

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads the Mail Tribune... MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-6141

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION

MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PUBLISHERS

Flight o' Time

Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO

Jan. 27, 1947 (Monday) Jackson County Civic Music associations will open the 1947 season Feb. 5, by presenting the National Male Quartet.

20 YEARS AGO

Jan. 27, 1937 (Wednesday) Minimum of \$2,400 is set as Jackson county's flood relief quota by national Red Cross headquarters.

30 YEARS AGO

Jan. 27, 1927 (Thursday) Judge W. J. Hartzell will preside at the Boy Scout of honor to be held tonight when Ronald Kring will be presented with an Eagle badge.

40 YEARS AGO

Jan. 27, 1917 (Saturday) About 1,176 fires on the national forests of Oregon, Washington and Alaska burned over 9,000 acres of timber land in 1916, it is announced.

What's Your I.Q.?

- 1. Was the grain drill, for planting wheat, an American or British invention? 2. Name Eugene Sue's imaginary paragon whose existence is based on the history of Christ's passion.

A FINE FIX

Newark, N.J.—(U.P.)—Sidney Richman Friday drove downtown to pay a \$2 traffic ticket. He double-parked when he couldn't find a spot and rushed into court to pay his fine.

Credit To No One

Those OLCC hearings last week had a good many aspects of a low-grade television mystery story. They left unanswered more questions than they resolved.

For instance: Did the money go for political campaign purposes or didn't it? If so, to whom? And did or did not the recipients know its origin?

Who are the two "unidentified" attorneys? And why the solicitude for them and their prospective "embarrassment"? Should attorneys, simply because they are attorneys, be immune from questioning in a matter of public interest?

THERE are other questions, too. The Oregon law which was allegedly violated in this instance is in ORS 471.420. It says:

"No license under the liquor control act or any dealer in, manufacturer or distiller of intoxicating liquor shall make any contribution to any candidate for political office or to any political party."

To the layman, this sounds specific and unequivocal. And most of the accused tavern owners, on legal advice, admit making the contributions in question, most of them with an understanding of what they were for. Yet, on legal advice, they plead innocent.

In effect they are saying, on legal advice, "I did what the law says is illegal. But I am innocent because I didn't know what this law, which regulates my licensed activities, said; and I didn't know how the money was to be used, even though I thought it was for a political campaign."

The question raised by this is: Does the law mean what it says? Or, through legal interpretation, does it mean something else? Also isn't it true that ignorance of the law is no defense?

AND one more question: Was the OLCC examiner interested in examining? Or was he content to let the attorneys for the "defense" marshal the witnesses and ask the questions?

The public is entitled to answers to these questions. They are entitled to know if the law has been broken, and if so by whom. They are entitled to know what happened to these contributions. They are entitled to know if the two "unidentified" attorneys—who are officers of the courts and as such are quasi-public officials—acted in a manner befitting the trusted profession of lawyer.

WHO will answer these questions? Will it be the new liquor control commission, which took office only the other day, in its report on this case?

Will it be the Bar association, which has assumed the responsibility for maintaining the profession in its position of trust and honor?

Will it be the Oregon Licensed Beverage Association, which has worked so hard to change the occupation of tavern keeper from one of odium into one of respect?

The hearings, in themselves, reflected credit on no one. If they result in a clearing of the air, and hereafter an honest response to legitimate questions before official investigators, however, they will have been worth while.—E.A.

Too Bad, But...

The Mail Tribune opposed the Hawthorne Park "free-way" route when it was first proposed. We still do.

But the Highway Commission has selected it, so we have to admit the goose is cooked, and those opposed will have to make the best of it, which we herewith will try to do.

HOWEVER to keep the record straight we would like to note again our main reasons for opposition to this selection.

No. 1: It runs contrary to accepted modern practice in state highway construction namely: that downtown and congested business districts should be avoided, and a "freeway" should BE a FREE way—that is free as far as possible from urban and local motor traffic.

No. 2: It will impair the beauty and attractiveness of Hawthorne park which has been a valuable community asset and render any development of Bear Creek, as the center of a new, improved and comprehensive park and recreational system for Medford, unlikely if not impossible.

Although for over a third of a mile it will be an "over pass" construction thus avoiding Jackson and Main street crossings, such a construction will tend to separate the city into two distinct areas, limiting freedom of access between them and creating (with the "Friendly Southern Pacific") yet another artificial barrier.

FINALLY No. 3: Routing the new "free-way" around the city instead of through it, either to the East or West, WOULD have given the touring motorist an attractive instead of an unattractive view of Medford, and instead of reducing the much publicized "tourist business" would, in our humble judgment have invited and increased it.

HOWEVER as indicated above, the State Highway commission apparently decided to "follow the election returns"—in this case the results of their hearings held in Medford and the pressures resulting therefrom—and as the Commission has the final au-

Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

SOVIET GRAND STRATEGY



Joseph Alsop

Moscow—It has been an astonishing experience, here in Moscow, to read the reports of Secretary of State Dulles' testimony on the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East. Such hours have been devoted to the discussion of dangers that hardly exist. The very real dangers that do exist have been so rapidly glossed over.

The very violence of the Soviet reaction to the President's new doctrine must of course give a look of truth to the administration's warnings about the possibility of Soviet armed aggression in the Arab lands. But in fact there is not the slightest evidence here to suggest in any way that the Soviets have any intention of using their armed might in the Middle East, either now or for years to come.

Indeed, all the evidence indicates that the Soviet leaders never had any real intention of resorting to force at any time during the Suez crisis, even at the moment when Premier Bulganin sent his threatening note to London and Paris and something unpleasantly like panic reigned in Washington. In truth, the real reason for the intensity of the Soviet reaction to the Eisenhower Doctrine was frankly stated by a brilliant Soviet expert on foreign affairs, who is the only member of the local hierarchy with whom this reporter has yet been able to talk at length.

"WE THINK," he said, "that this is a pretext for putting the buckle on the chain of American bases which surround the Soviet Union."

This does not mean, however, that the Soviet program in the Middle East will now be abandoned. In a very long and quite absorbing conversation about the present and future world balance of power, there was one point on which the Soviet expert quoted above was visibly sincere. The Soviets, he insisted, would never be content to let well enough (or bad enough) alone in the Middle East or any other troubled area on the Western side of the line that now divides the world.

In the same fashion, in Paris after the first London conference on Suez, Soviet Foreign Minister Shepilov flatly told the French leaders that his country "could never under any circumstances abandon its historic mission" of assisting in the "liberation" of peoples seeking to throw off the "colonial yoke."

Editorial Comment

HAWTHORNE ROUTE

Decisions this week of the state highway commission to use the so-called Hawthorne park route for the construction of the new section of U.S. 99 in the Medford area settles the last problem of location of the 25 mile project which starts south of Ashland and ends north of Central Point.

The action by the highway board means that Medford will be the only city between Portland and the Oregon line in which the high-speed four lane road will cut through the heart of a community. In other cases, cities and towns are being by-passed.

Here at Ashland, the route will be above Bear creek. Roseburg has already been by-passed as has Salem.

One factor in the board's announced decision seemed to be that following the Hawthorne park route would result in a minimum loss of valuable land such as orchard property and homes. However, it would seem to an outside observer that the route selected for Medford may have some distinct disadvantages for it will inevitably result in a physical division of that city with the super-road cutting through the center of the community. We are inclined to believe that if we resided in Medford, we would not be too happy about the choice.—Ashland Tidings.

authority in such matters, there is nothing we can see for the opposition to do but "grin and bear it." However—

If Medford grows in the next ten years as it has in the past—we hope it will and there are indications such a hope is justified—we believe the error of such a selection will then be conceded by most of those who today for various reasons so strongly support it.

—R.W.R.

HERE in Moscow, this reporter has certainly found plenty of expert support for the opinion that President Eisenhower and Sir Anthony Eden were all too successful at Geneva, in explaining their remorseless dedication to peace at any price. At any rate, it must have been delightful for the Soviet leaders to hear about this dedication just when a wholly new Middle Eastern program was being tentatively weighed.

Thereafter, the old Far Eastern emphasis of Soviet policy was at least temporarily abandoned. The links were formed with Egypt's President Nasser and the other Arab nationalists. The Middle Eastern program, which essentially consists of encouraging the Arabs to do what they want to do anyway, was adroitly launched.

The danger of the program lies in the fact that vengeance on the Western nations for the wrongs real and imagined is the immediate goal of Arab nationalism. The link with the Soviets in turn gives the Arab leaders the self confidence to seek this vengeance in ways that will prove fatal to the Western powers and especially to Great Britain. Yet thus encouraging the Arabs to do what they want to do costs the Soviets very little and involves a minimum of risk.

SUCH is the major present theme of Soviet grand strategy. One can only admire the cool daring and astute calculation of this strategy which gives the Soviet leaders a good chance of rather decisively upsetting the world balance of power at the small cost to themselves. One cannot feel this strategy will be successfully countered, either, simply by telling the Soviets they must not do the one thing they do not mean to do.

Yet the words have been spoken by the President. If they are now taken back by Congress, the after affects are likely to make the Summit meeting appear by comparison like one of the more hard headed episodes of Bismarckian diplomacy.

Copyright 1957 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

U.S. Budget Director Percival Brundage was testifying in Washington before the appropriations committee of the house of representatives.

The teletype adds: "Members of the committee are looking for places to CUT the proposed 72 billion dollar federal budget."

IF the members of the house appropriations committee are really serious in their desire to cut the budget proposed recently by the President, they might consult the report of the Hoover commission for government re-organization.

It will tell them how they can cut \$4 BILLION dollars a year off the budget without impairing any basically necessary function of the federal government—including national defense and the basic social services.

The cut would come out of what might be called the FLUFF of federal spending—including what for decades has been known as the "pork barrel."

SAVING of \$4 billion dollars wouldn't be hay.

Assuming that our present population is somewhere in the neighborhood of 167,000,000, each billion dollars the government spends costs you about \$6. If you are the breadwinner for a family of four, each billion spent by government costs you in the neighborhood of \$24.

So— If by careful and businesslike economy the federal government could cut its expenditures as much as five and a half billion dollars it would save you as an individual some \$33 a year. If you are the breadwinner for a family of four, it would save you something like \$132 a year.

If you are an average individual or an average breadwinner for a family of four, you could probably use that amount very nicely.

LET'S take a sharp look at this business of government spending.

There's a lot of politics in it.

This is the politics of the situation: At this particular moment in history, the executive department of our government (headed by the President) is in the hands of the Republicans. The legislative department (the congress) is controlled by the Democrats.

If the congress can put the bee on the President (in this spending controversy) the Democratic chances of winning the Presidency in 1960 will be improved (according to political reasoning).

If the President can put the bee on congress, Republican chances

of winning control of congress in 1960 will be improved.

Hence the political tussle over who is responsible for spending too much.

LET'S take a look at the facts. The President PROPOSES the amount to be spent—that is to say, the budget.

The congress APPROPRIATES THE MONEY.

IN OTHER words— If the congress thinks the President is being recklessly extravagant in his spending proposals, it can refuse to appropriate as much money as he asks.

That is the long and the short of it.

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 You Remember?

To the Editor: Do you remember when a chicken incubator was considered a miracle? When we were told an apple a day kept the doctor away? When everyone wore "patent leather" shoes? When rural smokers puffed corncob pipes? When banks had stacks of five, ten and twenty dollar gold pieces behind the cashier's cage for exchanging of customers checks or gold dust? When hardware stores sold gasoline to use in gas mantle lamps? When the men wore watch fobs and fancy vests? When every school student possessed an autograph album? When you were slighted if you did not get a comic valentine around February 14th? When everyone drank some sassafras tea every spring? When everyone hoped the groundhog would not see his shadow on Feb. 2nd? "Seems like all a dream now."

Bert Kissinger, 520 Boardman, Medford, Ore.

"He Didn't Live Long Enough"

To the Editor: My husband died in November of 1955, after a long and costly illness. His illness and death, and the later injury of my oldest son, took all our savings and made my family dependent on public support. It has been a long and bitter struggle to keep going.

After my husband's death, I found among his papers a booklet which showed that he, as a member of a well-known fraternal organization, was entitled both to weekly financial assistance while sick, and to a small death benefit. He had belonged for five years.

I made a number of attempts to obtain these payments to which I felt entitled, but was put off, for one reason or another, with no satisfactory explanation given to me. When I asked why, I was told that my husband "didn't live long enough" to be entitled to death benefits. I was also told they were "glad" I had not asked for their services at the funeral, because it would have cost them "a half day's wages."

What was done was done. It has now been more than a year. My reason for writing now is the hope that by making this known, some other person will not be hurt and deprived in the same way I was.

I admit I am bitter about it, particularly when the leaders of the organization make public statements about the "good" they do for their members and for the community. But my reason for telling this now is not for any sort of "revenge," but as a warning that things are not always what they seem. If other members know of these things, perhaps they will be less likely to happen in the future.

Mrs. Ben Blachly, 305 Effie St., Medford, Ore.

SAVAGE REBELS

Algiers—(U.P.)—French troops moved into the Algeria-Morocco border area west of Oran Saturday to search for a savage rebel band which marched 19 men to a cemetery, shot them, cut their throats and then draped their bleeding bodies over the tombstones.

Today and Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE SECOND INAUGURAL

The second inaugural is a statement of the President's ideals and of his hopes. It does not contain any definition of the policies, much less of the programs, which in his mind could best realize his hopes and ideals. The result is to give an impression of unlimitedness, of a lack of measure, of pledges and promises beyond the bounds of what is really possible, beyond the bounds, in fact, of what he himself actually intends to do and of what Congress would actually permit him to do.

Thus he affirmed with great energy his opposition to isolationism, which in its ultimately logical form is the conception of fortress America. But was it not for the other extreme to going to "we accept our own say that the deep involvement in the destiny of men everywhere?" Can it really be the policy of the United States government to become deeply involved in the destiny of men everywhere? In the realm of the spirit it is no doubt true that all men are brothers and that nothing human can be alien

to a good man. But in the realm where governments operate, it is always a question of practical policy as to where, as to how deeply, in what measure and in what degree, one government can and should involve itself with the destiny of other men.

Is it not an inflation of the moral currency for the head of a government, charged with the conduct of practical affairs, to make it appear that the alternative to a narrow isolationism is universal involvement?

THE absence of practical policy for the real world makes it difficult to be sure one has understood the central argument of the address. The world, he said in the earlier part of the address, is divided by the divisive force of international Communism and of the power it controls. The Communist orbit is, however, shaken by the rebellion of people who, like the Hungarians, wish to be free. Our purpose, the President went on to say, is to build a peace with justice where moral law prevails. Presumably, the realization of this ideal depends upon the ability of the peoples of the Soviet orbit, including the peoples of Russia itself, to overthrow the divisive force of international Communism.

The question which puzzles me is what is to be our own policy in the period, which may be quite prolonged, until these hopes of an internal revolution are realized. The address throws no light on that question. Yet this is the paramount question with which we shall be living for an indefinite time to come. It is not a policy to sit waiting and hoping for a revolution inside the Soviet orbit which will remove the problems that international Communism presents. The President does not mean to challenge the Soviet orbit which will remove the problems that international Communism presents. The President does not mean to challenge the Soviet orbit with arms. He cannot, surely, expect

to defeat it with propaganda. And in the address there is no suggestion that he is thinking of negotiating with it.

MY OWN view is that the world has become divided, and that there is no prospect within any foreseeable future that it can be united, as the President hopes, in one world which recognizes the same moral laws. We are in a period resembling the centuries in which Christendom and a militant Islam were in conflict, and there is no more prospect of a universally accepted moral order now than there was then. It may be misleading for the people, and distracting for the makers of foreign policy, to sponsor the idea that a universal moral order is an attainable goal of American foreign policy.

Our true goal, it seems to me, is to sustain our own moral order among the peoples who in fact subscribe to the same order, and beyond that, to aim not at a universal agreement but at accommodation among deep differences—and, as against the hot stew of the ideologies, to evoke the cooling spirit of live and let live.

(C) 1957 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

POTLUCK

(By M-T Staff and Contributors)

While the United States is talking about curbing the filibusters of politicians, the Medford Kiwanis club has done something about it. Members of the city council were guests at the club's noon luncheon last week. All were properly introduced (and the mayor was made an honorary member) but none of them were permitted to talk.

A young lady motorist was driving down the highway the other day when, to her horror, she saw a truck pulled over to the side of the road and a man lying on the ground nearby. "A terrible accident," she thought, and she pulled off the road to see if she could help.

Well, the truck was just out of gas, and the man on the ground was just trying to make a mechanical adjustment. She offered to drive for gas, but found when she returned to her own car, it was too far over on the shoulder, and was stuck in the sand.

So, she and the truck driver chatted for about an hour, until someone else brought gas for the truck, the truck pulled her car from the sand, and everyone drove off.

The home economics class of a Medford school was having a demonstration night not long ago, and mothers were invited to come and sample the cooking done by their daughters. One mother, who was on a special diet recommended by her doctor, brought a friend along to sample her daughter's cooking for her.

A deputy sheriff who recently drove to Pasadena, Calif., to pick up a prisoner, started to tell about the trip this way: "We left Pasadena in beautiful sunshine, which followed us all the way to the Siskiyou. Then we hit snow. The car skidded sideways, and went over a 20-foot bank. I managed to get out of the wreckage and free the prisoner, a burly man of some 280 pounds. I lifted him to my back and carried him up the bank in heroic fashion..."

At this point he was interrupted by loud and disrespectful noises from his fellow deputies, who proceeded to give him the title of "Mr. Liar of 1957."

Our favorite school paper, the Lincoln Legend, arrived last week, and on reading it we learned that the most notable thing about George Washington was his memory. They built a monument to it.

The thing we like best about the Legend (aside from its jokes) is the direct, forthright job of reporting which its staff does. Witness this story from the pen of Cheryl Champion: "We had three visitors in our school last week. They were girls from Medford High school who might decide to become teachers. They came to Lincoln school to observe some classes... We hope they decide to be teachers. We liked them."

Our favorite school paper, the Lincoln Legend, arrived last week, and on reading it we learned that the most notable thing about George Washington was his memory. They built a monument to it.

The thing we like best about the Legend (aside from its jokes) is the direct, forthright job of reporting which its staff does. Witness this story from the pen of Cheryl Champion: "We had three visitors in our school last week. They were girls from Medford High school who might decide to become teachers. They came to Lincoln school to observe some classes... We hope they decide to be teachers. We liked them."

Two Groups Ask Wage Increases

Portland—(U.P.)—The State Public Welfare Commission was faced Saturday with request from two groups for more money.

The Oregon Funeral Directors association asked for fees of \$165 for services now provided for \$75 or \$80. The services do not include the casket and cemetery plot or crematorium expenses.

Operators of licensed nursing homes had asked for a \$65 monthly increase in pay for welfare recipients at a previous meeting. They asked the welfare department to back them in requests they will make to the Legislature.

to defeat it with propaganda. And in the address there is no suggestion that he is thinking of negotiating with it.

MY OWN view is that the world has become divided, and that there is no prospect within any foreseeable future that it can be united, as the President hopes, in one world which recognizes the same moral laws. We are in a period resembling the centuries in which Christendom and a militant Islam were in conflict, and there is no more prospect of a universally accepted moral order now than there was then. It may be misleading for the people, and distracting for the makers of foreign policy, to sponsor the idea that a universal moral order is an attainable goal of American foreign policy.

Our true goal, it seems to me, is to sustain our own moral order among the peoples who in fact subscribe to the same order, and beyond that, to aim not at a universal agreement but at accommodation among deep differences—and, as against the hot stew of the ideologies, to evoke the cooling spirit of live and let live.

(C) 1957 New York Herald Tribune Inc.