

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune... Published Daily Except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.

Subscription Rates: Daily and Sunday—One year \$15.00... Daily and Sunday—Six months \$8.00

Special Paper of the City of Medford Official Paper of Jackson County... United Press—Full Leased Wire

Advertising Representative: WEST HOLIDAY COMPANY INC. Offices in New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION AFFILIATE MEMBER... 1957 NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

Flight o' Time: Medford and Jackson County History from the files of The Mail Tribune 10, 20, 30 and 40 years ago.

10 YEARS AGO: May 14, 1947 (Wednesday) Prospective serious shortage of water will be discussed by land owners of the Medford and the Rogue Valley Irrigation districts at a meeting tonight.

20 YEARS AGO: May 14, 1937 (Friday) Jackson County Chamber of Commerce is invited to luncheon in Grants Pass to honor Gov. Charles H. Martin.

30 YEARS AGO: May 14, 1927 (Saturday) About \$17,000 worth of remodeling starts on Rialto theater by the George A. Hunt company.

40 YEARS AGO: May 14, 1917 (Monday) Arrangements are completed for a "Do Our Bit" parade to be held in Medford this Wednesday.

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

1. Sept. 5, 1795: "The Boston Prices-Current and Marine Intelligence, Commercial and Mercantile." Was this the name of the first newspaper in the U. S., exclusively for commercial topics, or a bulletin board?

Pendleton Justice Submits Resignation: Pendleton—Justice of the Peace Ann Crago Monday submitted her resignation to Gov. Robert Holmes effective June 30.

The Miracle at Jamestown

Three hundred and fifty years ago yesterday — on May 13, 1607 — Captain Christopher Newport and slightly more than 100 settlers landed at Jamestown, Va., to found the first permanent English settlement in America.

As many as three million visitors are expected to attend the eight-month festival — through the end of November — marking the anniversary. The miracle is not that the Jamestown colony was the first lasting Anglo-Saxon settlement in the New World, or that it contributed so many "firsts" to our national history.

The mystery is that the colony survived at all. Few adventures ever weathered such vicissitudes. The original party included only a handful of likely colonists — a few mechanics and 12 laborers, and only four carpenters. About one-half the company of 120 or so were set down as "gentlemen."

IN CAPTAIN Newport's three ships — the "Susan Constant," "Godspeed," and "Discovery" — they were at sea more than four months. On May 13 they cast anchor at a marshy island 32 miles up the James River. Not far away, the Spaniard de Allyn's colony had eked out a brief existence during 1526.

The English colonists built a small fort, surrounded by rude huts, covered with sedge and earth, on an enclosure of slightly more than an acre. On higher ground they sowed some wheat.

Indians attacked almost immediately. They were beaten off, with a loss to the colonists of one killed and 11 wounded.

Newport departed for England with his ships — and a small cargo of clapboard and timber — leaving 104 persons in the settlement. An Indian siege followed, and the inhabitants were reduced almost to starvation. Then malaria and dysentery set in.

NEWPORT returned on Jan. 2, 1608 to find only some 40 of the settlers alive. Capt. John Smith, who was to be largely responsible for holding the company together, was about to be hanged for losing two of his men on an expedition. Dissension was rank.

Newport restored a measure of harmony, but five days after he had landed, fire destroyed the settlement. That winter the buildings were only partially replaced, and some persons died from exposure.

In the winter of 1609-10 — "the starving time" — famine almost depopulated the colony. Defeated, the small group remaining were about to start for England when they met Lord Delaware with a relief expedition.

THE colonists gradually learned to adjust to their new surroundings, but at a frightful cost. Some 5,650 colonists were sent over in the first 18 years of the colony; only 1,095 were there at the end of the period. Some had fled back to England, disillusioned; most had perished.

About 1614, John Rolfe, best known for marrying Pocahontas, showed the colonists that tobacco could be made a profitable crop. From then on the "deceivable weed" was the making of the settlement. Indian attacks were repeated, notably in 1622 and 1644; fires swept the town in 1676 and 1698.

The seat of government was moved to Williamsburg in 1699, and Jamestown gradually was deserted. Even so, it had been established, in 1619, the first legislative assembly in America. And at Jamestown the English had set up their first successful colony and proved that they could colonize the New World. — E.R.R.

Exemption Hike for Lower Incomes?

Much of the talk about lower federal taxes centers around raising the personal exemption in the income tax — say from the present \$600 to \$700 per individual. The move would be especially popular among the many small taxpayers who would thereby be relieved from paying any federal income tax whatsoever. (Several years ago it was estimated that a \$100 higher exemption would take four million or so income tax payers off the rolls.)

However, the point would undoubtedly be made that on an absolute basis a hike of \$100 in the personal exemption would save more dollars for the big taxpayer than for the small one. That would be because the tax rate on the last \$100 of taxable income is of course higher as the income gets higher.

FOR instance, the rate is 20 per cent on the first \$2,000 of income per individual, rises to 43 per cent on the amount of income between \$12,000 and \$14,000, becomes 65 per cent on the income between \$32,000 and \$38,000. So the saving would be \$20 or less per person covered in the smallest returns, \$65 or more in the largest ones.

It might be politically more popular to allow an exemption rise only on the smaller incomes, not on the larger. The history of personal income taxation in the United States affords precedents for any such arrangement.

IN THE first 20 years of the tax, from 1913 to 1933, the personal exemption applied only to the normal tax, could not be claimed in computing the surtaxes. (Today the distinction between the normal and surtax has been eliminated.)

And when the revenue act of 1921, applicable to the calendar years 1921, 1922, and 1923, raised the normal tax exemption for a married man to \$2,500 from \$2,000, the \$500 increase was restricted to those with incomes below \$5,000, denied to those whose incomes were over \$5,000. — E.R.R.



Matter of Fact By Stewart Alsop

PRESIDENTS AND BUDGETS Washington—President Eisenhower's belated last stand against the fierce attack on his budget suggests a somewhat surprising question. Did Congress trust Harry S. Truman and Dean G. Acheson more than it trusts Dwight Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles in the field of foreign policy?

Consider the contrast. Despite the President's intention of "going to the people," most observers agree that the chances are still high that the Congress will cut the liver and lights out of the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign program, carving great hunks out of the foreign aid program, the foreign information program, and the State Department budget.

It will be considered a miracle if the President holds the foreign aid program, originally budgeted at \$4.4 billion, at much over \$3 billion. Now look at the Truman-Acheson record on foreign aid.

IN 1948-49 the Truman administration asked for \$6.8 billion in foreign aid and got \$6.4 billion; in 1950 for \$5.5 billion and got \$5.2 billion; in 1951 for \$7.8 billion and got \$7.4 billion; in 1952 for \$7.5 billion and got \$7.3. In short, the Truman-Acheson programs were cut by the small, manageable percentage points—around 5 per cent—a budget-maker always allows for, while the Eisenhower-Dulles program was cut by almost a quarter last year, and may be cut by a third this year.

The Eisenhower-Dulles foreign aid program is lower than the Truman-Acheson programs by from one to three billion dollars. Truman, moreover, was far from a universally popular President in the period of "Korea, Communism, and corruption." As for Acheson he was the main political target of the Republicans, and he found precious few defenders among the Democrats.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was re-elected only six months ago by the second largest majority in history, and he is still phenomenally popular. His Secretary of State is not universally well-liked, but he has never become a central political target, and he has had an infinitely more kindly press than his predecessor. Yet Truman and Acheson always, without exception, got essentially what they wanted out of Congress, in matter affecting foreign policy, while Eisenhower and Dulles will be lucky to save the bare bones of their foreign program. Why the contrast?

AS USUAL, there are all sorts of reasons. There is the new budget-consciousness among the voters, which has awed the whole Congress. There is the growing economic isolationism of the South, one of the most important political phenomena of the Eisenhower years. There is the fact that foreign aid has been with us for a long time now, and the save-the-world fervor of the early Marshall Plan era is all gone now.

But it is also true that the President and his Secretary of State have been hoisted on their own petards. Petard number one was the "peace" propaganda of the 1956 campaign. It was undoubtedly effective politics. But it also persuaded a lot of voters that the time had come to sink back happily into "the new normalcy," and stop worrying about all those bothersome foreigners.

Petard number two is the way the foreign aid program was managed in the first Eisenhower administration. In early Eisenhower years the program was cut way down to close to the \$3 billion mark, in the name of "economy." But these "savings" were largely phony—it was a process of living off fat in the

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 an eye to clarification and condensation. Letters submitted for publication must not exceed 400 words.

Porter Needs Support

To the Editor: Congressman Porter thinks it advisable to introduce a Rogue River Flood Control Bill now to gain time. It would call for a construction program along the lines of the Bureau of Reclamation's Plan A submitted in March 1948. The Congressman is being opposed by some who think the current survey may come up with a revised plan that would eliminate the high dam at Lewis Creek.

The Rogue River system, its area, its topography, its rainfall, its tributaries, etc. haven't changed much in ten years. Given the same set of conditions and the same problems it is inescapable that the new survey will arrive at about the same conclusions as the old. If the new survey doesn't corroborate the old then the fat will really be in the fire. Which one are we going to accept?

Those who repudiated Plan A with its high dam at Lewis Creek, but are now reportedly ready to accept the recommendations of the present survey before they know what they are, are buying a pig in a poke. When the bag is opened it can hardly be other than the Lewis Creek Dam.

Flood control will be expensive because it involves reservoirs on either the Rogue or its tributaries or both. As taxpayers the method of financing the proposed program concerns us. Flood control can be linked with revenue producing hydro-electric power that will reimburse the government for most of the cost.

The taxpayers needn't be and shouldn't be saddled with any such costly thing as flood control divorced from power and irrigation. Rogue River water is the greatest asset this region has. It needs developing. The public's interest requires that there be integrated development of it's several interests. The Old Plan A assigned 51 per cent of the cost of the Lewis Creek Dam to power, 38 per cent to irrigation and only 11 per cent to flood control. There is no disposition to discount fish and flood control, but in point of people and values concerned they represent only minor interests with no right to control the river. The future of this valley is tied up much more with its power and irrigation possibilities.

Michael Strauss, a former Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation, says that Rogue River has the best ratio of benefits to cost of any river he has checked on. Congressman Porter is a key man in any possible development of the river. He is in a position to get the best advice on parliamentary tactics and engineering opinion. He represents all the interests of Rogue River water. He is showing that he has a better overall understanding of the problem than those who think only in terms of fish and flood control. He should get better support for his efforts than he got when he was last here.

W. E. Davies
Route 1, Box 82
Eagle Point, Ore.

Tax Collector Finds Reason Mail Ignored

Paris—A tax collector discovered Monday why plumber Raymond Guichard, 69, had failed to answer his back tax notices for more than three years. The collector entered Guichard's apartment and found the plumber had hanged himself from his dining room chandelier years ago. All that was left was his skeleton, still dangling from the chandelier.

DURLING ON VACATION: E. V. Durling is on vacation. His "On the Side" column will be resumed on May 27.

'Excesses' in Politics Discussed by Senator Richard L. Neuberger

By SEN. RICHARD NEUBERGER

Washington, D.C.—This was the statement that I issued on May 3: "A tragic event such as this wipes out all political differences. Mrs. Neuberger and I express to Mrs. McCarthy our heartfelt sympathy over the untimely passing of her husband. The death of Senator McCarthy takes from the Senate a controversial figure who stirred strong opposition and kept loyalties. His passing at so early an age is a shock to all of us."

A short time after this, we heard some of our liberal friends exulting that McCarthy was dead. Maurice and I were disturbed. She said this reminded her of the time she listened to a leading Portland businessman express gratification over the stroke which had claimed the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

What Has Happened? What has happened to us in America? Politics has taken on a kind of savagery. Have we lost the capacity for separating the man himself from his political views?

To me, a person mortally ill is not a political foe but another human being who can suffer pain and agony, who must endure the sheer terror of approaching death, who faces imminently the ultimate judgment which confronts us all. What does politics have to do with such an experience as this?

I have tried to analyze why politics has become so bitter that partisans can actually derive satisfaction from the death of a political rival. Residents of Oregon will remember the episode of the 1954 Senatorial campaign, when a prominent speaker in behalf of my opponent urged Republicans to get away from the issues and attack Neuberger personally. And what of the 1956 insinuations against Senator Morse's patriotism because he was not a war veteran?

Lists Three Factors: What lies behind these excesses? I would list three possible factors:

1. Current political campaigns, built around reaching a mass audience through television and radio, are concentrating more and more on putting across "personalities" rather than real and complex issues of government, which take longer to explain. Borrowing the selling techniques of the advertising industry, such campaigns depend on creating "good" impressions of one candidate and "bad" impressions about the other, even to the extent of personal smears which have nothing to do with any policy questions at stake.

2. The vast expense of such modern political campaigns requires campaign funds which have left Democrats increasingly dependent on funds raised by labor organizations, to offset the reliance of the Republican Party on the much larger benefactors from big-business sources. This tends to create more inflexible and bitter schisms between the two parties.

Cites Investigations: 3. Last but not least, there is the new tendency for the investigative function to subordinate the legislative process in our government—and for this Senator McCarthy himself must, of course, share much responsibility. In too many instances, the purpose and nature of legislative investigations seem to be to "expose" people, to shred their reputations, to bring them to the brink of prosecution—if not for prior misdeeds, then for contempt or perjury during the investigation itself—and to end their public careers, or those of the man associated with them. The investigative function is essential in its proper place. But when the side show becomes the main tent, and Congressmen cease to be legislators and assume the roles of policemen or "private eyes," the result has a corroding impact upon the atmosphere of both government and politics in the United States.

It is my hope that someday, when the tensions of the recent years which marked Senator McCarthy's political rise and fall are behind us, we may have political disagreements and campaigns in this country—as they often are in Canada, in Great Britain and other democracies—based on genuine debate of the issues of government, but free of personal rancor, character assassination and enduring bitterness.

350th Anniversary Of Jamestown Landing Observed

Jamestown, Va.—The roll of 17th Century drums and the roar of 20th Century jets combined Monday to mark the 350th anniversary of the landing at Jamestown.

The English settlers who landed May 13, 1607, formed the first permanent settlement in the new world.

Some of the nation's top dignitaries were on hand, including Vice President Nixon, Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson, Assistant Secretary for Air Dudley Sharp, TAC (Tactical Air Command) Commander Gen. O. P. Weyland, Virginia Gov. Thomas B. Stanley and U.S. Sen. Harry P. Byrd (D-Va.).

Actors Draw Interest: But despite the great show of brass, the nearly 3,500 spectators who thronged the mall of the ultra-modern, multi-million dollar festival park expressed their greatest interest in actors dressed in ancient costumes and the latest in Air Force jets.

The Air Force stole the show. A public address system was rigged up so the spectators could hear first-hand the conversation between Col. Carlos Talbott, leader of a jet flight, and a ground communications crew here.

The three jets, which less than eight hours before had taken off at London airport 4,500 miles away, swept overhead at nearly tree-top level.

Weyland said that three other F100 Supersabres continued on to Los Angeles, where they set a new record for non-stop jet fighter flight by staying in the air for 6,710 miles. They were refueled in the air en route.

Advertisement for Schenley Bourbon Drink. Text: 'Bourbon drinkers... When are you going to taste clearly finer Schenley "white label"?' Includes image of a bottle and a man's face.

Counsel With... Mr. Insurance—Fred Brennan

Advertisement for Fred Brennan Insurance Agency. Text: 'Buying insurance by mail order from the parent company rather than consulting your local agent or broker is just like buying your honey from the bee rather than the grocer. You might get it cheaper but there's also a chance you might get STUNG.' Includes photos of Fred Brennan and Bill Fish.