

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO. 27-29 North Fir St. Phone 2-5143

Subscription Rates: By Mail—In Advance Per Copy 10c. Daily and Sunday—One year \$15.00. Daily and Sunday—Six months \$8.00.

Advertising Representative: WEST-HOLIDAY COMPANY INC. Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, Portland, St. Louis, Atlanta, Vancouver, B.C.

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: April 9, 1947 (Wednesday). Emmett W. Beeson is appointed veterans agricultural agent for Jackson county succeeding Raymond Duncan.

20 YEARS AGO: April 9, 1937 (Friday). The Medford Corporation plans to start its sawmill next Thursday or Friday, according to General Manager James H. Owen.

30 YEARS AGO: April 9, 1927 (Saturday). C. C. Hoover shipped two more cars of dairy cattle to Hugh Clark of Fresno this week and will ship another car Monday.

40 YEARS AGO: April 9, 1917 (Monday). Mayor C. E. Gates, who recently purchased three resident lots on West Main st., has Architect Clark at work on plans and specifications for the erection of a bungalow on each of the lots.

What's Your I.Q.? (Time of ten correct is superior; seven or eight is excellent; five or six is good.)

1. Was the one-cent postal card first used in the U.S. in 1863, 1873, or 1883?

2. What calling was pursued in common by the following: Edward Teach, Captain Kidd, Mary Read, Jean LaFitte?

3. Bible: Was Caesaria seat of Pilate's or Caesar's government?

4. Passenger pigeons are now extinct: true or false?

5. Which State leads in the production of grapefruit?

6. The Sault Ste. Marie canal connects which two of the Great Lakes?

7. With the political life of which country do you associate the name Juan Peron?

8. In which novel by Thackeray is Becky Sharpe the heroine?

9. Is the term "gentleman friend" or "lady friend" good usage?

10. "Hame's hame, be it never so hamely."—J. Arbuthnot. What does "hame" mean?

Answers: 1. 1873. 2. They were all pirates. 3. Pilate's. 4. True. 5. Florida. 6. Huron and Superior. 7. Argentina. 8. "Vanity Fair." 9. No. 10. Home.

Court Rules Against Alaska Bus Company: San Francisco (UPI)—The Court of Appeals has upheld an injunction against the Anchorage Bus company of Anchorage, Alaska, forbidding it to operate between Anchorage and nearby Elmdorf Air Force Base.

In a 2-1 decision the Court affirmed Monday a preliminary injunction obtained by the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., which already has service between the air base and Anchorage.

Rawles Moore

"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight; He can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

"A wit's a feather and a chief a rod; An honest man's the noblest work of God."

The above well known quotations from Alexander Pope would be this department's selection of an epitaph for Judge Rawles Moore who passed away so suddenly and unexpectedly on Monday last.

It is not perfect. Epitaphs never are. But it comes closer to describing Judge Moore as we knew him—and have known him for many years—than anything else with which we are familiar.

We knew him well—perhaps as well as any fallible human can really know another.

And his sense of right, his inherent and unflinching honesty—even on the golf course!—where in the "good old days" we so often "gamboled"—were to us his outstanding characteristics.

WE SHALL miss him. The entire community will. Medford will be a far less interesting and enlightening place without him.

There is, of course, one consolation,—one might term it a mutual one.

That is:—it is comforting to realize that he departed without lingering or without suffering, quickly as he would have wished, "the sailor home from the sea, the hunter home from the hill."—R.W.R.

Whatever He Does Is Wrong

A large part of the writer's business is to read the editorials of the Oregon press. As the aforesaid press is overwhelmingly Republican we are forced to suffer a radically unbalanced editorial diet, politically speaking.

What has always, and continues to surprise us is the inability of the Republican press, AS A WHOLE, to even between elections give the opposition a decent break.

We are not complaining particularly, merely stating a fact.

As far as our records go, there are only two or three papers in the ENTIRE state, that might be accused of pro-Democratic leanings. Yet day after day the G.O.P. drum-fire goes on, as if the campaign of 1956 had never ended.

And the chief object of the partisan Republicans' wrath, is, of course, Oregon's senior Senator, Wayne Morse.

APPARENTLY Senator Morse's change of party labels, on the basis of principle, is something the G.O.P. Old Guard can never and will never forgive or forget.

So the one-sided war goes on.

One might think that changing party affiliations in this free democracy—which millions of good respecting American citizens do every few years—were an unpardonable sin, only properly expiated by political death.

Yet from his first election to the Upper House, to the present time, Oregon's senior senator repeatedly stated and clearly emphasized that he would not be bound solely by PARTY considerations; that he would always be a "free man" and when he believed the party to which he belonged was, from the standpoint of the national welfare wrong, he would put the welfare of his country above that of purely party fealty.

THAT he has done. More than that he has faced overwhelming odds—in the recent national election only two daily papers in the state supported him—but he NOT only won, but has always run far ahead of his ticket.

Is there any need of more evidence that public opinion in this state is behind him as it has been for 12 years? Is there reason to doubt that this will be true in the six years to come?

Newspapers are supposed, by and large, to reflect public opinion. But obviously that is not true where Senator Morse is concerned.

Again we are not complaining, merely stating a fact—however, a fact we feel is worthy of comment.

THIS is particularly so because at this time, several of the anti-Morse press have recently shown signs of getting their second wind.

This is particularly true of that vigorous champion of the Grand Old Party and everything it represents, the Salem Capital Journal.

For example: in the recent election the Salem paper damned Oregon's senior Senator for being nothing but an over-inflated "wind bag," an impotent figure in the Upper House, who had only to rise in his seat for a few words and that would be a signal for an immediate exodus and an empty house.

Following his election there was for Senator Morse a vocal hiatus. But instead of praising this departure from the practice so severely condemned the "C-J" proceeded to castigate this change of pace, as characteristic of Oregon's "Artful Dodger" fearful of becoming involved in the Dave Beck issue and thus losing his labor support.

Finally when a few days later, Senator Morse declared the time had come for the Teamsters union to get wise and to "clean house," this was the belated gesture of another self-seeking opportunist, climbing on the band wagon at the 11th hour as usual, just to get votes!

IT IS really rather funny. Such blind, persistent, utterly humorless partisan prejudice and astigmatism often is.

Senator Morse, who dared to depart from the Grand Old Party, because he had ceased to believe in

Sen. Goldwater Hits Eisenhower Budget; Others Join Attack

Washington (UPI)—Republican Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona scored President Eisenhower's budget Monday in one of the sharpest attacks on the President since his reelection.

Goldwater, former chairman of the GOP Senate Campaign committee charged that the President is "subverting" the national economy and accused Eisenhower of breaking his 1952 campaign promises to economize.

"No faithful public servant... would dare subscribe to such a breach of confidence," he said. Slams 'Modern GOP'.

Moreover, he slammed Eisenhower's "Modern Republicanism" as a "splintered concept of Republican philosophy" designed to have a "rather brief tenure."

Goldwater was the latest of a number of Republicans to attack the President's 72 billion dollar budget. Also, there have been other signs among a number of Republicans of disenchantment with the Eisenhower program.

Many Republicans teamed with southern Democrats in the House last week to cut appropriations for the Labor and

Health, Education and Welfare departments. And only Monday the two top GOP members of the House Rules committee — Reps. Leo E. Allen (Ill.), and Clarence J. Brown (Ohio) — joined with southern Democrats to block action in effect on the administration's Civil Rights Bill until next month.

Senate Democratic Leader Lyndon B. Johnson seized the opportunity of Goldwater's attack on Eisenhower to compare the new budget of "the so-called Great Crusader" with the peacetime high of nine billion dollars under President Roosevelt and 39 billion dollars under President Truman.

Goldwater said both he and the President campaigned in 1952 against big federal spending and promised to cut the budget. For four years, he said, the administration "made valiant efforts toward reducing the budget."

Now, Goldwater said, "this strange and mysterious force seems to have descended upon the Republicans, for something has happened to change the mind of the administration since 1952."

Matter of Fact By Joseph Alsop

NON POLICY-MAKING

London—On the eve of a long Middle Eastern journey, this reporter has been trying rather desperately to find out just what Middle Eastern policy was agreed upon by President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan at Bermuda.

Despite all the happy crowing in the contrary sense, the answer to the foregoing question is, alas, only too clear. They did not agree upon any policy.

The passage of time always makes the participants in great events, or even in events that ought to have been great but were not, more inclined to be honestly communicative. So although it is a bit late in the day, it still seems worthwhile. So although it is a bit late in the day, it still seems worthwhile.

In the first place, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan renewed their wartime comradeship. Thus a basis was laid for intimate personal communication between them in future times of crisis. This was certainly a plus.

In the second place, everyone kept repeating, with the President leading the chorus, that the former closeness and frankness must be reestablished forthwith. The President no doubt meant what he said. Whether Secretary Dulles, who is seldom close or frank with his own most intimate subordinates, was equally sincere in his protestations, is an interesting question which only the future can answer. There is no truth, at any rate, in the report that special mechanisms of joint consultation and planning were set at Bermuda.

In the third place, all present agreed about what they would like to see happen. Egypt's Nasser curbed, the U.N. resolutions enforced, the Middle Eastern oil sources protected for all time—these were some of the objectives that were easily adopted in a delightful glow of concord.

But the game of statesmen agreeing on what they would like to see happen is of course about on a par with the agreeable old parlor game of "what would you do if you had ten million dollars?" And there was no detailed agreement at Bermuda on the only really vital policy problem. This was, of course, the problem of actually making all these wonderful things happen.

THIS failure, although as yet only dimly sensed here, is the real reason for the very cool response to Bermuda in London. And this failure is the reason for saying that no real policy was agreed upon at Bermuda, for in

policy making the means are always the great difficulty whereas the ends are generally self-evident.

For the immediate future, developments in the Middle East do not seem too hard to predict, from this perspective of London. Having lightheartedly tossed away every means of pressure that could possibly be applied to Col. Nasser, the great powers of the West are eventually going to have to let Nasser operate the Suez Canal on approximately his own terms, at least as long as he keeps the controversial ditch open to all but Israeli traffic.

There will be a lot of empty bluster first. But even the most hot-headed British and French see that an attempted boycott would be a way of cutting off the nose to spite the face. So Nasser will get just about his way on this.

In Gaza, too, he is sure to get just about his way. He was, indeed, sure to do so from the moment when it was so strangely decided in Washington that a few thousand strictly, even passively non-shooting U.N. troops could control 250,000 suicidally inflamed Palestinian refugees wholly guided by Nasser's agents. Nasser may like to keep the U.N. troops in Gaza on his own terms, however, as a shield against Israel.

THEREFORE if Nasser does not try to interfere with the passage of Israeli shipping through the Gulf of Aqaba, which seems unlikely, the immediate prospect is disagreeable but unexciting. The sad phoniness of many assumptions made and things said in recent months will be displayed to the world. There will be bad feeling and criticism, especially Anglo-French criticism of American policy. But that will be about all.

The real danger to the Western alliance lies further ahead in the future, and outside the immediate neighborhood of the Suez Canal. The American Middle Eastern policy that is being given to be vaguely shadowed forth, is essentially a policy of replacing British weight and influence with American weight and influence.

This would not be easy in the best of circumstances. An American effort to stabilize the Middle East is bound to be encountered by powerful and astute opposition from Moscow. Moreover, for many different, extremely human reasons, replacing British influence with American influence is a remarkably delicate operation. To go smoothly—and it could hardly succeed unless it goes smoothly—this operation required a policy agreement, made in advance, in great detail, and at the highest level. Unfortunately, even after all the talk at Bermuda, no such agreement exists.

(c) 1947 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Communists Get New Foothold In India; Nehru Challenge Seen

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent Communism has established a new foothold in eastern Asia.

A Red government has been established in the state of Kerala, in India, as the result of the recent national elections.

Thus Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, friend of Soviet and Communist China, will have the opportunity of practicing the Red policy of "co-existence" on his own territory.

The Communists won 60 of the 125 seats in the Kerala State Parliament in the elections. They are assured the support of five independents and thus have a majority. Nehru's Congress Party was able to win only 43 seats.

It must have been a painful blow to Nehru. He gets along fine with the Russian, Chinese and other foreign Communists. But he never has had any fondness for his own Communists.

To make things worse, the new chief minister of the Kerala government—a post corresponding to prime minister — is held by Elankulam Namboodiripad, a one-time leader of the Congress Party.

First Red Foothold The victory of the Kerala Reds gives Communism its first official foothold in a new part of Asia—in any part of Asia, in fact, outside of the Soviet Union, China, North Viet Nam and North Korea.

It is ironic that it had to happen to Nehru. While the menace of Communism is serious in some Asiatic countries, the Indian Communists never have amounted to much.

Nehru, a benevolent dictator,

is firmly in charge of India as a whole. His Congress Party won 365 of the 488 seats in the ruling lower house of the Indian Parliament in the elections. The Communists won only 27.

But Kerala's 7,500,000 voters refused to go along with Nehru. Their vote for the Communists was largely a protest against the extreme poverty of that part of India.

Kerala is one of the 16 new states formed by Nehru out of the 29 states that once made up India. It is 15,035 square miles in area and has a population of 13,550,631. It lies at the extreme southern tip of the Indian peninsula.

Namboodiripad Newsman Chief Minister Namboodiripad is 48. A member of a high-caste patrician family, as is Nehru, he is a well-known newspaper man. He is wealthy, and has been a generous contributor to Communist funds.

Namboodiripad was converted to Communism about 10 years ago. He previously had been president of Nehru's Congress Party in Kerala.

As soon as he took office last Friday, Namboodiripad commuted all death sentences in Kerala and said he would free all political prisoners. He announced that he proposed a drastic land reform program. This will include, if he can get away with it, the nationalization of foreign-owned plantations.

It can not be said that the establishment of Communist rule in Kerala constitutes any serious threat at the moment. But Communism is always a threat wherever it gets even a little power.

In India, the danger in the long range view is that Communism will spread to other areas of the peninsula. That whole part of the country is impoverished and rich ground for Red penetration.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

Foreign affairs stuff:

The Middle East situation—which we'd like to see looking better and better—keeps looking grimmer and grimmer.

Let's keep our hats on. What's going on over there is a big stakes poker game. It is quite probable that a lot of bluffs are being run.

The best news is that there is no shooting—yet.

ON THE domestic front, the appropriations committee of the U. S. house of representatives votes a cut of nearly 218 million dollars in the requested budget for the department of commerce.

The bill, as trimmed, now goes to the house floor for action.

ON THE face of it, it SOUNDS like the house of representatives (where all money-spending bills must originate) MEANS BUSINESS, and is going to cut spending sharply so that federal taxes can be reduced.

Wait a minute. Before jumping to any conclusions, read this rather revealing little dispatch:

Economy-minded congressmen say they have trimmed nearly a BILLION dollars from President Eisenhower's record-breaking peacetime budget. They hope eventually to cut two or three times that much.

However—The budget-cutting fever cooled slightly Thursday night, when a ROLL CALL vote was taken and nearly 53 million dollars slipped back into appropriations for the labor and welfare departments.

WHAT does THAT mean? Briefly, it means this: The trimming was done on a VOICE vote. On a voice vote, nobody knows who voted for what. A roll call vote is a RECORD vote—and on a record vote anybody who is willing to take the time to check up on the record can find out who voted for what.

WHAT does THAT mean? It means that as of now in the congress of the United States—which has the final say on how much is to be spent, which governs the amount of tax money that will have to be taken out of the pockets of the people—TALKING ECONOMY is regarded as good politics, but actually VOTING for economy is regarded as bad politics.

In other words—The politicians still believe that what the people want is MORE SPENDING rather than less spending. They will continue to believe that until the people start picking out the spenders and voting against them.

WHEN that time comes— IF it comes— We will get more economy in government. But not, I'm afraid, until then.

TAKEING everything into consideration, it seems improbable that federal taxes can be REDUCED SHARPLY this year, or even next year.

But we certainly ought to be able to STOP TAXES FROM RISING, so that we can catch our breath, get our second wind and start reducing the national debt.

SPEAKING of the national debt—

INTEREST on it amounts now to about seven BILLION dollars. On the general assumption that each billion dollars spent by the federal government costs you as an individual about \$6, that means that interest on the national debt costs you individually about \$42 a year.

As late as the decade ending in 1936, our TOTAL per capita federal tax was only \$20.95. Now, only 20 years later, our per capita federal tax is more than \$400—or 20 times what it was 20 years ago.

It's getting about time to call a halt.

New Mexican Voters To Elect Congressman

Santa Fe, N.M. (UPI)—New Mexico voters went to the polls today to choose between Democrat Joseph Montoya and Republican Tom Bolack for the congressional seat held by the late Rep. Antonio Fernandez, a Democrat.

Only 70,000 persons were expected to vote despite an outlook for generally fair weather. More than 260,000 voted last Nov. 7 when Fernandez was elected at-large to an eighth term. He died the next day of a stroke.

CASH FOR TAXES

IF YOU HAVE taxes, insurance or other obligations to meet, come in and see us. We offer a complete loan service. One of our plans will solve your problem.

OREGON FINANCE COMPANY

Locally Owned & Operated Gene Thomas, Manager 46 South Central

Counsel With . . .

Mr. Insurance—Fred Brennan



Fred Brennan

THINK IT OVER Human lives are cheap today, And yet we must protect them, For cars we buy Are now so high, We can't afford to wreck them.

Or Call Mr. Friendly Bill Fish

Phone 2-4940

MEDFORD INSURANCE AGENCY 27 NORTH HOLLY ST.



Bill Fish

We think a mighty lot of help could come from our state legislators, now sitting in Salem. They could rewrite the existing gambling statutes to include pinball machines of the type now in operation. They could ban pinballs entirely from the state of Oregon—as the City Commission and the people of Portland have banned the gambling devices in Multnomah County's metropolis. We strongly urge Coos County legislators to initiate such legislation.—Coos Bay Times.