party." The explanation may well be that the Chinese are still Stalinists because they are still in the early stages of their own forced industrialization, of which the target date is 1967. The Russians, according to this view of things, have now achieved a formidable industrial system, and have therefore outlived Stalinism.

To take this view is to regard Stalinism as in its essence the totalitarian terror required for an inhuman purpose—to compel a generation to sacrifice itself in order to transform a primitive peasant economy into an advanced industrial economy.

WITH this in mind, we can best appreciate the crucial importance to the future of mankind of what Nehru is doing in India. It is to demonstrate that there is a humane and liberal alternative to the Stalinist way of developing a backward country. But for Nehru's India, backward countries would have no practical alternative model to that provided for them by Soviet Russia and Red China. This is why Nehru, far from being a stooge of Moscow, is the most formidable rival in Asia, of Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung. (C) 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

Matter of Fact

By JOSEPH ALSOP LETTING THE DUST SETTLE

Washington—The most important single fact revealed by a long Middle Eastern journey is the simple fact that the United States of America has not the shadow of a Middle Eastern policy.

The Middle East has considered a bigly greater strategic and economic significance than the Far East. A Middle Eastern convulsion now looms ahead, on the scale of the Far Eastern convulsion that began with the loss of China.

If this Middle Eastern convulsion is not averted or controlled, the effects on the Western Alliance can make the after-effects of the Far Eastern convulsion seem downright coy.

To be sure: This Administration is always very conscious of its public relations. All sorts of meaningless activities and purely temporary expedients are made to look like parts of a large policy-design, that does not in fact exist.

For example, the Middle Eastern mission of UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold had no visible result whatever except the momentary prevention of an actual outbreak of war between the Arabs and Israel. Yet this was grandiosely portrayed as a brilliant triumph of American policy.

It was like claiming every successful foray of the fire brigade as a triumph for the municipal housing program, on the ground that even although houses are not getting built, at least they are not being burned down.

MEANWHILE, the vacuum of American Middle Eastern policy approaches the point of being ludicrous. We have able diplomatic representatives in the area, but when you ask them what our policy is they throw up their hands in amusement or despair.

Almost every American Embassy in the Middle East sees the problem utterly differently from all the other Embassies, so that you wonder if they all belong to the same country. The operations coordinating board, that mysterious adjunct of the National Security Council, has even sent an able young staff member to the Middle East to rush about from Embassy to Embassy, in order to synthesize viewpoints but this has little visible effect.

This utter vacuum of American policy cannot be too strongly stressed, because it is the least understood of the four cardinal factors in the ugly and dangerous Middle Eastern crisis. The other three factors are:

FIRST, the rise of Arab nationalism, with its threat to all Western positions in the area including the oil interests that provide the lifeblood of most of the Western allies.

Second, the unceasing and increasing Arab-Israeli tension, with its constant threat of renewed fighting.

Third, the Soviet intrusion in the area, which has greatly encouraged the Arab nationalists both in their anti-Westernism and in their determination to wreak vengeance upon Israel.

These three forces are immensely powerful. They have combined to produce a rancid, rising ferment of a really frightening kind. The British, the people most directly threatened by this ferment, no longer have either the prestige or the power to control it effectively. They can talk of moving troops to the head of the Persian Gulf, if this is useful to safeguard their most important oil sources. But this is really about the best they can do; and it is a very poor best.

THEREFORE the utter vacuum of American policy in the Middle East means that the only power, the only influence that might be used to pacify and control the situation is not being used for any purpose whatever. We do not wish to take the risk, or accept the commitments, or even make the distasteful choices that are essential for a serious Middle Eastern policy. So we are just letting things rip.

BUT in Cairo and in Baghdad, in Damascus and Jerusalem, one always heard the same weary, desperate, pleading refrain—"Any American policy, even a bad policy, is better than none at all. You must at least try to prevent catastrophe, even although you cannot be absolutely sure of success."

The true criticism of the Truman administration's handling of the rise of Chinese communism was not that they did not prevent Communist success. No one could guarantee the defeat of the Chinese Communists. The true criticism was that the Truman administration did not even

POTLUCK (By M-T Staff and Contributors)

Eagle-eyed readers of this (and other) newspapers take a certain delight in finding silly errors. More power to them. We all make them—some of them in the reporter's or wire service's copy, some of them typographical.

One recent wire story read as follows: "(He) was born in Louisiana. His father died three months before he was born. He began shining shoes to help his mother."

A reader (anonymous) clipped it out and sent it in, commenting, "It's a good trick if you can do it."

A columnist on the Ashland Tidings pointed out another one which appeared in the M-T last week, in a story about a death in which a line was dropped, with the result that the story indicated the county coroner shot himself. Sigh!

A day or two ago there was an editorial on this page voicing mild protest over the confusing practice of saying 12:15 p.m. when, to be utterly clear, it should be 00:15 p.m.

Well, sir, another kind reader (also anonymous) sent us a clipping from Llewellyn George's Moon Book of 1953, and there, big as life and twice as handsome, were tables of the moon. The hours between midnight and 1 a.m., and between noon and 1 p.m., were all PROPERLY set forth—0:10 a.m.; 0:09 p.m., and so on.

That, friends, is progress. Newspaper Publisher Bob Chessman visited the M-T one day last week during his vacation. He comes from one of the West Coast's fishing capitals, Astoria, origin of many popular brands of canned fish sold all over the country. And why was he vacationing in southern Oregon? To go fishing in the Rogue, of course.

Helga Mitchell of the Applegate area sends us a paragraph of "Rural Reflections," as follows: "Summertime causes changes in country traveling. Convertibles become converted, cyclists decrease their attire, and truck

Working late one night last week, the society editor was overhead to exclaim upon looking at the clock, "Heavens, time is fighting!"

Our reaction to that Anglo-Latin mauling is to wonder if, when Christmas comes, is Adeste just Fiddling?

One of the steadiest, most reliable, hardest-working and most conscientious businesswomen we know was accused by a disrespectful colleague the other day of being unpredictable. A short time later he received from her the following note:

"I get up early every morning, I collect my clothes (forgetting at least one piece of them so I make another trip upstairs), I get breakfast and eat at the same time, I drive to the office, over the same route, arriving at 8:10, I always wear my hair the same way, I am always attired in either grey, black or navy blue, I always think I can do more than I actually can, both at home and at the office, I always get the essentials done even though I think I can't possibly, I always drink coffee when I promise myself I won't, and after 15 years I'm still worried that I don't earn my pay and that I'll be fired any day."

"WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY SAYING I'M UNPREDICTABLE!!!"

It's a rapid 99 miles from a point just north of Central Point (where a sign says 127 miles to Grants Pass) to another point about a mile down the road (where another sign says 26 miles to Grants Pass).

The other evening about 7 o'clock we saw a dozen or so high school girls, dressed in pedic pushers, pushing their way up the stairs of the building marked "Carpenter's Local 2067."

We assume they were union label pedal pushers.

You know how people are always talking about women not knowing their way around?

Well, a couple of agronomists last week, in their car, started leading a gal reporter, in her car, to a farm where some soil research experiments were under way.

She says it was a real nice drive, but she began to wonder after they passed the same corner in Jacksonville for the fourth time.

The same can be said of the Eisenhower administration's dealings with the Middle Eastern crisis to date. Copyright 1956, New York Herald Tribune, Inc.

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.

Do We Believe in Lynching?

To the Editor: Do you believe in lynchings, too? Lynchings were supposed to be a form of "justice," when "men" took the law into their own hands.

In your editorial on the Minority Report of the Senate Committee investigating the Al Sarena Mining Case, you state that you never believed there was anything unlawful in the transaction—that it was all entirely "within the law," but it should be corrected by new legislation.

During the twenty years of the Democratic regime, the law remained unchanged. Are you unaware of the fact that during the "nearly four years" of the Republican administration, the law has been changed to recognize the timber value on mining claims?

Don't you feel that you are being unjust in calling a perfectly legal transaction "shenanigans"? Or are you playing "partisan politics"? The plain fact is that these individuals were entitled to their mining patents under law. Otherwise, why didn't Oscar Chapman deny the patents?

Mrs. Bertha Coy Ross, Gold Hill, Ore.

Tax Burden

To the Editor: I want to call the attention of your readers to the way the unprecedented and unnecessary increase in taxes on real property in this county this year is doing great damage to our county and state. A great

many people are selling out and moving out of the state because they cannot stand the present tax burden.

To give one example among many: One rancher of my acquaintance got a raise of \$800 on taxes on his ranch, and since the profit on his beef cattle is not sufficient to stand such an unjust increase in taxes, he immediately had a sale and sold all of his cattle, and as soon as he can find sale for the ranch, he intends to move to Idaho and buy a ranch there.

The tax on my business property was increased over 300 per cent, and my business cannot stand it, therefore I may be forced to move my business out of the county. I have talked with quite a few others who are in the same dilemma. This may be a part of the present effort of big business to crowd out and force small business into liquidation.

How can we expect to attract tourists, and get them to settle in the county, with our excessive tax burden to discourage them? Again, how can we expect to attract and persuade industries to settle in the valley and create jobs for our people, when they hear of our excessive taxes?

I hope that our civic leaders will seriously consider the harm that is being done, and do something to lessen the burden. Robert L. Taylor, 906 North Riverside Ave., Medford, Ore.