

MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE
"Everyone in Southern Oregon Reads The Mail Tribune"
Published Daily except Saturday by MEDFORD PRINTING CO.
33 North Fir St. Ph. SP 2-6141

They Don't Really Trust 'Ike'

We sometimes, — not often — wonder how many people in Oregon take the "Oregon Voter" and if they do take it, take it seriously.

We don't refer to the weekly's statistical tax and financial reports, which are excellent. Nor to its factual and biographical coverage of the regular sessions of the state legislature, which are also OK. But to its political opinions, as expressed by the head of its political department, Ralph T. Moore.

We don't often read them for they are so predictable, — always take the same old line—that is "view with alarm" when the Democrats are in power and "point with pride" when the Republicans hold sway.

But of late there has been an extraordinary change in this familiar, and somewhat prehistoric, pattern.

PRESIDENT Eisenhower has now been in office for 5 years, promises to remain for 3 years more, and yet in its current issue of the Voter we note that the extremely serious-minded and solvent Mr. Moore has resumed his role as a male Cassandra and views the future with almost as much forboding and alarm that for so many years he viewed—and still views—the theories of the "New Deal."

How come? The only answer we can imagine is that the Oregon Voter's political mentor, is almost as strongly opposed to "Ike" and his "MODERN Republicanism" as he was to F.D.R. and the "New Deal." He also believes with some other G.O.P. stalwarts, that the President has strayed from the straight and narrow path of those early days when he castigated "TVA" as "creeping socialism."

For in the present situation Mr. Moore in reviewing the 5th year of Republican administration feels impelled to view with great alarm as follows:

"In review of 1957 one can but feel some uneasiness over evidence of solid entrenchment of the socialist concept in our body politic. No nation thus afflicted has ever survived."

THAT is certainly rather a horrendous observation regarding the G.O.P. conception of the present "state of the union."

But "R.T.M." is quite serious and uncompromising about it.

THIS time, however, The Voter doesn't, as in the past, go back to the second battle of Bull Run for its political concepts but years and years before that to none other than that great Revolutionary hero, Benjamin Franklin.

Yes, it seems that wise, canny and resourceful patriot following the original national constitutional convention said that they had given the people a republican form of government (with a small "r" please) but the question was whether the people had the character and enterprise to KEEP it.

The Voter quite clearly doubts they did have these qualities, and seems to be sure they haven't got them now.

At least The Voter trembles for the future of the country, General Eisenhower not withstanding.

For example, Mr. Moore writes it is quite certain the Honorable Ben Franklin would, if he were alive today, have as "dim a view" of the present set-up with its "gaudy gimmicks", all of which must be "dislodged" IF THIS GREAT REPUBLIC IS "TO ENDURE"—as The Oregon Voter has.

STRONG words! And what a job.

For it is not difficult to enumerate some of the changes that must be made, if the United States of America, according to The Voter, is to endure.

Commentator Moore doesn't enumerate them in detail so we can only guess, but we feel fairly certain we are not far wrong when we include in this list of "gaudy" and expendable "gadgets" the following:

- Social Security. Old Age pensions. Unemployment insurance. Federal power and loans. Farm subsidies. Labor unions. Federal aid to schools.

There are undoubtedly more that are anathema and spell America's doom, according to the Ancient Republicanism as represented by the Voter's political commentator, and there may be some in the above that might be accepted by them, not because there is any belief in them as necessary in a continued program of constructive progress, but because they are IN our accepted system of democracy and the opponents see no PRACTICAL way to get them out.

Why? Because the people want them and unfortunately for Mr. Moore this is still a government OF the people.

But, all in all, we believe that gives a fair picture of the "state of the nation" as The Voter's political spokesman views it.

FINALLY, if wise and shrewd old Ben Franklin COULD return to earth and spend a short time sizing up the situation, we feel he would have no more use for ANCIENT "Republican-ism," than he had for obscurantist Toryism, nearly 200 years ago!—R.W.R.



IT WAS AS HIGH AS I COULD REACH!

Today & Tomorrow

By Walter Lippmann

THE PRESIDENT'S MILITARY POLICY

Measured in money, the President's program does not register a conviction on his part that there is a crisis in our affairs calling for extraordinary measures. Budgets are complicated affairs and are not easy to interpret. But the President's budget message gives some figures which are enlightening and which provide a significant measure of the President's response to the post-Sputnik situation.

The figures are for "total government expenditures (1) for all procurement to equip our forces and those of our allies with weapons, ships, planes and missiles, (2) for atomic energy, and (3) for all scientific research and education." The figures, that is to say, measure weapons, and scientific research and training for men to invent and to perfect the weapons. The figures do not measure military expenditures for pay, for housing and construction, for food, clothing, recreation, medical care, etc. The figures register the specific response of the Eisenhower administration to the present phase of the race of armaments.

The over-all figures for 1957, for the fiscal year which ended June 30 of last summer, were \$20.5 billion. For the current fiscal year, 1958, which will end on June 30 of the coming summer, the figures will be approximately \$21.1 billion. For the fiscal year 1959, which begins next July 1, the figures will be about \$21.6 billion. In short, the total increase for weapons and research will be just a little more than a billion dollars next year as compared with the pre-sputnik year 1957.

THE section of the message which gives these figures is entitled, "Changes in Emphasis." These words define exactly the President's basic policy.

The total effort for military weapons is not to be much greater. But the extra money which is to be spent for missiles and related things is to be drawn mainly, except for 1.1 billion dollars, from a cutback in the "older types of weapons and equipment."

WHAT is the explanation, we may ask, for the display between what the President is asking of the country and what, following the Gaither and Rockefeller reports, the country expected to be asked for? The root of the matter is, I venture to think, a difference in military doctrine.

The President's budget rests on the proposition that if there is not likely to be a big total war, or even a big limited and localized war. For that reason, we have in this budget the "changes in emphasis" which are concentrated upon the big strategic deterrents at the expense of the older and more conventional weapons. Now the amount of money that can be spent effectively and rapidly upon these experimental and untested weapons is not enormously great, and while the President's estimates may be somewhat less than could be spent, they are radically less.

THE government could spend a great deal more on military defense if it accepted two ideas. On the one hand, it could spend more if the President believed it desirable to build up rapidly the older services in readiness for "limited wars," and if, on the

other hand, he accepted the idea of a large program of shelters against radiation for the civilian population. It is here, I think, on these two points, that the President has diverged from the more or less expert groups who are advocating considerably larger military budgets.

The crucial question in this difference of opinion is whether, and to what extent, a strategic balance of power is deterrent. I myself believe that this question cannot be answered categorically and by the mere attempt to measure fire power. The only answer possible is to say that strategic deterrence will work if, but only if, it is accompanied by a diplomacy of accommodation which is based upon a recognition of the realities of the balance of power.

(c) 1958 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

French Premier Faces Test on First of Three Crucial Issues

By CHARLES M. McCANN United Press Correspondent

French Premier Felix Gaillard has taken the offensive on the first of three big issues which could bring his downfall.

The National Assembly, the controlling house of Parliament, started a new session Tuesday.

To the surprise of deputies, Gaillard at once demanded a vote of confidence on his proposal to postpone \$12 million in payments to war veterans.

The vote is to be taken today. French political experts predict Gaillard will survive—largely because members do not want a new cabinet crisis right now.

To Face Other Tests But a victory will only bring the 38-year-old Premier, who took office last Nov. 5 after a 37-day cabinet crisis, closer to two even bigger tests of his strength.

The first is Gaillard's plan for home rule for Algeria, which he hopes may prove the first step toward ending the nationalist rebellion that has drained French blood and money for more than three years.

The second is his plan for constitutional reform, designed to end the incessant series of cabinet overthrows that have weakened France's position as a world power.

Unless Gaillard can survive the entire world, and I am confident that we can outsell and out-produce Russia and thus command the respect of those people with whom we do business internationally.

Dana McBarron Rogue River, Ore.

Now He's Seen Everything To the Editor: The writer has now seen everything and can spend the rest of his days in peace, with absolutely nothing to worry about.

Appearing on the front page of Monday's paper was an article stating that "The Water Resources Development Corp. of Denver, Colo., had been given a state license to regulate the weather from April 1 to Oct. 15, 1958". That IS a news item extraordinary.

Now all that we guys on the river have to do is get them a license for the rest of the year. (Possibly they would make a special job rate to be busy the entire year in this area.)

Our concern about being washed out by high water would then be a thing of the past. We could then just fish and hunt all the time, our minds at ease.

And look at all the work it would save the Reclamation Service and the Army Engineers. And think of all the expensive surveys that wouldn't have to be made again. We might even get our highway patched up again, real good.

Awwful simple ain't it? We thought it was such a difficult problem, too.

Bill Brewster, Trail, Ore.

4-H Does It Again! To the Editor: We aren't exactly sure of how to say it but feel that it, definitely, should be said!

4-H has done it again! This versatile organization seems to hit upon every imaginable phase of training that is possible for developing young people into worthwhile citizens.

The 4-H group we have in mind is one of two such groups in Southern Oregon! They call themselves, "The Pacifiers" . . . and truly they are. Yes—this group specializes in child care.

At a recent social function of our community, the Pacifiers donated their services. With the assistance of their leader, Mrs. Dave Harbison, they attended 40 pre-school children with such ease that many of the mothers remarked on their capabilities.

From the 4-H program this group receives training in child care skills that include many actual hours of experience as well as helpful knowledge gained from films and special instructions.

Since this group can receive pay only by their individual "baby-sitting" service we would like to give them a plug by mentioning their names: Sandra Wallis, Connie Gregg, Helen Vickoren, Rickey Meyers, Sharon Simmons, Sharon Cartwright, Sharon Williams, Martha Armstrong, Marjy Andrews, Charlene Andrews and Florence Oscar.

Mrs. Ed Kimmel Mrs. Bert E. Simmons Eagle Point Jayceettes Eagle Point, Ore.

In the Day's News

By FRANK JENKINS

What of Ike's budget? Is it a goodie? Or is it a baddie?

I WOULDN'T know. But, judging by the comment on the wires as this is written, it seems to be about as popular as a polecat at a pink tea.

GEN. Thomas White, air force chief of staff, thinks a shortage of funds may put a crack in the nation's first line of defense—the strategic air command, upon which we must rely until we get inter-continental missiles.

He bases his opinion on SAC's failure to get 700 million dollars in the new Eisenhower budget.

SO MUCH for military opinion — which, of course, must be and WILL BE taken into consideration. Let's pass on now to the politicians.

Farm belt congressmen say proposed budget cuts in agriculture conservation and land reclamation programs are "unwise and unrealistic." Rep. Jamie Whitten of Mississippi says defense needs can be taken care of by cutting out waste in the present defense program RATHER THAN REDUCING FARM AID.

OREGON'S Senator Morse complains that the two million dollars requested for the Pacific Northwest's John Day dam is "only a fraction of what is needed."

He adds: "This budget continues the policy of starving federal multipurpose development in an attempt to force its bankrupt partnership upon the people who have repeatedly rejected it at the polls."

EASTERN Oregon's Al Ullman joins Senator Morse in "deploring the two million dollars John Day dam didn't get. He says:

"We need to restore farm markets and farm purchasing power. We need to help small business and encourage small industries.

"Defense spending alone will not solve this crisis."

OH, SHUCKS! I forgot. There is one Pacific Northwest senator who LIKES the budget. He is Sen. Warren Magnuson, of Washington, who says he is VERY MUCH pleased with it because it recommended 20 million dollars for Ice Harbor dam in Washington state.

He says he has asked for \$570,000 more in planning funds for Lower Monumental dam in the Columbia Basin.

AT THIS point, let's skip to another development in the news.

In Washington yesterday, members of the congress, along with federal communications commission members and reporters, submitted themselves as a guinea pig audience for a test demonstration of the new "subliminal perception" technique in TV advertising — in which messages are flashed on the screen so fast you can't see 'em, but they are supposed to influence you to do what the messages tell you to do.

In this case, the subliminal messages commanded the test audience to BUY POPCORN. This morning's dispatches are vague as to the results, and we'll have to wait for the reports of the popcorn sellers to see what happened.

I CAN'T help wishing that instead of "buy popcorn," they had flashed this command on the screen:

"BE STATESMEN—not demagogues."

If subliminal perception could put that command over in our congress it would be something WONDERFUL.

Matter of Fact

By Stewart Alsop

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

Washington—President Eisenhower's letter to Premier Bulganin is not only well written and forceful counter-propaganda, it is also a major state paper, representing the kind of basic national policy decision which only the President can make.

The decision is to press seriously for an agreement with the Soviets to eliminate the long range ballistic missiles from the arsenals of both sides.

That is the meaning, of course, of the President's proposal that "outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes." The proposal is at least comparable in significance to the old Acheson-Lilienthal-Baruch plan for control of nuclear weapons. As in that case, nothing at all may come of it. All the same, because the President's decision embodies a major national policy, it is worth trying to understand the reasoning which lies behind it.

The proposal raises two obvious questions. Is an agreement to eliminate the long range ballistic missiles technically feasible? And would such an agreement be in the national interest of the United States?

THOSE who favored the proposal inside the government (they faced bitter opposition) answer both questions in the affirmative. Their reasoning is largely based on the nature of the ballistic missiles at the present state of their development.

In the first place, a ballistic missile follows a trajectory which carries it to an altitude of several hundred miles. Any test-firing of a missile is thus subject to detection at a great distance by line-of-sight radar, as our own Turkish radar installations, which have detected hundreds of Soviet missile firings have proved. Thus a limited number of agreed radar installations would be sufficient to detect any illegal test-firings on either side.

Obviously, this country has no intention of agreeing simply to cease testing missiles. But it is also considered technically feasible to render existing missiles useless. For in the present state of the art, both ICBMs require an elaborate base structure.

Each base is like a small, permanent factory, since the liquid fuel must be constantly manufactured on the spot. The Pentagon has already publicly announced the precise location of our first projected ICBM base, simply because it will in any event be impossible to hide the huge

installation, which will cost in the neighborhood of \$100 million.

BECAUSE the bases are so visible and elaborate, a limited and manageable inspection system would be sufficient to locate missile bases on both sides. In fact, our own intelligence already has a rather precise idea of the location of existing Soviet missile bases, and once the bases were located and dismantled, neither side could threaten the other with decisive surprise attack, simply because the weapons are useless without the base.

So much for technical feasibility. As for the national interest, one point is obvious, that the Soviets are already far ahead of this country in the missile field. But that is not all. By the very nature of the weapon, the ballistic missiles favor a closed society over an open society.

For a closed society, they offer the ideal weapon of surprise attack. For an open society, they impose the almost impossible requirement of an instant, on-the-spot decision to strike back, which is in the nature of things almost impossible in a democracy. Take our own ICBM base mentioned above. Soviet ICBMs will obviously be zeroed in on that base.

Given less than 20 minutes warning time, who is to decide to fire the missiles before they are obliterated? And even if an automatic (and most democratic) on-the-spot decision is possible, will that be enough? For in the present state of the art, a liquid fueled missile requires complex "topping up" preparations before it can be fired. These preparations take, not minutes, but hours.

THESE are some of the arguments which persuaded the President to make the control of ballistic missiles the key proposal in his letter to Bulganin and a key point of American national policy. There are, as there always are, arguments on the other side. One such argument is that the Soviets might secretly perfect air-breathing missiles which could not be readily detected by radar, or solid fuel missiles which would not require the easily detectable base system.

In any event, it is no doubt unlikely that the Soviets will negotiate seriously now that we have, by our folly, allowed them to gain a decisive lead in the missiles. Even if they do, extremely powerful voices will be raised in this country, especially in the Pentagon and industry, against any real agreement. But when all this is said, it is still true that the President's proposal is a hopeful sign of reviving initiative, after the long years of drift.

(c) 1958 New York Herald Tribune Inc.

Church Services
For those who are actively engaged in the work of their respective churches, we believe that baptisms, weddings, and funerals should rightfully be conducted in the church.
These are, and should be, events of religious background and significance and their ceremonies belong in the church.
For that reason it is our policy to make no extra charge for funeral services conducted in the church.
DAY OR NIGHT - PHONE SP 2-8030
Chapel Mortuary
Across from the Courthouse
Frank Morgan - Harold Snodgrass
FUNERAL DIRECTORS

NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL EDITORIAL 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
Jan. 16, 1948 (Tuesday)
Special program scheduled over radio station KYJC observing the 60th wedding anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. J. S. Aldredge of 517 Beatty st., Medford.

From Arthur Perry's Ye Smudge Pot, column: "Merchants of Sweet Home, in products of long skirts worn by the fair sex, have banded together and vowed to grow 1890 whiskers."

20 YEARS AGO
Jan. 16, 1938 (Wednesday)
Sun shines in Medford and valley for first time since dense fog enshrouded the countryside Dec. 31.

M. N. Hogan elected president at a meeting of the board of directors of the Community Chest of Medford.

30 YEARS AGO
Jan. 15, 1928 (Monday)
A modern 10-story office and business building may be erected in Medford, according to Earl C. Miller whose company erected the Medical Arts building in Portland.

Two hundred young trees have been received at the city playground from Mrs. Grace Nye of Cascade Gorge; they will be planted by Boy Scouts and Floral society.

40 YEARS AGO
Jan. 16, 1918 (Wednesday)
From local and personal column: "The Westerlund orchards this winter and fall planted 400 acres to wheat. Because of the high price of wheat the whole valley has shown a big increase in wheat acreage."

Boys as well as girls are learning to knit in the Junior Red Cross at Washington school.

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

- 1. Matzoth, which is served during the Jewish Passover, is leavened, or unleavened, bread?
2. Bible: According to Genesis 14 was Abraham contemporary with Amraphel or Sargon?
3. In which government department is the Office of Indian Affairs?
4. "Ah," "Oh," and "Lo" are what parts of speech?
5. The next term of U. S. President begins at noon on what date in January?
6. Beaufort's scale is used to measure the weight of horses, strength of wind, or speed of ships?
7. Basking, hammerhead, man-eater, thresher, tiger, and whale are all names for what large fish?
8. What color is claret wine?
9. In law, a witness having opposing interests, is called what?
10. What is the predominant religion in Mexico?
Answers: 1. Unleavened bread. 2. Amraphel (Hammurabi, the lawgiver of ancient Babylon.) 3. Department of the Interior. 4. Interjections. 5. January 20. 6. Strength of wind. 7. The shark. 8. Red. 9. Adverse witness. 10. Roman Catholic.