

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

Off-Street Parking Needed

- (1) Is an off-street parking program important?
(2) Would it help me, as a driver?
(3) Would it cost me any money if it is passed Nov. 6?
(4) Would it increase taxes?
(5) Would it harm anyone?

These, we believe, are the key questions to be answered by Medford voters in deciding whether to approve the proposal that the city buy and develop off-street parking lots.

Our answers to the five questions are, in order, 1) yes, 2) yes, 3) yes, 4) no, and 5) probably not—or at least, not much.

IF ONE drives downtown early in the morning, or on a Sunday, or late at night, parking is no problem. But at any other time it is. During the busier hours of the day, it is frequently impossible to find a spot within blocks of where one wants to go.

This poses a double difficulty: To the driver, who is frustrated, and to the merchants, who would get the driver's business, if the driver could get to him.

To the first, it causes, at best, frayed nerves and increased gasoline bills.

To the second, it threatens his livelihood. Therein lies its importance.

THE program is designed to provide enough added parking spaces to make finding a place to park, either on or off the street, less of a chore than it now is.

There are not quite enough now, as any driver can testify. The number is decreasing, as new buildings occupy more lots which have been used for parking, and as the needs for greater traffic flow make it necessary to remove even more spaces from the streets.

If the off-street program is approved, it will help the driver.

THE proposal will cost an estimated \$721,000 (or more, or less, depending on circumstances) over a 10-year period. Obviously this money is not going to come out of thin air. Someone must pay for it.

Well, about one-third will be paid by downtown merchants and property owners through assessments on downtown (and downtown only) property. A majority of them have agreed in advance that this is equitable, since they are the ones to derive the first and greatest benefits.

The balance will be paid by the others who benefit—those who use the parking spaces, both on-street and in the new off-street lots, all of which will be metered.

If you are a driver, and occasionally park downtown, it will cost you a little more.

IT WOULD not increase taxes (except for the property assessments on downtown property mentioned above).

The initial financing will be done by general obligation bonds, which are backed by the general credit of the city. In case of a major depression, or similar catastrophe which would reduce parking meter revenues, the costs would then fall on property, to be paid by taxes.

But if plans are to be made with such a fear as an overriding consideration, nothing would get done. It is unlikely, to say the least.

If, however, our economy continues on its present level, or even if it were to decline moderately, the cost would be borne, fully or in major part, by the self-liquidating features of the plan. If the economy continues to expand, there will be no problem at all.

But, in the unlikely event that the entire burden were to fall on the taxpayer, the total amount would only be about \$1 per year per capita.

IN A LETTER addressed to this page the other evening, the writer expressed the fear that parking lots located near "small businesses" would be a detriment to them. How?

After all, small businessmen are dependent on customers. And if it is easier for customers to get to the businesses, the businesses will be benefited—not damaged. The movement itself is supported in large measure by the business and professional men of the community, who see it as of potential benefit to everyone, and not least to themselves.

We fail to follow the logic which concludes parking lots would aid "big businesses" and harm "small businesses."

The program might have some adverse effect on existing, privately-operated parking lots. But if traffic forecasts are borne out (and so far they have been too conservative), there will be plenty of business for all.

THE Mail Tribune has previously gone on record favoring the arterial street program.

It now recommends a "yes" vote on the off-street parking program. It is, we believe, soundly thought-out. Experience, both here and in cities which have done similar jobs of providing for their growing traffic and parking needs, indicates that both are necessary. While they are separate ballot measures, they are tied together in purpose, and each would be at least partly self-defeating without the other.

These could be called "good housekeeping" measures for the city of Medford.—E.A.

MUCH IN COMMON
Detroit (U.P.)—Rudy Valee, the singing idol of the 1920s and 1930s, said Sunday he felt he and Elvis Presley have much in common. "Presley feels as I did back in 1929," Valee said. "He doesn't have much of a voice so he compensates with assorted gyrations. But people say they enjoy his performances and who am I to question what someone else likes."

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE PEACE ISSUE

There has been as yet no serious discussion of foreign policy between President Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson.



Walter Lippmann

Insomuch as there is an issue between them, it turns around this, that the President's contribution to the making of peace has been unique and indispensable but very limited. His role has been that of a liquidator of old and sterile conflicts, as in Korea, Formosa, and Indo-China, rather than that of a shaper and builder of what is to come.

He has played a great part in the process, which is not yet completed, of bringing to an end the Stalinist phase of the cold war. But on the phase which is following it, he has been so lacking in ideas that the initiative has been taken over, without serious challenge from him, by the Soviet Union.

ON TUESDAY at Pittsburgh President Eisenhower said that "the full turning . . . on the road toward peace . . . seemed to come three years ago" when the Korean armistice was made.

What was his contribution to that hopeful turning? I would say what he certainly did not cause the turn. What he did was to make acceptable to the American people the concessions and the compromises which the turn has involved. It has involved the partition of Korea. It has involved the partition of Indo-China. It has involved the containment and confinement and the de-facto neutralization of Nationalist China in Formosa. It has involved the reversal of the central principle of the platform on which he ran in 1952, and the replacement of the policy of liberation by a policy of acceptance of the status quo.

The turning of the road, which required all the compromises, coincided, speaking generally, with the advent of Eisenhower to the White House and the death of Stalin. Both these events made it easier for the turning to take place. But the causes of the turning lie much deeper than the individuals, and none of us, I think, understands them fully. But it was the fact that the military incidents of the cold war had all ended in stalemates that could be broken only by the kind of big war that no one dared to fight. This was true not only of Korea, Formosa and Indo-China but also of the Greek civil war and the Berlin blockade.

PRESIDENT Eisenhower's great contribution, which has given him his fame as a peacemaker, has been to induce the American people to accept the unpalatable consequences of the stalemates. We have not recognized the Communist government of China, and we are still unable to prevent it from acquiring the Chinese seat in the United Nations. But we are negotiating with Red China with a view to reaching some sort of formal truce, and we do not any longer challenge its existence.

This line of policy is not limited to the Far East. In the Middle East, both as respects Palestine and Suez, the determining element in preserving the peace has been President Eisenhower's acceptance of the Soviet Union as a great power in the Middle East.

IN MY view, that he has been doing has been right and necessary and no one else but he, a celebrated general and a Republican of unimpeachable conservatism, could have kept the country united while he was doing it.

But we must not deceive ourselves. This process of liquidation, this engagement, and withdrawal from commitments and positions that have become untenable, is bringing into existence a world order that is far different from and much less favorable than, the one that we have known. The Western Alliance, of which we are the core, now has competitors and adversaries in every quarter of the globe.

What disturbs me about the prospect of another Eisenhower administration is that the President has done so little to prepare the government and the country for the kind of competition which we now face. Virtually all the Eisenhower policies are hand-me-downs from Roosevelt, Truman, and the Stalinist phase of the cold war.

On the paramount question of our era, which is the working out of a new relationship between the Atlantic powers and the nations of Asia and of Africa, there is no Eisenhower policy. There is no intimation even of the kind of invention and constructiveness which produced the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, and NATO.

Copyright 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Big Change Foreseen in East As Japan Talks With Russians

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent

A big change is likely to take place in the Far Eastern situation within the next few days.



Charles M. McCann

There is every expectation

that the negotiations will succeed.

If they do, Japan will enter the United Nations next month, after having been denied membership for years by Russia's veto.

Japan will have the prospect of entering into trade agreements with Russia totalling upwards of \$125 million a year.

There will be the prospect also of increased Japanese trade with Russia's ally, Communist China. Establishment of normal diplomatic relations between Red China and Japan will be brought nearer.

Independent Policy

Japan is likely, as the result, to turn its attention more to its Far Eastern neighbors and pursue a more independent policy toward the United States.

The agreement which Hatoyama is negotiating calls for a declaration ending the state of war between Japan and Russia, restoration of normal diplomatic relations, repatriation of Japanese war prisoners still held in Russia, a long-term fisheries agreement and Russia's support of Japan's admission to the United Nations.

The question of the future of some small islands whose return Japan seeks will be left for future consideration.

Japan has been in a state of war with Russia since Aug. 8, 1945. The United States and 48 other countries signed a formal peace treaty with Japan in San Francisco on Sept. 8, 1951. Russia refused to take part.

Negotiations for a formal Russian-Japanese treaty were started in London on June 1, 1955.

They dragged on until last March 29.

Russia tried hard to force Japan to agree to adopt a neutralist foreign policy as the price of a treaty. It finally dropped that bid to stop Japanese rearmament. But the negotiations failed, largely because of Russia's refusal to surrender any of the islands it occupied as the result of World War II.

Japan Paid Heavily

Japan paid heavily for the 25 days Russia spent in the war. It is now known that for months before that, Japan had sought to get Russia to ask the Allies for peace terms. The Russians sat on the request.

Then the United States dropped the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima on Aug. 6, 1945. Three days later, with Japan facing inevitable and disastrous defeat, Russia declared war.

As the result of the Japanese surrender on Sept. 2, Russia got possession of Sakhalin Island from Japan and also the long, important Kurile Islands chain which extends northward from Japan to Russia's Kamchatka Peninsula.

Japan wants to get back at least two small islands in the southern Kuriles. Russia has refused to give back even these.

If Hatoyama succeeds in his Moscow negotiations, it will be a crowning success for him. Whatever happens, he is likely to step down from the prime ministry next month. He is 73, partly paralyzed, and tired out. Opposition to him has been growing steadily for months, in his own dominant Liberal-Democratic party as well as out.

Matter of Fact By Stewart Alsop

INTERIM REPORT

Washington — "Outside the farm areas," Republican Chairman Leonard

rather complacently to this reporter some months ago, "there is a contentment which is wonderful." At about the same time, Adlai Stevenson, musing on his defeat in the Minnesota primary, observed that "somehow" he had "failed to communicate."

For some weeks now, this reporter has been wandering

around the country, talking to voters in key areas, trying to sense their reactions and the trend of the campaign. Especially in the last week or so, the two not very profound observations quoted above kept coming back to mind. For they tell a good deal about how the campaign is going.

At the outset of the campaign, there were visible signs, discerned by many observers, that the Stevenson candidacy was really getting off the ground. Recently, these signs of a shift to Stevenson have been much less visible. The reasons are related to both the remarks quoted above.

TALKING to people in the workers' districts or the middle class residential areas of big cities, you do not get the feeling that the contentment Chairman Hall professed to find is really all that wonderful. "Eisenhower prosperity" is certainly an Eisenhower asset. But it is a negative asset, in the sense that the Eisenhower candidacy would have suffered badly if there had been really widespread economic trouble in the cities, just as it has certainly already suffered on the farms.

Moreover, prosperity is not a decisive Eisenhower asset. There remain many economic discontents for Stevenson to exploit—and exploiting discontents is, after all, the function of an opposition. There are certain areas of genuine economic distress in the cities as well as on the farms—among hard-hit small businessmen, for instance, and in some places where industry is depressed.

BUT there is also, almost everywhere, much less "wonderful contentment" than the statistics about the current boom would suggest. A great many people who ought, statistically, to feel prosperous, do not. A householder in a comfortable middle class street in Louisville, Kentucky, gave a clue to why this is so.

"There's hardly a house in this street that's paid for," he said, "and hardly a car or a television set or a dishwasher either."

A great many people, in short, have gone heavily into debt to buy the things they want. Paying for these things takes a painfully large slice out of their incomes. Thus they feel, not prosperous, but harried, hard-pressed and worried about the future. Being human, these people are tempted to blame, not their own extravagance, but the Administration in power, just as the farmers in the drought-stricken areas tend to blame the Administration for what is, in fact, an act of God.

These are the people who feel no "wonderful contentment." It is among such people that Stevenson might hope to find the switchers from Eisenhower that he needs to put him over the top—only about 5 per cent of the total vote.

A FEW weeks ago, it seemed at least quite possible that Stevenson might find his needed 5 per cent among these discontented people. Now it begins to look distinctly improbable. There are many reasons for this apparent faltering of the Stevenson candidacy.

One is the specious "peace issue," which the Republicans have exploited far more effectively than "prosperity." Another is the increasing participation of President Eisenhower in the campaign, which has tended to dispel doubts about his health, and which has moved is appealing personality front and center.

But, as one talks to the voters, one cannot escape the conclusion that there is an even more important reason—that Adlai Stevenson has again, to use his own phrase, in large measure "failed to communicate."

THIS is partly because his television appearances, which he stubbornly refuses to rehearse, have been generally poor. It is partly because he has lately taken to debating issues, like the stopping of hydrogen bomb tests, which deeply interest him but do not deeply interest the mass of the voters.

At any rate, the discontented and still undecided voters, Stevenson is not yet a real person, a recognizable and well-liked human being who will deal with their personal troubles. This "failure to communicate" is Stevenson's great weakness,

which he must somehow overcome in the few campaign weeks that remain, if he is to have a ghost of a chance of winning.

(C) 1956 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

NOTE the dates.

They are important.

They reveal the fact that Senator Morse got on the Eisenhower bandwagon early. He established himself as one of the original Eisenhower boosters.

He went into the 1952 Republican convention an Eisenhower booster.

But—Somewhere along the line—SOMETHING HAPPENED.

He came out of the 1952 Republican convention a bitter foe of Ike.

WHAT happened?

I don't know. There are conflicting stories.

But one must assume that he wanted something—wanted it VERY MUCH—and didn't get it. So he turned his coat and became a Democrat.

WHY?

It was egotism.

He sincerely—and fundamentally—believed that the fortunes of Senator Morse were more important than the fortunes of the Republican party.

Or Ike. Or the country.

He was utterly sure he was right and the Republican convention that had failed to give him whatever it was he wanted was wrong.

That's supreme egotism.

U.P. Correspondents Forecast Headlines

United Press correspondents around the world look ahead at the news that will make the headlines.

Involvement

Watch for more top-echelon State Department speeches and statements between now and Election Day. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his aides still insist they aren't going to get involved in the campaign.

But Washington insiders say President Eisenhower and Dulles agree something ought to be done to counter Democratic criticism of administration foreign policy. So the anti-campaigning stand is being quietly relaxed.

Dulles recently appeared on a national TV interview program. He's expected to do it again within a week or so. Some of his aides are likely to get going also.

Close Eye

Although it won't be disclosed officially, the Justice Department is keeping a close eye on bids submitted to the government by drug firms for Salk anti-polio vaccine. A Democratic controlled House sub-committee has reported that vaccine makers submitted practically identical bids on three different occasions. One Democrat holds they are guilty of "collusive price-fixing" in violation of anti-trust laws.

Back Door

There's more than meets the eye in Britain's warning to Israel that it will send troops to the assistance of Jordan in event of Israeli aggression. It just happens that if Britain sent troops to Jordan, they would be conveniently close to Egypt in event that the Suez Canal dispute exploded.

Another Suez Angle

Israel probably will be getting another shipment of the French-built Mystere IV jet fighter planes soon. Paris reports that the Suez situation tip-

ped the scales in favor of the decision. France stopped supplying Israel with jets earlier this year after repeated protests from Arab countries, especially Egypt. But the French are even angrier with Egypt over Suez than Britain is.

Premature

Discount those London reports that Princess Margaret is thinking about an early marriage. Here's what caused them: Margaret was at a private house party last month. A brash teenager remarked in her presence that a girl was on the shelf unless she got married by 21. An older woman agreed. Twenty-six year old Margaret casually remarked: "Oh, I shall probably get married some day." The gossips took it from there.

Use Tribune Want Ads

Graves To Open

GEO. N. TAYLOR

The Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout and the dead in Christ shall rise first. At that moment, we of His who are here on earth shall be caught up to gather with them. So shall we ever be with the Lord. 1st Thess. 4:13-17. And what was Christ's part?

When He was nailed to the cross the soldier's spear pierced His side and the blood gushed out. The blood told Christ's death for our sins. (Christ had no sins of His own.) Being cleared by His blood, we are saved from God's wrath of our sins. Romans 5:9—BIBLE.

To Be Saved—Believe down in your heart in Christ's death for your sins.

To Grow Christlike—Find time daily for Bible and Prayer.

To Earn Reward—Do as Christ commands. Must you go and empty handed?

This Message sponsored by a Dairy family.—adv.

Families in every neighborhood are served better by Perl's Prices of Funerals... PERL FUNERAL HOME SINCE 1908 FRANK AND BILL PERL Phone 2-6675

What's the Answer?

Can You Get 4 of the 7? Copr. 1955 Editorial Research Report

- 1. President Eisenhower becomes (a) 60, (b) 63, (c) 66 or (d) 69 years old this year?
2. The Constitution does or doesn't fix the number of Supreme Court justices at nine?
3. Soccer football is on the increase or decrease in U.S. colleges as a whole, or about holding its own?
4. Columbus landed Oct. 12, 1492 on what is now Haiti, Dominican Republic, Cuba, Jamaica, or some other West Indies Island?
5. Vice President Nixon gets a higher or lower salary than House Speaker Sam Rayburn, or the same?
6. The island of Cyprus lies closest to the Greek mainland, Turkey, Egypt, the Suez Canal or the British island of Malta?
7. A polygraph is used to chart stock prices, measure heart action, detect lies, improve hearing or take dictation?
The answers: 1. 66. 2. Doesn't. 3. On the increase. 4. Another West Indies island. 5. Same. 6. Closest to Turkey. 7. Detect lies.

Use Tribune Want Ads